United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2009 No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 14, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ELLEN O. TAUSCHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, purveyor of all human events and Father of the ages, the times in which we live cause Your people to be filled with anxiety and hesitant to trust.

Make the Members of Congress strong in their defense of the most vulnerable in our midst, to inspire light in our darkness.

Make them bold in upholding moral principles and determined to do what is right for the Nation's stability, without feeling self-righteous or fearful of personal consequences because of their unified purpose to do what is best for this country.

If the times ask much of us, Lord, enable us to make sacrifices or to take risks that will ensure a better future for Your people.

Help us to stand strong because we place all our trust in You. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IT'S TIME FOR AMERICA TO COME HOME

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the American people have a right to know or ask what's going on here. We have trillions of dollars for war, trillions of dollars for Wall Street, and trillions of dollars for health insurance companies; but now we hear we have less money for Social Security and less money for Medicare. Is there a connection?

We must begin restoring our Nation by restoring the peace. And we begin today when we defeat the supplemental appropriation that keeps us in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Democrats were elected on a promise to end the war in Iraq; we are continuing it. Democrats were elected to get us out of Afghanistan; the war is escalating. And to top it all off, Members of Congress, we have a rule, it's in the rule, which keeps Guantanamo open, keeps the prisoners there, despite the fact that many of them may have had their basic rights violated.

It's time for America to come home, start paying attention to creating jobs, health care, education, retirement security, investor security.

It's time for us to start paying attention here instead of running around the world trying to tell other people how to live.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, a new report shows Social Security is a lot worse off than predicted. It's time for Congress to find real solutions to the Nation's ailing retirement safety net. The trustees' report predicts an even gloomier forecast than last year due to the economic downturn and the beginning retirement wave of the baby boomer generation.

The President and Majority Leader HOYER have rightly called for action to bolster Social Security's future. Congress must respond now by finding a solution.

As the lead Republican tasked with handling Social Security, I stand ready and willing to join Democrats and Republicans to get the job done now. The longer we delay, the more drastic Social Security's adjustments will be, the greater the burden will be on future generations, and the more detrimental the impact on our national economy.

Americans want, need, and deserve a Social Security system that works.

AMERICA'S ADDICTION TO OIL

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, immediately after the President announced his intention to turn America into a 21st century green economy, the special interests began lobbying to keep America addicted to oil.

We were told there's no urgency to change, no threat to the planet from the ongoing and massive releases of carbon into the atmosphere, and that we should pump every drop of oil out of every foreign country regardless of how many wars we need to wage to satisfy our addiction.

Just remember this: The special interests want to keep us addicted to oil because that is in their interests, not ours, not America's best interests.

We have an Administration that recognizes and is responding to the global crisis, and Congress needs to support the President with legislation that will cure America of its addiction to oil and save the planet in the process.

Time indeed is running out, and we have before us the evidence and the legislative proposals to remake America into a clean and energy-independent economy. It's time to act while there's still time to have air to breathe.

ENERGY PUNISHMENT TAX

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, somewhere in the prohibited, cold corridors of the darkened back rooms of this castle, the Capitol, in places unknown, unseen, and unheard of by the public, the new Federal taxcrats are carefully crafting the energy punishment tax.

This $646 billion tax is aimed at punishing Americans and businesses for using any type of energy. The idea is we should not only feel guilty for using energy, we should pay for our energy sins by being taxed on consumption.

So the taxcrats are going to double the cost of natural gas and home heating oil by taxing the use of it. Use natural gas or home heating oil in your home to keep warm in the winter, you're going to be hit with the keeping warm tax.

Electricity costs are going to increase by 73 percent; so be careful about turning on the AC. It's going to cost you more with the keeping cool tax.

Taxes on gasoline will go up 50 percent. Don't drive your car unless you want to pay the new driving tax.

Americans are taxed enough already. The government should not tax us back to a Stone Age existence with the new absurd energy punishment tax.

And that's just the way it is.

NORWEGIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join in the celebration of Syttende Mai, or Norwegian Constitution Day.

On May 17, 1814, an assembly of Norway's leaders signed a Constitution declaring Norway's independence and establishing a government that was radically democratic for its time, especially in Europe.

This Sunday, exactly 195 years later, millions of Norwegians will gather to celebrate their independence, their long history of constitutional democracy, and their national achievements.

Norwegians and Norwegian Americans across our country will celebrate at smaller, but no less joyful, Constitution Day events. In my home State of Washington, the Norwegian Ambassador to the U.S. will serve as the Grand Marshal of a Constitution Day parade.

The United States and Norway share in the celebration of Constitution Day because we have a strong diplomatic friendship, a robust trading relationship, and a shared history of commitment to democratic principles.

Moreover, the U.S. and Norway are military partners. Today in Afghanistan, as a for instance, Norwegian soldiers are fighting the Taliban and al Qaeda alongside U.S. servicemembers.

So I congratulate Norway on this Constitution Day and look forward to celebrating Syttende Mai with them for years to come.

STIMULUS

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the Associated Press issued an analysis this week that describes what many have known all along: The $787 billion economic stimulus plan isn't getting to the people who need it most.

For those who knew the Federal Government would not be able to effectively and efficiently distribute the money, this comes as no surprise.

The May 11 story says: ''Counties suffering the most from job losses stand to receive the least help from President Barack Obama's plan to spend billions of stimulus dollars on roads and bridges, an Associated Press analysis has found.''

The story continues: ''The very promise that Obama made, to spend money quickly and create jobs, is locking out many struggling communities needing those jobs. Many struggling communities don't have projects waiting on a shelf. They couldn't afford the millions of dollars for preparation and plans that often is required.''

The Democrat spokesman for the House Transportation Committee said, ''I think the Administration oversold the transportation aspect of this. It was sold as the heart and soul of the package, and it really just isn't.''

That's the understatement of the year.

21ST CENTURY GREEN SCHOOLS

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, a healthy learning environment for our children is the gateway to a brighter future. Unfortunately, too many of them attend schools that are crumbling, making it harder for teachers to teach and students to learn. In fact, research has shown better quality schools have higher rates of student achievement.

For this reason I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 2187, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act to modernize, upgrade, and repair school facilities across this country. This legislation creates healthier, safer, and more energy-efficient learning environments for our Nation's children. In addition to improving our schools, this bill will play an important role in protecting our environment and improving our economy through the creation of environmentally sound schools and the creation of thousands of new construction jobs.

Madam Speaker, I represent an urban district where many students would benefit from the modernization of these schools. By passing this bill, these students and others across this country will get the opportunity to learn in a healthier and sounder environment.

THE CAP-AND-TAX PROPOSAL: WRONG MEDICINE FOR AN AILING ECONOMY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, a picture is worth a thousand words. And this ran in the Wall Street Journal: ''The U.S. recovery: Uncle Sam throwing a lifeline out''. And what is it? It is an anvil of a tax. This signifies what is happening on this cap-and-tax proposal.

A 44 percent to a 129 percent increase in electricity costs, gasoline up 61 cents, natural gas up 108 percent.

Don't believe me? Believe Chairman Emeritus JOHN DINGELL, who said, ''Nobody in this country realizes that cap-and-trade is a tax, and it's a very big one.''

Also, President Obama, who said, ''Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity costs would necessarily skyrocket.''

A tax increase is the wrong medicine for an ailing economy.

AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, as the American Clean Energy and

Security Act goes to markup next week, citizens around our country will be looking forward to legislation that not only addresses the crucial issues of energy independence and climate change but also does not greatly increase our costs.

Americans understand that we are at a crucial point with the high and unpredictable costs of energy, global warming, and its direct impact on our health, wellbeing, and national security must be addressed. The people of the insular areas understand this in a more acute way as we have the highest energy costs in the Nation, geographic locations that are susceptible to the ill effects of climate change, and economies that can be easily affected if the goals of energy independence and environmental sustainability are not reached.

As we work to move our country into a new clean energy economy, we look forward to our full inclusion in legislation that will create jobs in our communities, encourage the production of cleaner renewable energy resources, decrease the pollution that has damaged our air and water quality and impacted our health, and produce entrepreneurial opportunities for both large and small businesses.

We look forward to a new direction and a new clean energy and green economy.

□ 1015

TAKE CARE OF OUR SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last Monday a tragic event occurred in Iraq when five servicemembers were killed at the Camp Liberty Combat Stress Control Center. It points out the importance that we need to pay attention to with posttraumatic stress disorder, acute stress disorder, and a wide range of other mental illnesses which can occur after prolonged combat or exposure to severe stress.

We need to understand and communicate with our soldiers and their officers that these problems are real and they are treatable and you can get a soldier back in emotional shape. It is not a sign of weakness. It is not a sign of failure on the part of the soldier or the officer, but they need to get help.

Over the centuries in our military, the uniforms have changed, the weapons have changed, the ships have all changed, but the soldier remains the same, brave and strong and true. But Congress must, nonetheless, provide substantial funding to take care of our soldiers and their families and keep them in mental health shape and physical shape and to get them back on their feet strong and ready.

Congress and our Nation must continue to support them. There is hope, there is treatment, and we need to continue and support our soldiers in that endeavor.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL AMERICORPS WEEK

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National AmeriCorps Week. Over the last 15 years, nearly half a million AmeriCorps volunteers have served with thousands of nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations across America. AmeriCorps recruits and trains millions of community volunteers to serve our country's critical needs in education, the environment, public safety, and disaster relief nationwide.

Sixty-five percent of AmeriCorps alumni go on to pursue a career in public service. In my home State of California alone, almost 8,000 people this year will participate in one of more than 7,500 AmeriCorps programs throughout the State. One such program is coordinated by the Santa Barbara County Education Office in my district.

This program provides daily tutoring and reading for over 700 at-risk students. It recruits volunteers for additional educational programs, and it works to increase disaster preparedness in the schools of Santa Barbara County.

The over 700 million hours served by AmeriCorps members have bettered our communities and touched the lives of countless Americans. These individuals dedicate their time and energy to help meet the needs of our local communities, and during these tough economic times, we need them now more than ever.

To all these incredible participants in AmeriCorps, I commend you and thank you for your service.

NOT RELEASING DETAINEE PHOTOS IS THE RIGHT DECISION

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to our President. I am grateful that he has reversed his decision on releasing the alleged detainee abuse images.

It was the right decision to come to. It was the right decision to make, and I congratulate him. I thank him. I think we are all grateful to him.

I am glad to see that he listened to his team of national security advisers and realized that releasing those images is not in our national interest.

It does not make this Nation more safe. It makes it less safe. It does not help our troops in the field. It makes their job more difficult, more dangerous, and it makes their lives less safe every day.

Having Fort Campbell in my district, with troops just returning, having our Tennessee National Guardsmen just now deploying to Afghanistan, what we need to do every day is say thank to you these men and women and make certain that our service honors their service. And I thank the President for joining us in reversing his decision.

PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FRAYING ECONOMY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today we have a $96.7 billion bill that expands supplemental funds for more war in Iraq, ratchets up U.S. military presence in Afghanistan, and allocates a minimum of $400 million for nation building in Pakistan where corruption is the norm.

We must ask how competent is our government to transform a world beyond our borders that speaks Arabic, Pashtun, and Farsi? Not even a handful of our military does.

Those majorities practice religions largely foreign to us, and their governments, if you can call them that, are undemocratic, weak nation states with vast legions of poor people and corrupt governance. Pakistan alone has 163 million impoverished people, and Afghanistan's largest export is heroin. So we are going to inject ourselves into that situation even deeper, with almost no multinational support.

What have we achieved politically in Iraq? Spending our Nation into endless debt, we have transformed a secular dictatorship into a divided Nation separating Sunni, Shia, and Kurd factions. A nation of 25 million has been upended, millions uprooted, and maybe 18 million shell-shocked people remain, while oil contracts have been divided up among multinationals. Not a pretty picture. And not a situation that will hold long term.

So, now we're going to take on Afghanistan, a country that's not a nation, with over 400 tribes, where the Taliban is strengthened by the very sight of foreign troop presence.

Madam Speaker, it is time for America to come to our senses. After $1 trillion, isn't it time to pay more attention to the fraying economy here in our homeland and the American people?

PRESSING NEED FOR TAX SIMPLIFICATION

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, last week the House Small Business Subcommittee on Finance and Tax held a hearing on a long overdue issue: the pressing need for tax simplification for America's small business.

The IRS estimates it takes over 37 hours to complete the 1040 short form, the most basic income tax form we have. Why does it take this long? Because our Tax Code today runs over 67,000 pages.

This is a disgraceful state of affairs. We need a simpler and fairer Tax Code that rewards, not punishes, hard work and success. Small business creates 70 percent of all new jobs in America. Small business can lead us out of this economic recession and back into recovery if Congress gives them a chance.

Let's start by overhauling our broken tax system.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER CAINE

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, today I would like to honor Christopher Caine's 25 years of service to one of Vermont's most important and valued businesses, IBM.

The largest private employer in Vermont, IBM has long served as a bedrock in Essex Junction in the greater Burlington community. It has proven itself to be a strong corporate citizen and has shown the world that Vermonters can compete for quality high-tech jobs.

For the past 25 years, Christopher Caine has made a major contribution to that success in such positions as public policy director and, most recently, as vice president of governmental affairs.

Like thousands of Vermonters who earn their livelihoods at IBM, Christopher has worked diligently to ensure the success of this great American company, and, in so doing, he has contributed to a key part of Vermont's economy.

Upon his retirement this year from IBM, I want to salute Christopher for his contribution to IBM and to the State of Vermont.

CERTIFY YUCCA MOUNTAIN AS PERMANENT NUCLEAR WASTE DEPOSITORY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, nuclear power is an environmentally friendly way to meet our energy needs. Fortunately, we have a safe and ready option for permanent storage for the waste generated by this clean power at Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

But despite the fact that energy ratepayers in my State have contributed over $375 million to the Nuclear Waste Fund, the Federal Government has refused to keep its end of the bargain and store the nuclear waste.

Nationwide, this fund has now collected over $350 billion in fees and interest since its inception. Minnesotans and all Americans should not have to pay for government inaction.

I have introduced legislation that would require the President to certify Yucca Mountain as a permanent nuclear waste depository; and if it's not certified, the bill would return billions of dollars from the Nuclear Waste Fund to ratepayers across the country.

Madam Speaker, let's quickly pass the Rebating America's Deposits Act.

DO BETTER TO GIVE VETERANS SUPPORT

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Madam Speaker, we owe our Nation's brave men and women in uniform a debt of gratitude. However, after speaking with so many families, it's obvious that we must do better to give veterans the support that they have earned. None of our troops should end up on the streets after serving their country, and all of our troops should have access to treatment for conditions such as posttraumatic stress syndrome.

This is why I rise today to announce my strong support for the Veterans Bill of Rights. This new bill of rights pledges three things.

One, we will increase the Veterans Administration's direct support for homeless veterans. No veteran should ever go hungry.

Two, we will make counseling services for PTSD available in every veterans center in America.

And, most importantly, three, we in Congress will make veterans a number one priority in all public policy decisions. We owe this to them and much, much more.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of Veterans Bill of Rights.

ENERGY

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, during the campaign, President Obama pledged 95 percent of taxpayers would not see their taxes increased one single dime. Unfortunately, the President has broken this promise.

The President's budget included a cap-and-trade policy, otherwise known as cap-and-tax, that will hit every home utility bill and inflict more pain at the pump. Every American will be impacted by this dangerous policy. American households, on average, can expect to pay an additional $3,100 a year in energy costs.

The American people still live with the memory of $4 a gallon for gas and the hardship it inflicted on their family budgets. Even our Democrat colleagues say this.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD from North Carolina is quoted today in Roll Call as saying, ''The cost of everything is going to go up.''

The cost of everything is going to go up. This is the wrong direction for this country.

VISIT LAS VEGAS

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, this week is National Tourism Week. Tourism is the sixth biggest industry in America.

As the congresswoman from the entertainment and tourism capital of the world, fabulous Las Vegas, I want to encourage all of my fellow citizens to enjoy the remarkable diversity of options the tourism industry provides.

Come to Las Vegas. Enjoy our great hotels, fabulous shows, superb restaurants, water sports, Grand Canyon tours, great shopping, and our other wholesome family entertainment. Memorial Day weekend is right around the corner. Make your reservations now.

I promise you will have slots of fun.

SALUTE TO ROBBIE BEANE

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a sheriff's department veteran from Beauregard Parish in my Louisiana district who was recently killed in the line of duty.

Detective Robbie Beane had dedicated 14 years of his life protecting and serving the good people of Beauregard Parish. On May 5, he died in an accident while on duty with three of his fellow officers.

During his 14 years as a member of the Beauregard Parish Sheriff's Department, Robbie Beane worked his way up to detective and had become a volunteer member of the SWAT team and the SWAT diving team.

Detective Beane was an active member of his church and volunteered in civic organizations. He was slated to be the next president of the Deridder Lion's Club.

Detective Beane is the first member of the Beauregard Sheriff's Department to be killed in the line of duty.

He leaves behind his wife, Nikki, and their daughter, Joslynn. This is a tragic loss, and I want to express my sincere condolences to his family and thank Robbie Beane for his service to our State.

21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVIL). Pursuant to House Resolution 427 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2187.

□ 1028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2187) to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, and for other purposes, with Mrs. TAUSCHER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, May 13, 2009, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111–106, offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ELLSWORTH), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111–106 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. GIFFORDS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. BRIGHT of Alabama.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. GRIFFITH of Alabama.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. GIFFORDS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Ms. GIFFORDS:

In the table of contents in section 1(b) of the bill, add at the end the following:

Sec. 314. Education regarding projects.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 314. EDUCATION REGARDING PROJECTS

A local educational agency receiving funds under this Act may encourage schools at which projects are undertaken with such funds to educate students about the project, including, as appropriate, the functioning of the project and its environmental, energy, sustainability, and other benefits.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 334, noes 97, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—334

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—97

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Graves
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Latta
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop (UT)
Bordallo
Engel
Radanovich
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner
Welch

□ 1057

Messrs. JORDAN of Ohio, CARTER, McCARTHY of California, FLAKE, COLE, LUCAS, BONNER, WALDEN, BURGESS, BARRETT of South Carolina, ROSKAM, WHITFIELD, GRAVES, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. BRIGHT:

In section 102(a), add at the end the following:

(3) DISTRESSED AREAS AND NATURAL DISASTERS.—From the amount appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year pursuant to section 311(a), the Secretary shall reserve 5 percent of such amount for grants to—

(a) local educational agencies serving geographic areas with significant economic distress, to be used consistent with the purpose described in section 101 and the allowable uses of funds described in section 103; and

(B) local educational agencies serving geographic areas recovering from a natural disaster, to be used consistent with the purpose

described in section 201 and the allowable uses of funds described in section 203.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 433, noes 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—433

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bordallo
Radanovich
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner
Whitfield

□ 1107

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. GRIFFITH:

In section 102(b)(2)(C)(v) of the bill, strike ''air quality,'' and insert ''air quality (including with reference to reducing the incidence and effects of asthma and other respiratory illnesses),''.

In section 103(12), strike ''through (11)'' and insert ''through (12)''.

In section 103, redesignate paragraphs (11) and (12) as paragraphs (12) and (13), respectively.

In section 103, insert after paragraph (10) the following:

(11) measures designed to reduce or eliminate human exposure to airborne particles such as dust, sand, and pollens;

In section 310(a)(5)(D) of the bill, after ''quality,'' insert ''student and staff health (including with reference to reducing the incidence and effects of asthma and other respiratory illnesses),''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 433, noes 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—433

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)

Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Faleomavaega
Putnam
Radanovich
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1114

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 257 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2187) to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 427, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2187, to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 311, add at the end the following:

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) and any other provision of this Act, for any fiscal year for which funds are authorized to be appropriated under this Act that immediately follows a fiscal year in which the Federal Government has a deficit in excess of $500,000,000,000, the amount authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be $0.

(2) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this subsection, the term "deficit" means a fiscal year during which outlays of the Federal Government exceed receipts of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We all know our Nation is drowning in a sea of red ink, but earlier this week we learned that the sea is even deeper than we knew. On Monday we learned that this year's deficit is now projected to be $1.84 trillion, about $90 billion higher than we were told in February. And what's the majority's answer to record-setting deficit spending? Of course it's more spending.

The bill we're debating today would add an estimated $40 billion in new spending. And despite the majority's hollow promises of fiscal responsibility, there's nothing in the legislation to offset this hefty price tag with spending reductions elsewhere. This is just more of the same borrow and spend, spend and borrow policy that we've seen under this majority and this administration.

This motion to recommit is a small but meaningful step to reverse that trend. It allows this bill to take effect exactly as the majority has drafted it as long as the Federal deficit is below $500 billion. We're not cutting the bill. We're not damaging the schools. We're not doing any of the other things that the majority would surely accuse us of. We're keeping this bill exactly as it is now. The only difference is that when our Nation's deficit exceeds $500 billion, we will not authorize the funding for this particular new program.

Half a trillion dollars is an awfully high bar. In fact, the entire time George W. Bush was President—in fact, the entire history of our great Nation, our deficit has never exceeded $500 billion, that is until this year in which we're facing a deficit of $1.84 trillion.

I urge Members to vote yes on this motion to recommit and send a signal to the American people that we're serious about taming the deficit.

Maybe one day the Federal Government will be able to afford $40 billion to tell schools how to maintain their facilities, but that day is not today.

This motion to recommit ensures that this new program will wait until we can afford it, until the American people can afford it.

Before I close, I'd like to point out that the Obama administration may feel the same way. The administration did not issue a statement of administration policy on H.R. 2187. That's a deliberate decision not to endorse the bill, and that is conspicuous. I can't help but wonder if President Obama agrees that now is simply the wrong time to swipe a $40 billion charge on the government charge card and send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this legislation last year had bipartisan support as it passed this House overwhelmingly. Why did it have that support? Because this legislation

enabled the Federal Government to partner with local school districts who were looking to repair and to restore and renovate their schools to make them more energy efficient so that those local school districts could save on the average $100,000 in energy bills by making these changes.

We know that the economy has made it more difficult for those local school districts to be able to repair and renovate and restore those schools that are in such bad need of that kind of work. So we offer the hand of the Federal Government as a partner with those districts based upon those local priorities, some of which have been waiting for several years. That partnership is critical to the survivability of these districts in meeting their energy needs as we go forward.

So what do we have here? We have an attempt to kill this amendment based upon a deficit from a party that gave us and left office with $1 trillion in deficits, when they entered office with $5 trillion in surplus.

They want to tell us how to manage the books and not take care of local schools, not have school construction, not have local jobs in our community because they ran up the deficit. The all-time world champions of deficits now want to suggest to you that you should put your schools at the end of the line of the deficit that they created.

Yes, we have a budget. We have a budget that takes down the deficit, that takes down the deficit to what it was in the Reagan years. You know, we've been through this before. We went through this where the Republicans run up the deficit on the theory that they starve the beast, and then none of the things that we believe in can go into effect.

We're not going to let this happen on this bill. It's most important that we understand that, that this is about this party trying to stop what is an agenda that has bipartisan support in the House, in the Senate, at the local levels to try to improve the learning opportunities for so many of our students.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Ladies and gentlemen, this amendment is 8 years too late. If the minority wants to be sure there's a trigger before you can do something, where was the trigger before they enacted the reckless tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country? Where was the trigger before they enacted the disastrous Medicare part D program and plunged us further in deficit? And where was the trigger before they poured over $1 trillion into a mismanaged war in Iraq? This amendment is 8 years too late. Vote it down.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. This decision is simple. The American public made a decision. They want us to go in a new direction. They want us to improve our education systems, our health care systems, and our energy systems.

The party on the other side is not interested in that. They don't have those solutions on the table. They haven't presented those solutions on the table. But what they want to do is infringe on the ability of this President and this country to move forward in a new direction. We cannot let that happen. They didn't do it.

This is a party that is now holding weekend talk sessions about how they lost their way. Yeah, they lost their way on fiscal irresponsibility for 8 years, and now they want the school children of this Nation to pay the bills.

I ask for a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 247, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—182

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Cassidy
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1145

Messrs. TEAGUE and MAFFEI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SHUSTER and NEUGEBAUER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 258 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 275, noes 155, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

AYES—275

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—155

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—3

Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1154

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the title offered by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to saddle future generations with billions in debt, and for other purposes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6 of rule XVI, the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 257, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—149

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns

Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOES—257

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Carney
Carter
Dahlkemper
DeGette
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Gordon (TN)
Hall (NY)
Kagen
Kilpatrick (MI)
Matsui
McDermott
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Pence
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Stark
Tanner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wexler

□ 1217

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Messrs. DEFAZIO and RANGEL, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I regret missing rollcall vote No. 260 today on the dilatory motion offered by the Minority to change the title of H.R. 2187. I was necessarily detained in important meetings and receiving briefings on the FY 2009 supplemental to prepare for the very serious vote on that legislation scheduled for later today.

Simply looking at the motion offered by the Minority, it is clear at face value that it was not a serious legislative effort to improve the Green Schools bill's focus on helping rebuild our nation's schools but was instead a dilatory tactic and a childish effort meant simply to embarrass and delay. We are not children and this is not a game. If I had been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2187, 21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2187, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 434 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 434

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, 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 amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 434.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 434 provides for consideration of H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. No Member of Congress takes today's vote lightly. In my two terms in Congress, I've had many late nights thinking about our troops who protect all us around the globe—ones who I have met, ones from my district, and others—thinking about how to bring them home safely and responsibly.

Today, we vote to fund them and their efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is not a perfect bill, and it is not the silver bullet which will end the wars within the next year. But it is a responsible plan to support our servicemen and -women and assist them as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot fully understand the next steps in Iraq and Afghanistan without looking at the steps our Nation has taken to get here.

In 2001, following the September 11 attacks, Congress authorized President Bush to take action against Afghanistan for harboring and enabling al Qaeda to attack us. We were greeted as liberators for the most part and even had Osama bin Laden cornered in the mountains of Tora Bora.

But in 2002 and 2003, President Bush and others changed the country's focus from the biggest threat to American security to a country which actually posed little threat—that being Iraq.

Ever since that moment, we have been playing catchup in both countries, trying to defeat insurgencies while promoting democracy and economic development, which are precarious at best. Even experts concede achieving these missions simultaneously is difficult.

Last November, Barack Obama and JOHN MCCAIN outlined two very different visions of our future involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq, President Obama's plan involved expeditiously transitioning authority to

the Iraqi Security Forces, promoting economic development, and removing combat troops within a year. This vision is very close to the plan I described to my voters when I was elected to my first term.

In Afghanistan, the plan involved broadening the international coalition, eradicating al Qaeda and the Taliban, empowering women, and providing an increase in troops, is what is provided for in this particular bill.

Knowing full well Barack Obama's military and diplomatic goals in Iraq and Afghanistan, more Americans voted for President Obama and the plans he outlined than they did for Senator MCCAIN or his plans.

Over the course of the past few months, President Obama has put the pieces in place to keep his promise, putting a national security team in place—a bipartisan team at that—of Robert Gates, James Jones, and Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Today's bill is a plan laid out by the President and his bipartisan national security team that finally understands that victory will not be achieved by military might alone.

Many in the House today, on both sides of the aisle, have stated their opposition to this bill before the new President with his new ideas has even had a chance to implement his plan.

President Obama inherited an international mess. American voters chose President Obama and his plan, and it is time that Congress gave our troops the resources they need to complete their assignments.

In my opinion, there are three components to this bill. First: in Iraq, we provide funding for military operations, including $4.8 billion for lightweight mine-resistant vehicles, or MRAPs, and $1.3 billion for IED threat mitigation. The bill also provides $1 billion for economic development in Iraq.

These provisions are essential to President Obama in order to meet his intended date of August 31, 2010, to remove all combat troops from Iraq.

In Afghanistan, we require the President to objectively report to Congress on five critical areas in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Among these are questions of anticorruption efforts, independent security forces, and political consensus. We also provide $1.52 billion in international aid for development of that war-torn country.

Lastly, the bill focuses on our troops and domestic emergencies. We provide funding for H1N1 influenza. We also provide $470 million to address Mexican border violence and drug cartels. We also provide to our troops stop-loss payments in recognition of their additional participation in the wars in the Middle East. These troops who signed up to serve fell victim as part of a backdoor draft—and this bill justly repays them.

Mr. Speaker, today we will have an emotional debate about how our Nation moves forward in Iraq and Afghanistan. The way forward in Iraq and Afghanistan is to vote ''yes'' today. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. First, let me express my appreciation to my very good friend from Golden, a hardworking and thoughtful member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that today we will be considering legislation that represents a true bipartisan effort on a critically important issue. The underlying bill, an emergency supplemental funding bill for our troops, was largely developed through bipartisan consensus, and we as Republicans are very happy to have had the opportunity to work with President Obama on this issue.

The President has repeatedly said that he would like to work with Republicans to develop real solutions for the challenges that we face as a country. So far, unfortunately, the Democratic leadership has done a less than perfect job in dealing with the request for bipartisanship, shutting out Republicans and injecting a greater and greater amount of partisanship into the legislative process.

But today we have before us our first real opportunity to come together and work in a bipartisan way. This occasion is all the more significant because the issue at hand is the funding of our troops.

I'm very proud that we're able to demonstrate to the men and women who voluntarily, voluntarily put their lives on the line for our country, that the support for them in Congress is unified and unequivocal. We owe a great debt to them and to their families, and it is very fitting that we should be joining together in this show of support just before Memorial Day.

Our troops in Afghanistan are facing rapidly increasing threats. Our troops in Iraq are working to fully turn responsibility for security over to the Iraqis. Thousands of others are deployed in dangerous places, as we all know, around the world.

We must ensure that they have the resources, protection, and support they need to do their jobs effectively and, as my friend from Golden said in his statement, to come home safely. The underlying appropriations bill will help to ensure just that.

But this is not, by any means, Mr. Speaker, a perfect bill. There are some key improvements that I believe need to be made. Unfortunately, the rule that we are considering today prevents any amendments from being considered. Even amidst this great bipartisan effort, the Democratic leadership has chosen to tarnish the outcome by refusing to allow debate on a number of key issues. Allowing amendments to be debated and considered would enable us to take this important bill and make it even more effective.

One such amendment which my friend and colleague Mr. ROGERS, the gentleman from Kentucky, has offered, would have redirected some funding to very important border security efforts. This is a critical national security issue. Violent drug wars have been escalating, as we all know, on our border for months, and we need to ensure that we have adequate homeland security resources. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this rule does not allow us to ensure the needed additional funding to deal with border security.

Another key issue that must be addressed, as we all know because it has been the center of a great deal of controversy, is the question of how the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay will be shut down.

The President has made it clear that he intends to close this facility, and his administration has already begun to move forward on this. Yet Congress has been presented with no clear plan as to how the facility will be closed and, most important, what will be done with the detainees. Will they be moved to American soil? Tried in jail or—God forbid—released here in the United States?

The Guantanamo detainees include Khalid Sheik Muhammad, mastermind of the 9/11 attacks; Hambali, al Qaeda's operation chief for Southeast Asia who planned the 2002 Bali bombings that killed 200 people; Ahmed Khalfan Ghailani, one of the FBI's most wanted terrorists, who helped plan the 1998 bombings of our embassies at Dar es Salaam and Nairobi.

□ 1230

These are Guantanamo detainees, and we have received no plan for where they will be moved if the facility is shut down. We have received no commitment, no commitment at all, for congressional oversight. This bill should explicitly require planning and consultation with Congress so we can ensure that unacceptable security risks will not be borne by our communities and our constituents.

Republicans have repeatedly raised this issue, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership, apparently feeling the pressure to address this issue, would like to self-execute an amendment in this rule to the bill that will place restrictions on the process for closing the detention facility at Guantanamo.

But there are two key problems with their approach here, Mr. Speaker. First, the substance of their amendment does not adequately address the risks that we must guard against. It does not guarantee that governors and State legislators will have the final say on whether terrorists can be housed in their States.

Under the Democratic plan, States can be forced to allow the world's most

dangerous terrorists to be held in their communities.

Second, by self-executing this flawed and inadequate amendment, they are circumventing the debate and scrutiny that an issue of this magnitude demands. The issue of bringing committed terrorists onto American soil—not people who perpetrated crimes who are American citizens, but foreign-born terrorists—on American soil should not be dealt with haphazardly, nor cloaked in secrecy. It must be considered extremely carefully, thoroughly, and openly. This rule denies us that opportunity and fails to ensure the protection of Americans.

There are other issues that should be dealt with, Mr. Speaker. The large increase of foreign assistance funding, while important to long-term efforts to combat the roots of terrorism, should not be considered emergency funding. This funding should be included in the regular budget subject to regular budgetary considerations. Designating them as emergency funds just skirts the tough choices that responsible budgeting demands.

All of these issues should be addressed in an open debate with an amendment process, which is standard operating procedure for appropriations. As I said in the Rules Committee yesterday, appropriations bills are considered privileged resolutions. They come straight to the floor. We don't even need to go to the Rules Committee for consideration of appropriations bills. It is done traditionally to simply protect the bill and the work product of the Appropriations Committee, and then allow for an open amendment process.

Fixing these problems, Mr. Speaker, would make a good and important bill all that much more effective. It would allow the legislative process for this bill, which has developed in such a bipartisan way, to finish in the same cooperative spirit in which it began.

During my tenure as chairman of the Rules Committee for 8 years, every single wartime supplemental was considered under an open rule. Not even one has been open over the last 3 years since the new Democratic majority has been in charge. It is very unfortunate that the Democratic leadership once again is trying to thwart the best efforts of President Obama and congressional Republicans to work together and build consensus.

But despite their disdain for bipartisanship and open debate, we as Republicans will join with the President in support of this troop funding bill, and we welcome this opportunity to work with him on this issue.

We sincerely hope that we can continue to come together on other very pressing issues that we will want to address effectively and responsibly in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, and I will be explaining throughout this debate time what it is that we hope to do if we are able to defeat the previous question as it relates to Guantanamo. If by chance we are not successful in defeating the previous question, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the underlying rule so we can, in fact, continue with the spirit of bipartisanship to make this important bill even better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from California. I just would like to respond on a couple of matters.

First of all, we hope and expect that this will be the last supplemental that we will have to do in this fashion so that these budgets for our military, whether it is in Iraq or Afghanistan, or elsewhere around the world, are treated within the whole budget.

So I appreciate your comments about that, but this has been a system that we intend to stop. This is the last one. As it was laid out, we left it halfway finished last year.

Second, to my friend from California, I would say that in the spirit of bipartisanship, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has come up with the rule concerning Guantanamo, or the amendment concerning Guantanamo. Some of the Members of my caucus are going to take real issue with that amendment. They think that it goes too far in terms of giving the President time to develop a plan for releasing or transferring the prisoners who are held at Guantanamo. I know that Members on your side of the aisle think it doesn't go far enough. So in an effort of bipartisanship, the chairman has tried to craft this amendment.

My last point is with respect to the border. There were hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated in the stimulus bill for border protection and border enforcement, and there is even more so in this particular bill.

So three of your points I would like to take issue with. I do appreciate the extension of the hand in bipartisanship.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr PERLMUTTER. For about 15 seconds. I have a lot of speakers.

Mr. DREIER. On border security, it continues to be a high priority, and the situation has gotten worse since we provided that level of appropriations.

On the issue of Guantanamo, Mr. WOLF, a member of the committee, has come forward with a very thoughtful amendment. We are going to seek to make that in order if we are able to defeat the previous question. I know that the chairman of the committee has said that he doesn't believe that State legislators and governors should be able to preempt Federal law. We know, as Mr. WOLF said in his testimony, that there are a number of States that have already indicated an interest in having an opportunity to receive these detainees.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Reclaiming my time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in 2001 I voted in favor of the resolution to authorize the use of force in Afghanistan to hold to account al Qaeda and the Taliban for their unconscionable and unforgivable acts against our fellow citizens. I would do it again if faced with the same decision.

But after 8 long years, our mission has been vastly expanded and the policy is unclear. It has been a very hard decision to make because I appreciate the good work of Chairman OBEY and many of the items in this bill; but I cannot support the supplemental appropriations bill.

I believe not just the United States but the international community made a promise to the people of Afghanistan, not to the Karzai government, not to the regional powers, but to the people of Afghanistan. We promised that we would stand by them as they rebuilt their country after ousting al Qaeda and the Taliban government that provided these terrorists safe haven.

Everyone I know, including President Obama, keeps telling me that there is no military solution in Afghanistan, only a political solution. And I believe this, too. So I am very concerned when we put billions of dollars into building up the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan without a clear mission and without an exit strategy.

Just as I insisted that the previous administration provide Congress with clear benchmarks and an exit strategy for Iraq, then we should do the same with this administration in Afghanistan. I am not advocating for an immediate withdrawal of our military forces from Afghanistan. All I am asking for is a plan. If there is no military solution for Afghanistan, then please, just tell me how we will know when our military contribution to the political solution has concluded.

I appreciate and I support the required reports on Afghanistan and Pakistan that Chairman OBEY has included in this supplemental. But these reports don't tell us anything about the mission of our service men and women in Afghanistan and how we will know when it is time to bring them home.

I hope, at the very least, at some point in the near future we will have a full and thorough debate about our strategy in Afghanistan. Sadly, that will not happen today.

In preparation for that debate, I have introduced this morning a bill with 73 bipartisan cosponsors that requires the Secretary of Defense to outline for Congress by the end of the year the exit strategy for our military forces in Afghanistan. My bill doesn't withdraw our forces; it doesn't set a definite timetable. It simply asks the Secretary of Defense to outline what our strategy is.

I don't think that it is too much to ask that over the next 7 months the Defense Department tell us what is the

plan for completing our military mission in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, when I first ran for Congress, I promised my constituents that I would never vote to send our servicemen and -women into war without a clearly defined mission, and I am sticking to that promise. I am sick and tired of wars that have no exits, deadlines or an end. We owe our troops and their families much better, and I am deeply concerned about how long we will be able to sustain and pay for an expanded military presence in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to know: What is the exit strategy that brings our servicemen and -women home? Until someone gives me a credible answer, I will be voting ''no.''

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I would say to my friend from Worcester that it is very important that he realizes that he should be voting ''no'' on this rule so we can have the kind of debate to which he aspires.

With that, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague from California yielding me this time.

I frankly had hoped that we would be bringing this bill to the floor today, the supplemental, following the traditional pattern of appropriations processes with an open rule so that we could come together and discuss some of these very key issues together in a positive way. And as the ranking member of the Rules Committee said, make what is a very good and bipartisan effort significantly better by addressing a few key issues that indeed are of great concern to the American people.

I would specifically like to mention that the gentleman from Colorado suggested that this is the last supplemental. I am sure that you have watched the House for all of the years you have been here, and I know that you are absolutely convinced that this will be the last supplemental, but I wouldn't want to suggest that others would perhaps consider that to be a bit naive.

But in the meantime, I was most intrigued by another discussion I had with the gentleman in the Rules Committee when we were talking about Guantanamo. Indeed, Guantanamo is an issue that will become of greater and greater concern to the American public as we go forward from here.

The rule does self-enact a proposal by the chairman of the full committee that addresses Guantanamo. There are a number of things it does not, however, address in its language form. And, indeed, an open rule would have allowed us to have discussion of the very thoughtful work done by our Members in the full committee. Those Members' products were rejected on a partisan vote in the appropriations process, unfortunately, and we should have a chance to address them here on the floor.

I would like to share a few things that the chairman's amendment that is in the rule does not do. The rule includes language from Mr. OBEY that, among other things, does not require the administration to conduct a risk assessment of the dangers of releasing Guantanamo detainees into American communities.

It does not require any notification, including the Congress, Governors, State legislators, or local communities, as to when and where detainees will be released outright to the general public after October 1, 2009, and on and on I could go from there.

I was very fascinated by the gentleman from Colorado's reaction. He said that is what our prison system is about. After all, we in Colorado have some serious people in prison; for example, the Unabomber. Well, I would suggest to the gentleman from Colorado, those criminals who are housed in Colorado and other States who are domestics who violated our law in a variety of ways—the Unabomber being a nut case, for example—do not reflect the intensity and commitment of al Qaeda-trained terrorists who absolutely have dedicated their lives to trying to destroy our way of life. Those people in the hundreds potentially being released without any notification to the American public or to our governors and local legislators—it is unacceptable, unacceptable that we follow that path. And because of that, I am going to urge a ''no'' vote on the PQ and a ''no'' vote also on the rule.

□ 1245

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have to agree with my friend, Mr. LEWIS from California. You're right, there will be other supplementals. The purpose is that these supplementals are not going to become a regular course of business as they have been as it applies to Iraq and Afghanistan.

With respect to your points about the housing of these prisoners, nobody wants these particular prisoners in their State or in their prison system; but on the other hand, we have very unsavory characters from time to time in various prisons across the country. Fort Leavenworth might be an appropriate place. But the amendment, as Mr. OBEY has projected it, is no money within this appropriation will be used for release or transfer. And so the amendment is an attempt to strike a compromise between your concerns and the concerns of our caucus, and that's what this whole process is about.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield? I would be happy to yield 30 seconds to my friend from our time if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I want to yield to my friend from California (Ms. HARMAN) for 2 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and tell him we miss him on the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am keenly aware of the economic hardship faced by people in my district and all over the country and the heartfelt questions being raised about the costs and policies involved in this bill. After careful review, however, I believe the bill is needed, and the policies it funds reflect a change in direction from failed Bush administration strategies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the West Bank, all locations I have visited on several trips this past year.

We are ending the combat mission in Iraq, a policy I strongly support. We are also embracing a strategy for Afghanistan, which makes governance, and not projection of military force, the top priority. Mission success there will only come from efforts to eliminate corruption and help the central and local governments provide essential services to the Afghan people; otherwise, that country will revert to a failed state and a safe haven for terrorists intent on attacking the United States and our allies.

Pakistan is even more dangerous because of its huge population, a military larger than ours, and its nuclear arsenal. This bill funds nonmilitary aid and counterinsurgency training to enable Pakistani forces to defeat the growing Taliban threat inside their borders.

A promising security program in the West Bank is also supported, a key building block to a viable and independent Palestinian state. The bill makes explicit that no Palestinian funding will go to Hamas, which continues to rearm and threaten Israel.

For the future, as has been discussed, funding for our troops in harm's way in missions like these will be on budget and fully debated through the regular process in Congress. This is yet another good course correction by the Obama administration, and one I have long advocated.

This is a sound bill and a sound rule. Vote ''aye'' on both.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, the author of the very important border security amendment to which I referred earlier, the gentleman from Somerset, Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the border war, if you want to call it that—the war on the border with Mexico—now is more than trying to stop illegal aliens from coming across. It is trying to prevent the flood of drugs coming across and, more importantly, to keep trying to prevent the spillover of the violence between the drug cartels in Mexico competing and fighting for the control of that trade into the U.S. from these drugs and violence from spilling over into the U.S.

Ninety percent of the cocaine coming into this country comes through Mexico, comes across that border. And no wonder the drug cartels in Mexico are warring with each other and the government in Mexico to control that

trade, because there are billions and billions of dollars involved. But already, those drug cartels have infiltrated most of the American cities. Most of the large cities in this country have cells or pieces of that drug cartel organization now in their communities. You read about killings and murders and hostage-taking in places like Birmingham and Atlanta and Chicago and New York—and of course Phoenix—and all of the cities of the West. They're here now.

This bill doesn't contain one penny for the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms organization. All of the law enforcement groups in this country are shut out in this bill, and this rule seals it so we can't get into it. And we are ignoring, with our heads in the Cancun sand, the cartels in Mexico that are supplying our young people with their deadly poison.

And so I urge that we defeat the previous question so that we can be allowed to bring these matters to this bill. And then, failing that, I would hope that we would defeat this rule that shuts these matters out.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to this supplemental appropriation. This bill simply continues and amplifies the failed policies that have caused us to be caught up in a continued occupation of Iraq and an increasingly large presence in Afghanistan.

Instead of playing the Taliban shell game and so-called chasing Osama bin Laden, we should devise a smart strategy to win the hearts and minds of the people of Iraq and Afghanistan. They will help us to locate Osama bin Laden. Air strikes that kill innocent civilians will only harden the civilians against us.

The Taliban are leading us into Pakistan, where we are on the verge of a new footprint, after giving the former President Musharraf billions of dollars while he was playing footsie with the Taliban and allowing them to control the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Now President Zardari has proven to be weak and ineffective, yet we're rewarding him with more of our tax dollars.

There are two good amendments that should have been made in order: the McGovern amendment, which would require a simple exit strategy, and the Tierney amendment, which would have placed conditions on any additional dollars given to Pakistan.

We should be taking over the madrassas, rebuilding infrastructures, and building democratic institutions that will support long-term sustainability in these countries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader, our friend from West Chester, Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I told the President that when he does what we agree with, in terms of what is right for the American people, we would be there to support him. The President has made very responsible decisions with regard to this mission in Iraq and a gradual withdrawal of our troops, and I believe that his decisions with regard to his plans in Afghanistan are sound. It is clear that the President listened to the commanders on the ground and our diplomats and is engaged in an effort to win our battle against the terrorists who threaten the United States and our citizens.

One of those decisions that he also made was a decision to send up to the House a clean bill asking for funding for our troops. I believe this bill provides those resources and, just as importantly, does not include politically motivated restrictions that would hamstring our commanders in the field.

Republicans support the underlying bill, and I think it deserves support from Members on both sides of the aisle. But let's be very clear; we will be watching very closely in the weeks to come as some may try to load this bill up with unrelated spending or language that would undermine our troops. That includes potential money for the International Monetary Fund. That should be debated on its own merits, and not as part of a troop funding bill for our men and women who are in harm's way.

I am also pleased that the $80 million in funding to transfer Guantanamo prisoners from the United States was removed from this bill. It deserved to be removed. And I will once again ask a very important question: What is the administration's plan for those prisoners who are being held at our detention facility? Will they release or transfer them and allow them to come to American soil? I don't know of any community or neighborhood in America that would want them.

The language inserted by Chairman OBEY in this bill on this issue, I think, is inadequate. It will do nothing more than to provide cover, pure and simple. And the fact is, there is nothing in this legislation that will keep Guantanamo terrorists out of America, nothing. And I think that we can and should do better.

Our solution is the Keep Terrorists Out of America Act. Our plan, I think, does what the American people overwhelmingly want. It ensures that those terrorists are not transferred or released into our communities, and Members on both sides of the aisle have spoken out against the release of those prisoners in our country.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) offered similar language in the Appropriations Committee where it was defeated. I believe, as we get into the previous question on this rule, that we also defeat the previous question and allow the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) to offer his language on this bill.

So I would encourage Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question. Let's have a fair and open debate on this issue and allow Members the opportunity to allow the House to work its will, but I understand that the underlying bill does, in fact, deserve our support.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to my friend from Nevada, Congresswoman BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, but deeply concerned with the funding to the Palestinian Authority and to rebuild Gaza. By giving this money, I believe we are sending precisely the wrong message that Hamas can partner with Iran, attack Israel with impunity, and refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist, all the while the United States will provide aid no matter what. Talk about the soft bigotry of low expectations.

At the very least, we should use our aid to help modify the behavior of Hamas. Before we send more money to the Gaza, more money to the Palestinian Authority, all Palestinian factions should recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, renounce terrorism, respect past agreements, and release Gilad Shalit, the young Israeli soldier who was kidnapped by Hamas and who has been held captive in the Gaza for almost 3 years. Without these conditions, we are simply writing the Palestinians another blank check to continue their self-destructive and violent behavior.

So while I support the rule and the bill, I have serious reservations about funding this and urge my colleagues that we not continue this pattern of rewarding unacceptable behavior in the future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Appropriations who had an amendment dealing with Guantanamo Bay, but unfortunately, with the structure we've got, it won't be made in order, the gentleman from Goddard, Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Speaker, when approaching national security issues, Congress has always acted in a prudent bipartisan manner to protect the American people. Last week, however, in a straight party-line vote in the Appropriations

Committee, Democrats rejected both Republican alternatives to prevent terrorists held at Guantanamo Bay from getting a plane ride to the United States. Then yesterday, the Democrats on the Rules Committee rejected my amendment to prohibit terrorist detainees from being transferred or released in the United States. Speaker PELOSI and her leadership team are refusing an up-or-down vote. Do we allow hardened terrorists to be transported to the United States knowing that eventually some will be released to the streets of America?

Democrats have instead offered a fig leaf. Their provision simply delays; it does not prevent. It delays the Obama administration's plan to release terrorists onto our streets.

□ 1300

The administration has already authorized the release of 30 detainees. This is not conjecture. This is not speculation. This is happening. And unfortunately my colleagues are simply delaying the real problem. Seventy-five percent of the population do not want terrorists released in the United States, and 20 percent don't even realize it's a possibility.

Congress should not abdicate its responsibility to provide for the common defense of this Nation. We should be able to speak on this issue. Americans deserve an up or down vote on the question, do we welcome terrorists on the streets of America or not? This will simply sweep the question under the rug, hoping the problem will go away.

The gentleman from Colorado mentioned that we could send them to Fort Leavenworth. I have been to Fort Leavenworth. I am from Kansas. We do not want terrorists in Fort Leavenworth or in Kansas, and I don't want them on any street in America.

So I think it's only fair that we reject this rule and give us an up or down vote on whether we want a plane ticket for terrorists to get from Guantanamo to America.

I would encourage my friends to vote ''no'' on the previous question to allow Mr. WOLF an opportunity to present his language and vote ''no'' on the rule so we can have a chance for an up or down vote on whether we bring terrorists into our Nation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Kansas, I know, knows full well that it says in the amendment, ''None of the funds made available in this or any prior act may be used to release an individual who is detained, as of April 30, 2009, at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, into the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia.''

That's what the amendment says. That's what is part of this bill.

I would now like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. America went to war against Iraq based on a lie. We were told in 2002 Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. The previous administration even pursued torture to try to extract false confessions to try to justify the war.

It's time to tell the truth. The truth is, we should not have prosecuted the war against the Iraqi people. The truth is, the Democratic Senate could have stopped the Iraq war in 2002. The truth is, we Democrats were given control of Congress in 2006 to end the war. The truth is, this bill continues a disastrous war which has cost the lives of thousands of our soldiers. The truth is, the occupation has fueled the insurgency. The truth is, the Iraq war will cost the American and the Iraqi people trillions of dollars.

As many as 1 million innocent Iraqis have lost their lives as a result of this war. Don't tell the American people you're ending the war by continuing to fund the war. Don't tell the American people that the war will end when their plans leave 50,000 troops in Iraq. Don't tell the American people that the way out of Afghanistan is to escalate and more counterinsurgency.

Get out of Iraq. Get out of Afghanistan. Come home, America. Come home.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2346, War Supplemental Appropriations for FY 2009. This bill devotes an additional $84.5 billion to military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan for fiscal year 2009. I believe that the U.S. has a moral obligation to fulfill in Iraq and Afghanistan. We must remain dedicated to reconstruction, stability and prosperity in these countries and in the region.

The U.S. cannot be in and out of Iraq at the same time. The U.S. has agreed to withdraw all combat troops from Iraqi cities by July of this year. However, recent news reports indicate that some combat troops will remain beyond this date. Our continued funding of war operations in Iraq only ensures our continued presence and undermines our stated goals for withdrawal by 2011. Funds for Iraq should be dedicated to bringing all of our troops and contractors home. We must meet our moral obligation to rebuild Iraq and support viable solutions to the refugee and internally displaced populations. We must hold ourselves responsible for the death of over 1 million innocent civilians in Iraq.

Funding of expanded combat operations in Afghanistan will not meet the security objectives of the U.S. Sending additional brave American service members to Afghanistan does not increase security and it is not an act of diplomacy. Sending additional troops sends one message: The U.S. is ramping up combat operations. This message only encourages the Taliban and other insurgent groups to do likewise. We have ensured that the months and perhaps years ahead will be bloody. And we have failed to present an exit strategy.

Bombing raids and drone attacks in Afghanistan and Pakistan have inflamed the civilian populations in these countries. Innocent civilians are killed in these massive and unpredictable attacks. This includes innocent children, mothers, fathers, grandparents, sisters and brothers. Communities, homes and infrastructure are destroyed. The number of refugees and the internally displaced continue to rise from the destruction.

The brutalities of war produce more than news reports of so-called ''collateral damage.'' Taliban and insurgent recruitment profits from these failed policies. The drone attacks are propagating extremism in the targeted areas. Former Chief of Staff to Colin Powell maintains that drone attacks are not an effective counterinsurgency technique. If the Administration will not stop the drone attacks, Congress must use the power of the purse to ensure their cessation.

Ninty percent of the resources devoted to Afghanistan over the last eight years have gone to support military resources. This is contrary to the counter-insurgency strategy put forth by General Petraeus that calls for an 80–20 split, that devotes 80 percent of resources to political solutions and only 20 percent of resources to military operations. General Eaton, who trained Iraq Security Forces in 2004, has echoed this strategy. This bill fails to correct the imbalance and continues the failed status quo.

We need to provide for the traditional sense of security by first ensuring economic security, health security, and job security for all. The roots of terrorism begin not in hatred, but in desperation. All people seek the basic necessities such as food, clothes, shelter, good health, and the ability to earn a decent living. If we can level this playing field, there is no desperation that may potentially evolve into hatred. We have failed to meet these objectives in Afghanistan.

Stability in Afghanistan requires that aid dollars reach local Afghans, Afghan institutions and organizations. The current instability of Afghan institutions must be replaced with strong education and health care systems, judiciary and law enforcement systems, workforce development and transportation systems. These institutions must be built and run by Afghans. The current practice by which foreigners fill high-skill and high-level positions will leave Afghanistan without the skills and leaders to ensure sustainable, long-term stability in the country.

The U.S. must partner with Afghans to empower women and girls. Currently, one in six women die in childbirth in Afghanistan; 80% of women are illiterate; and development assistance has not reached Afghan women. We can encourage and foster reform by investing in Afghan institutions that create educational, economic, social and political opportunity for women.

National security will not be achieved through military might but rather through our dedication to supporting Afghans as they build a foundation of human security, social security and economic security.

Security cannot blossom from the ravages of war. Terrorism will not be stopped by acts of terror.

[From the Nation, May 12, 2009]

THE POLITICS OF ESCALATION

(By Tom Hayden and Joseph Gerson)

Congressional leaders are cooperating with the Obama administration in quashing any serious criticism of growing military escalation in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Indications are that there will be no benchmarks or conditions set on the $96 billion supplemental appropriation before Congress beginning this week. The administration, which once promised no more rushed supplemental appropriation, is rolling funds for war and swine flu into one package, while not yet disclosing how much is earmarked

specifically for Afghanistan. Rep. David Obey says he wants to give the Obama administration a one-year deadline for results, which likely means making it more difficult to withdraw from a deepening quagmire.

The only current Congressional vehicle for dissent is a proposed amendment by Rep. Jim McGovern (D–Mass) that requires the secretary of defense to report on an exit strategy from Afghanistan by this December, six months after Congress has appropriated funds for escalating the war. Even that modest measure, with fifty co-sponsors at present, has met with administration resistance to an exit strategy with benchmarks.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, under fire for what she knew about Guantánamo waterboarding and when she knew it, is going along with the administration by preventing the McGovern amendment from being voted on. Congressional leaders believe that war opponents are not sufficiently powerful to either require a vote on the McGovern measure to achieve more than two hours of debate on the supplemental, which could also include soliloquies on the swine flu.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus has met with President Obama and, according to sources attending, will not be opposed at this point to his Afghanistan-Pakistan policies. Instead, the caucus is sponsoring a series of informational hearings on public policies for the region.

The Senate, with the possible exception of Sen. Russ Feingold, is not expected to question the Obama policies, either.

Insiders say the dominant message behind closed doors is a political one, not to embarrass the president. On policy, one knowledgeable expert reports, doubt is widespread in Congress and ''no one has any idea where it will all end.''

The desire to protect the resident may shy Democrats away from demands that were routinely made of the Bush administration: requiring regular reports on an exit strategy, transparency in the budgets for war, clear definitions of casualty levels on all sides, application of human rights standards in detention centers, and others.

It is understandable that the economic crisis and high expectations for the new president have deflected Congressional Democrats away from their oversight role. As the quagmire deepens, however, antiwar questioning will rise again. The danger is that by then the Obama administration will be engulfed in the politics of escalation, as happened to earlier Democratic presidents.

AFGHANISTAN

(By Chris Hedges)

The bodies of dozens, perhaps well over a hundred, women, children and men, their corpses blown into bits of human flesh by iron fragmentation bombs dropped by U.S. warplanes in a village in the western province of Farah, illustrates the futility of the Afghan war. We are not delivering democracy or liberation or development. We are delivering massive, sophisticated forms of industrial slaughter. And because we have employed the blunt and horrible instrument of war in a land we know little about and are incapable of reading, we embody the barbarism we claim to be seeking to defeat.

We are morally no different from the psychopaths within the Taliban, who Afghans remember we empowered, funded and armed during the 10-year war with the Soviet Union. Acid thrown into a girl's face or beheadings? Death delivered from the air or fields of shiny cluster bombs? This is the language of war. It is what we speak. It is what those we fight speak.

Afghan survivors carted some two dozen corpses from their villages to the provincial capital in trucks this week to publicly denounce the carnage. Some 2,000 angry Afghans in the streets of the capital chanted ''Death to America!'' But the grief, fear and finally rage of the bereaved do not touch those who use high-minded virtues to justify slaughter. The death of innocents, they assure us, is the tragic cost of war. It is regrettable, but it happens. It is the price that must be paid. And so, guided by a president who once again has no experience of war and defers to the bull-necked generals and militarists whose careers, power and profits depend on expanded war, we are transformed into monsters.

There will soon be 21,000 additional U.S. soldiers and Marines in Afghanistan in time for the expected surge in summer fighting. There will be more clashes, more airstrikes, more deaths and more despair and anger from those forced to bury their parents, sisters, brothers and children. The grim report of the killings in the airstrike, issued by the International Committee of the Red Cross, which stated that bombs hit civilian houses and noted that an ICRC counterpart in the Red Crescent was among the dead, will become familiar reading in the weeks and months ahead.

We are the best recruiting weapon the Taliban possesses. We have enabled it to rise from the ashes seven years ago to openly control over half the country and carry out daylight attacks in the capital Kabul. And the war we wage is being exported like a virus to Pakistan in the form of drones that bomb Pakistani villages and increased clashes between the inept Pakistani military and a restive internal insurgency.

I spoke in New York City a few days ago with Dr. Juliette Fournot, who lived with her parents in Afghanistan as a teenager, speaks Dari and led teams of French doctors and nurses from Mdecins Sans Frontires, or Doctors Without Borders, into Afghanistan during the war with the Soviets. She participated in the opening of clandestine cross-border medical operations missions during 1980 and 1982 and became head of the French humanitarian mission in Afghanistan in 1983. Dr. Fournot established logistical bases in Peshawar and Quetta and organized the dozen cross-border and clandestine permanent missions in the resistance-held areas of Herat, Mazar-i-Sharif, Badakhshan, Paktia, Ghazni and Hazaradjat, through which more than 500 international aid workers rotated.

She is one of the featured characters in a remarkable book called ''The Photographer,'' produced by photojournalist Didier Lefvre and graphic novelist Emmanuel Guibert. The book tells the story of a three-month mission in 1986 into Afghanistan led by Dr. Fournot. It is an unflinching look at the cost of war, what bombs, shells and bullets do to human souls and bodies. It exposes, in a way the rhetoric of our politicians and generals do not, the blind destructive fury of war. The French humanitarian group withdrew from Afghanistan in July 2004 after five of its aid workers were assassinated in a clearly marked vehicle.

''The American ground troops are midterm in a history that started roughly in 1984 and 1985 when the State Department decided to assist the Mujahedeen, the resistance fighters, through various programs and military aid. USAID, the humanitarian arm serving political and military purposes, was the seed for having a different kind of interaction with the Afghans,'' she told me. ''The Afghans were very grateful to received arms and military equipment from the Americans.''

''But the way USAID distributed its humanitarian assistance was very debatable,'' she went on. ''It still puzzles me. They gave most of it to the Islamic groups such as the Hezb-e Islami of [Gulbuddin] Hekmatyar. And I think it is possibly because they were more interested in the future stability of Pakistan rather than saving Afghanistan. Afghanistan was probably a good ground to hit and drain the blood from the Soviet Union. I did not see a plan to rebuild or bring peace to Afghanistan. It seemed that Afghanistan was a tool to weaken the Soviet Union. It was mostly left to the Pakistani intelligence services to decide what would be best and how to do it and how by doing so they could strengthen themselves.''

The Pakistanis, Dr. Fournot said, developed a close relationship with Saudi Arabia. The Saudis, like the Americans, flooded the country with money and also exported conservative and often radical Wahhabi clerics. The Americans, aware of the relationship with the Saudis as well as Pakistan's secret program to build nuclear weapons, looked the other way. Washington sowed, unwittingly, the seeds of destruction in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It trained, armed and empowered the militants who now kill them.

The relationship, she said, bewildered most Afghans, who did not look favorably upon this radical form of Islam. Most Afghans, she said, wondered why American aid went almost exclusively to the Islamic radicals and not to more moderate and secular resistance movements.

''The population wondered why they did not have more credibility with the Americans,'' she said. ''They could not understand why the aid was stopped in Pakistan and distributed to political parties that had limited reach in Afghanistan. These parties stockpiled arms and started fighting each other. What the people got in the provinces was miniscule and irrelevant. And how did the people see all this? They had great hopes in the beginning and gradually became disappointed, bitter and then felt betrayed. This laid the groundwork for the current suspicion, distrust and disappointment with the U.S. and NATO.''

Dr. Fournot sees the American project in Afghanistan as mirroring that of the doomed Soviet occupation that began in December 1979. A beleaguered Afghan population, brutalized by chaos and violence, desperately hoped for stability and peace. The Soviets, like the Americans, spoke of equality, economic prosperity, development, education, women's rights and political freedom. But within two years, the ugly face of Soviet domination had unmasked the flowery rhetoric. The Afghans launched their insurgency to drive the Soviets out of the country.

Dr. Fournot fears that years of war have shattered the concept of nationhood. ''There is so much personal and mental destruction,'' she said. ''Over 70 percent of the population has never known anything else but war. Kids do not go to school. War is normality. It gives that adrenaline rush that provides a momentary sense of high, and that is what they live on. And how can you build a nation on that?''

The Pashtuns, she noted, have built an alliance with the Taliban to restore Pashtun power that was lost in the 2001 invasion. The border between Pakistan and Afghanistan is, to the Pashtuns, a meaningless demarcation that was drawn by imperial powers through the middle of their tribal lands. There are 13 million Pashtuns in Afghanistan and another 28 million in Pakistan. The Pashtuns are fighting forces in Islamabad and kabul they see as seeking to wrest from them their honor and autonomy. they see little difference between the Pakistani military, American troops and the Afghan army.

Islamabad, while it may battle Taliban forces in Swat or the provinces, does not regard the Taliban as a mortal enemy. The enemy is and has always been in India. The

balance of power with India requires the Pakistani authorities to ensure that any Afghan government is allied with it. This means it cannot push the Pashtuns in the Northwest Frontier Province or in Afghanistan too far. It must keep its channels open. The cat-and-mouse game between the Pakistani authorities and the Pashtuns, which drives Washington to fury, will never end. Islamabad needs the Pashtuns in Pakistan and Afghanistan more than the Pashtuns need them.

The U.S. fuels the bonfires of war. The more troops we send to Afghanistan, the more drones we send on bombing runs over Pakistan, the more airstrikes we carry out, the worse the unraveling will become. We have killed twice as many civilians as the Taliban this year and that number is sure to rise in the coming months.

''I find this term 'collateral damage' dehumanizing,'' Dr. Fournot said, ''as if it is a necessity. People are sacrificed on the altar of an idea. Air power is blind. I know this from having been caught in numerous bombings.''

We are faced with two stark choices. We can withdraw and open negotiations with the Taliban or continue to expand the war until we are driven out. The corrupt and unpopular regimes of Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan and Asif Ali Zardari are impotent allies. The longer they remain tethered to the United States, the weaker the become. And the weaker they become, the louder become the calls for intervention in Pakistan. During the war in Vietnam, we invaded Cambodia to bring stability to the region and cut off rebel sanctuaries and supply routes. This tactic only empowered the Khmer Rouge. We seem poised, in much the same way, to do the same for radical Islamists in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

''If the Americans step up the war in Afghanistan, they will be sucked into Pakistan,'' Dr. Fournot warned. ''Pakistan is a time bomb waiting to explode. You have a huge population, 170 million people. There is nuclear power. Pakistan is much more dangerous than Afghanistan. War always has its own logic. Once you set foot in war, you do not control it. It sucks you in.''

Mr. DREIER. Well, I guess for a different reason my friend from Ohio is going to be joining us in opposition to this rule, and I very much appreciate that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCINICH. Well, of course I will be voting against the rule. I want the war to end.

Mr. DREIER. I understand. I appreciate the gentleman joining us, as I say, for a somewhat different reason than ours. We all want this war to end, there's no doubt about that, but we also want to ensure success.

With that, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule. I offered an amendment yesterday to address an injustice against the members of our armed services that were shut out by this proposed rule.

Briefly, my amendment would have increased the across-the-board military personnel pay for 2009 from 3.9 percent to 4.4 percent. This pay raise would have been effective retroactively from January 1, 2009.

According to estimates by the Congressional Research Service, the pay gap between military personnel and civilians in comparable positions is 3 percent. Particularly during a recession, it is unacceptable that our men and women in uniform receive less than their civilian counterparts.

I was just in Afghanistan over the weekend and had the opportunity to meet and work with the wonderful committed and professional group of men and women in the military. They've been serving us to keep us safe and to establish the stability in the Middle East. But given this shortfall in pay, I thought it was appropriate to provide for our troops some supplemental income in this supplemental appropriations bill. Unfortunately this rule would not even allow an up or down vote on my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this continued abuse of process. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would like to say, the gentlewoman has offered an extraordinarily thoughtful amendment which reaffirms our dedication to our men and women in uniform. Especially as Memorial Day approaches, it seems to me that we should have an open amendment process that would allow us to fully debate the Biggert amendment. And it saddens me that this structure around which we are considering this issue is so restricted.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank you.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time does each side have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 13½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have so many concerns about this supplemental, I don't know where to start. But I'm going to start at one point. And I believe the most important point is, this supplemental keeps us involved in Iraq, and it sets up an unending occupation of Afghanistan.

The cost of the supplemental is just too great without a defined stated mission, without redeployment plans. We're going to look at an endless military presence in Afghanistan. That will just serve to fuel anti-Americanism throughout the region, and it will continue to promote the instability.

Sadly, the rule does not provide Members a chance to remedy the situation. Proposals providing accountability and transparency from my colleague BARBARA LEE, from JIM MCGOVERN, from JOHN TIERNEY actually haven't had a chance for an up or down vote. It could have made a difference when we voted on the floor today.

The American people deserve much better than that. I urge my colleagues to oppose this funding and promote a foreign policy based on SMART security, humanitarian assistance, development and diplomacy.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking new Member with a very, very distinguished career in public service, the gentleman from Aurora, Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) who has said, and I agree with him, that we can make this bill a better bill if we open up the amendment process. I certainly agree with my colleague from the great State of Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) who says that this is not a perfect bill.

One provision of this bill gives U.S. taxpayer dollars to the Gaza Strip in the aftermath of the fighting between Israel and Hamas for reconstruction aid. It does this by giving $119 million to the United Nations. In 2004 Peter Hansen, then commissioner-general of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency remarked that, ''I am sure that there are Hamas members on our payroll, and I don't see that as a crime. Hamas as a political organization does not mean that every member is a militant. And we do not do political vetting and exclude people from one persuasion against another.''

Hamas is a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization. The United Nations might not consider having Hamas members on their payroll a problem, but it certainly is a problem for the United States and Israel.

The supplemental before us provides up to $119 million to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to spend in Hamas-controlled Gaza, which means that Hamas members on the U.N. payroll will effectively be on the U.S. payroll.

I intend to vote against this rule because it does not allow the chance to amend this provision. I filed an amendment that would have instead provided $119 million for humanitarian relief to go to USAID. The rule before us would bar this amendment from being offered.

I appreciate the attempt at additional oversight placed on the U.N. in this supplemental, but it is simply too little too late.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you.

I wrote Secretary Clinton in March, along with 21 of my colleagues, noting there is no way to spend money in Gaza without inappropriately benefiting Hamas. Unfortunately out of the several ways to save money that might inappropriately benefit Hamas, we are choosing one of the worst.

Mr. Speaker I would urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Colorado, it's good to see you here.

I would just say on page 55 of the bill, there is a provision that says that no funding, no assistance is to be provided to or through any individual, or private or government entity, that advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity.

With that, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Also let me thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for their hard work on this bill and for including provisions that I offered, prohibiting the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I opposed the 2001 resolution authorizing the use of force because it gave President Bush and any future President an open-ended blank check to wage war anywhere on the globe, starting in Afghanistan.

Nearly 8 years later, I continue to oppose the supplemental appropriations bills for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq because it continues us down the wrong path and can lead to war without end. Unfortunately this will continue to happen if we don't repeal that 2001 authorization.

I oppose this $94 billion supplemental because it favors military activities over diplomatic, development and reconstruction efforts by a ratio of 9–1. Afghanistan will not be stabilized through military action.

As noted by the Carnegie Endowment, the presence of foreign troops is the most important element driving the resurgence of the Taliban. This is counter to our national security interests. This does not include an exit plan for Afghanistan. It does not fully fund the redeployment of troops out of Afghanistan.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 30 additional seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much for yielding.

This does not prohibit the drone attacks. It does not include a strong regional approach, which the situation demands, including a strong nuclear nonproliferation effort in Pakistan.

The supplemental appropriations bill does not reflect a new direction. Therefore, I cannot support it.

Let me just mention that our friend and colleague Congressman PETE STARK is unable to be here today for this important debate. So I wish to conclude by reading one sentence from his statement. He said, ''President Obama is moving America's foreign policy in a better direction, and he has shown superior judgment to President Bush on when we should send our troops into harm's way. However, I cannot support any more funding for these wars.''

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 10¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of my colleague how many speakers he has remaining on his side of the aisle?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have at least three.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of that, I would ask my friend to proceed, and I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend Mr. PERRIELLO from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as someone who was very critical from the beginning of the Iraq war but nonetheless am supportive of the supplemental before us.

I believe we stand at a promising moment, a promising moment in terms of the trends in Iraq and a promising moment in terms of having a leader in the White House who understands the challenges before us to get Afghanistan right.

Having been on the ground there in previous years, I can assure you that the questions that were not being asked before are being asked now. It's not going to be an easy struggle there. But I say to my more progressive colleagues who are very critical of this that we should give ourselves a little credit. The era of arbitrary power in the Bush doctrine really ended with the '06 election. A new period of smart power, led with General Petraeus and Secretary Gates, has moved us in a direction of real national security, not Hollywood security. This is an important move, and it's a move that continues today.

That change was only solidified by the 2008 election. We have people who are deadly serious about getting national security right in Iraq and Afghanistan, who understand the military's job is to back up a political solution and are looking for that, who understand that we cannot solve the situation in Afghanistan without dealing with corruption internally.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to extend my friend 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PERRIELLO. We will not solve Afghanistan without dealing with corruption internally and with Pakistan externally. And finally, we have a President who's negotiating from a position of strength, not weakness, unlike the last two administrations.

So I rise today with a grave seriousness about the supplemental before us but also a sense that we're on the right track with this new national security strategy. I believe that it is the right thing to do to support it.

□ 1315

Mr. DREIER. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like now to yield 1 minute to my friend from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the underlying supplemental appropriations bill. Frankly, I am undecided on the rule.

I returned from Afghanistan just a couple of days ago, and I could see firsthand the passion and commitment of our servicemen and -women, our diplomats and other civilians. But I want them to know that this debate that we are having here today is not about them. It is about the direction that we need to proceed. I saw the commitment and courage of Afghan women to build a future for their country. But this supplemental appropriations bill will not get us there. Let me quote, ''Given its terrain, poverty, neighborhood and tragic history, Afghanistan in many ways poses an even more complex and difficult long-term challenge than Iraq, one that, despite a large international effort, will require a significant U.S. military and economic commitment for some time.'' Those are the words of Secretary Robert Gates, and not my own.

And yet here we are today prepared to commit our servicemen and -women to a war without end, placing them in harm's way without a plan for being there and a strategy for leaving Afghanistan. I understand that we want to give our President an opportunity to work out a mess that he inherited but did not create. Unfortunately, this Congress and this President have to be honest with the American people——

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. We have to be honest with the American people that this is not an in-and-out military operation. Winning requires a long-term, sustained commitment to turn 90 percent illiteracy to literacy, grow food products instead of producing heroin and opium, build a civil society and rule of law. We need a plan while we are there and a strategy for leaving. We don't have it. And I will be voting against the supplemental.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to again inquire of my friend, does he have two speakers remaining?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have three speakers remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I will reserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both sides have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Ohio, Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership. Today we consider the last war supplemental providing funding for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, I am deeply

concerned that this bill does not have an exit strategy for military operations in Afghanistan. Out of fairness to our brave soldiers, we cannot have an open-ended strategy. And I support the bill introduced by Representative JIM MCGOVERN to require one.

This bill does have some provisions in it that I support. Since October of 2001, approximately 160,000 soldiers have been subject to stop-loss orders, serving on involuntary extended tours of duty.

Last June, I introduced the Stop-Loss Compensation Act to ensure that all our soldiers affected by the policy would be properly compensated. And last fall we took the first step toward fulfilling our duty to these brave soldiers by including stop-loss compensation for fiscal year 2009 in the continuing resolution. But today I am proud that we will extend the $500-a-month payments to all 160,000 soldiers that have been affected by stop-loss since 2001.

And, Mr. Speaker, on the home front, our firefighters who answer the call of duty in communities throughout this country are often the first on the scene and the last to leave. Because of the current recession, a lot of communities, including the community of Elyria in my district, are being forced to lay off firefighters, resulting in staffing levels that are too low.

I am proud to say that we have worked on language to include in this bill that will allow SAFER grants to be used to rehire and retain much-needed firefighters. The Elyria Fire Department has already informed me that with this change, they plan to apply for a SAFER grant to reinstate the 10 firefighters who were laid off last month.

This bill will help us ensure that stop-loss payments for those who protect us overseas will be properly given and to ensure the adequate staffing for those who protect us at home.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will inquire again of my friend.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have two more. I have two 1-minute speakers.

Mr. DREIER. Then you will close. I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would yield 1 minute to my friend from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, ''mission accomplished.'' If this were so, then continuous funding for combat is not needed. However, resources for our military withdrawal is. The supplement as a means of financial support for continuing conflict is a very deceptive technique. Funding should be in the budget since it appears that there is no end to the conflict in Iraq. Combining food assistance, AIDS, farm loan programs, refugee assistance in this bill will give the bill the votes needed for passage. But humanitarian issues should be in separate legislation. They are too important to be dumped in this bill.

To make my point, I will not vote for any war funding that deprives my constituents of the domestic funding needed to improve their lives. The rule is the passageway for this injustice.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me, at this time, yield 4 minutes to the extraordinarily patient author of the amendment about which we have been speaking dealing with the issue of Guantanamo, my good friend and classmate from Vienna, Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank Mr. DREIER for the time.

I rise in opposition to the rule. I had an amendment which dealt with the Guantanamo Bay issue. And let me sort of lay it out. There are several issues really involved. One, there are Uyghur detainees at Guantanamo Bay that Eric Holder was prepared to release into the United States. This is not a Khalid Sheik Mohammed that we are transferring to release in the neighborhoods in the United States.

Who are the Uyghur detainees? They are members of a group called the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Movement. Many of them have been trained in al Qaeda training camps in Tora Bora. Now, that is something that the American people should know. Also, their leader is a man named Abdul Haq. Haq is on the terrorist list of the U.N. The Obama administration also put him on their terrorist list last month. And yet Eric Holder is saying, and some people believe he was ready to do it 2 weeks ago Friday, to release them, to release them with Federal pay, if you will, so they can live on the environment, go to the shopping malls, do whatever, release them in the United States, without even telling the Congress anything.

Now, Congress cannot be like Pontius Pilate and sort of wash our hands and say, you know, we don't want to be involved in this. We don't want to know. If something happens, it is your responsibility. The Congress, the United States Congress and the American people want us to be involved. That is why they sent us here. So that is the Uyghurs, Eastern Turkistan Islamic group, terrorists, Tora Bora, Abdul Haq.

The other one is they want to move some of these terrorists like Khalid Sheik Mohammed that Mr. DREIER mentioned to the United States. Now, he is the one, he is the one who beheaded—beheaded Daniel Pearl. He was the mastermind of 9/11 which killed 30 people from my district. Now, is it okay for Eric Holder to say, well, we are not going to give you a report? And it just so happens that no Member of Congress—Eric Holder has refused to allow the FBI career people to come up and brief the Congress. Now if Attorney General Ashcroft had prohibited the FBI from coming up to brief Senator LEAHY, this place would be up in arms. But Holder is prohibiting the FBI up until maybe next week to come up and brief on this issue.

Now, everyone said, well, we can hold him without any trouble. Okay. Great. But don't forget, Officer Pepe was stabbed in the eye by one of these guys at the World Trade Center—in the eye up in Attica. And don't also forgot the sheik, the blind sheik, Rahman, was proceeding sending information out with regard to his lawyer.

And lastly many people forget but the terrorists who were in American prisons were in communication to the Madrid bombers, with the Madrid bombing. But Eric Holder said, we are not going to give you a report. And do you know what? The Congress said, we don't want a report. We don't really want to be involved. We really don't want to know. So you go ahead and do whatever you want to do.

And lastly this: everyone in Guantanamo is medium to high security. The others have been released. Of the others that have been released, 61 have come back on the terrorist field, terrorist attacks against us and against our men and women in uniform. That is the low level guys.

These are the medium and high. So what we wanted to do is say that Congress ought to be involved. We didn't get into whether or not you close Guantanamo Bay or not. We were not stopping that. We were just saying, let's give us a report. Let's let the American people know. If the Congress doesn't want to know, let the American people know about whoever may be released in their neighborhood. They will at least know.

And lastly the Governors and the State legislators ought to participate. For that reason, this amendment should have been made in order whereby we could debate it to say, do you want these people to be released or do you want them to be retransferred? And should the Congress be involved?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I always supported the efforts in Afghanistan. But last weekend I went to Afghanistan. And as much as I want to support the country and I want to support this bill, I cannot. The problems there are overwhelming. Ninety percent of the women are illiterate and a huge majority of the men. Twenty-five percent of the children die before age 5. Thirty years of war has devastated any possibility of leadership in that country. Women area abused and beaten. Drug addiction is rampant. There is corruption in the government and corruption in the military.

In Afghanistan we were told it would take 10 to 15 years to turn this country around—10 to 15 years. So we either go full throttle or we just say, okay, because we can't just string it along like we did in Vietnam. Their needs are far more than one country can give. If other nations would stand up and do what we have done and give the same commitment of their people and their talent, Afghanistan could turn this around. And we could help them. But the world won't adopt Afghanistan. And we cannot be a single parent there.

Our focus now has to be Pakistan, the greater risk.

And so I will not be able to support this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker, Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, for 1 minute.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and for the supplemental. In Wisconsin we have had the largest call-up, the largest redeployment of our guard units since the Second World War. Many of our companies in western Wisconsin have had deployment ceremonies, tremendous sacrifices that our troops are making as well as their families to serve our country. This supplemental ensures that they get the tools and the resources and the equipment that they need to do their job as safely and as effectively as possible. It is the least we can do given what they are doing for us.

I also want to commend the dean of the Wisconsin delegation, the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, because he recognized the huge shortfall when it came to Farm Service Administration loans for our family farmers. The demand was exceeding the authority that we gave them to give out these ISA loans which is important for them to have so they can buy the seed so they can plant it in the ground and stay in business. And 47 of the 50 States were reaching shortfalls in this manner. It was brought to Mr. OBEY's and others' attention, and they took immediate action in order to rectify it before we had a wholesale reduction in family farming throughout the country. So I commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the supplemental.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman will be closing for his side?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for my Republican colleagues when I say that when President Obama said that he wanted to work in a bipartisan way, we would agree when it was the right thing to work with him in a bipartisan way.

Clearly, supporting our men and women who are daily stepping forward and volunteering to help us in the effort to prosecute this ongoing struggling against radical extremism deserves bipartisan support. So we are pleased that President Obama has made this request. We all hope, as Memorial Day approaches 1 week from Monday, we all hope very much that we are able to see this war come to an end. And we all want to see our men and women come home just as soon as we possibly can.

It is unfortunate that while President Obama has agreed to work with Republicans in our quest to ensure that we have adequate funding and support for our troops, that the Democratic leadership has chosen to use a procedure that is, unfortunately, one that we never once used when we were in the majority in dealing with a wartime supplemental. This is a closed rule that denies us a chance to offer the very, very thoughtful amendment that Mr. WOLF has come forward with.

□ 1330

It's clear, for those who heard our colleague from Vienna speak from this well about the deliberation that he took in crafting this amendment, that it's one that should be considered by this full House. But, unfortunately, the rule that is before us denies that.

Our colleague from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) had a very, very needed amendment that would increase the compensation level for our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, this rule denies a chance for that to be considered.

The distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Somerset, Kentucky, of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security (Mr. ROGERS), had his amendment that would have allowed for a transfer to deal with the pressing need that exists on our southern border, to secure it so that the drug cartels that are moving throughout Mexico killing literally thousands and thousands of people, so that we're able to protect ourselves from that. We are not even allowed to debate that amendment that Mr. ROGERS, a hardworking member of the Appropriations Committee, brought forward.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what we should do is defeat the previous question. And if Members who are committed to allowing for congressional involvement to deal with this difficult issue of Guantanamo, if they share that concern, Democrats and Republicans, we should join to defeat the previous question.

If I'm successful in my quest to defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to substitute Mr. OBEY's inadequate language on the Guantanamo detainees with Mr. WOLF's far more robust solution to the detainee problem.

And, again, to be very specific, Mr. Speaker, the Wolf amendment would require real risk assessments on the dangers of releasing Guantanamo detainees into our local communities. It would require the consent of governors and State legislatures before the Guantanamo detainees are sent here, and it would require a certification that bringing detainees on U.S. soil won't create legal repercussions that could result in terrorists roaming freely on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the application of the Wolf amendment has the effect of extending beyond the end of this fiscal year by requiring a detailed report in advance of any releases or transfers, while Mr. OBEY's language would allow terrorists to be released into the wild of our local communities without a second thought anytime after October 1.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the full language of the amendment in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question if they're committed to dealing responsibly with the Guantanamo issue and, if we're not successful with that, to vote ''no'' on the rule.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I think I will begin where my friend from California just left off, and that's with the Guantanamo issue, which I think has been blown way out of proportion because in the amendment that is proposed as part of this rule, none of the funds made available in this or any prior act may be used to release an individual who is detained as of April 30, 2009, at the Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia. It goes on to say that the President shall submit to the Congress in writing a comprehensive plan regarding the proposed disposition of each individual who is detained as of April 30, 2009, at Guantanamo Bay.

So this amendment provides precisely what they're concerned about. So their complaint is one that completely baffles me, and all the rhetoric and the histrionics attached to it as the potential for terrorists running amok in the streets simply is not accurate under this amendment or this supplement.

But the real purpose of the supplemental appropriation deals with several other things. Let's begin with wildfire suppression, making sure that firefighters can receive different kinds of grants for rehiring and personnel purposes; border enforcement, there's additional funding so that the border enforcement along the Mexican border is beefed up, as it was within the stimulus bill. There's additional funding for narcotics trafficking. We deal with the influenza as part of this supplemental, farming.

But then the most important and the real key to this supplemental deals with our troops. And it begins with allowing additional funds for stop-loss so that those people who have had to stay in the military beyond their original tours of duty get an additional $500 a month. There is a potential pay increase, and there is funding for warriors in transition. We had the terrible incident a few days ago of one of our troops killing a number of others because of the stress that comes from these war zones. So there's additional funding for that. Then, of course, the additional funding for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. We require reports as to how things are proceeding

towards the President's withdrawal date of August 31, 2010, from Iraq as well as requiring reports as to reconciliation and political consensus in Afghanistan.

I urge that my friends and my colleagues here in the Congress vote ''yes'' on the previous question and vote ''yes'' on the rule.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 434 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike ''printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution'' and insert ''printed in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2009 and numbered 2''.

(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 form 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. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the rule for H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. Clearly, this is an important bill and must be only amended with items that are essential to move clear the way for the assistance this country so greatly needs. I am saddened by the decision to make the rule a closed rule. Nevertheless, I support the rule and the underlying bill.

On May 4, Chairman OBEY released a summary of his initial mark of this legislation, reflecting the subcommittee's proposals. His mark provides a total of $94.2 billion, about $9.3 billion above the amended Administration request ($83.4 billion in the initial April 9 request, plus $1.5 billion for influenza preparedness requested on April 30, for a total of $84.9 billion).

It adds $3.2 billion for military construction, $3.1 billion for C–17 and C–130 cargo aircraft, and $3.2 billion for international affairs, with some offsetting reductions from the request elsewhere. This mark also provides $2.0 billion for influenza preparedness, $500 million more than requested.

AMENDMENT

Although it was a closed rule. I would have offered the following amendments.

While I am pleased to see more money going to support efforts by the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, our military, and our institutions managing foreign affairs; I want to ensure that funding that was already allocated is utilized.

In 2008, I worked with Congressman MURTHA and the Subcommittee on Defense to appropriate federal dollars for military personnel to receive assistance with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Having worked with Riverside General Hospital in my district, and learned of the many men and women suffering from PTSD; I formally requested and received FY08 funding for Riverside General Hospital to provide PTSD services to not only military personnel in Houston, TX but in the surrounding communities as well.

Due to unforeseen issues with the Department of Defense (DoD), the appropriated funding was never released from the Agency to the Hospital; and therefore services have yet to be rendered.

Therefore, to ensure legal authority for disbursement by DoD, I would like to have the funds allocated through Defense Health Operations & Maintenance in which case, the appropriate language should state:

''Of the funds provided for operations and maintenance for the Defense Health Program, the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $1,000,000.00 to Riverside General Hospital of Houston, Texas for services to treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders for active duty personnel, active duty dependents, National Guards, Reservist and military retirees with 20+ years of service discharged and/or on leave of duty.''

I believe this small technical amendment would right a wrong and clear the way for previously allocated funding to be disbursed. This language would fall within the statutory authorities available to DoD and will allow Riverside General Hospital to make improvements to the hospital in order to provide post traumatic stress disorder treatment to our military personnel. Without this amendment, or another appropriate legislative vehicle the funding will expire effective September 30, 2009, and the Agency could not release any funding to the hospital nor could the hospital push forward with much needed care.

PTSD

Last year the rate of suicide in the military exceeded that of the general population, with at least 128 Army soldiers ending their own lives last year. The suicide count, which includes soldiers in the Army Reserve and the National Guard, is sadly growing, 15 deaths are still being investigated, and the vast majority of them are expected to be ruled suicides according to Army officials.

The new suicide figure compares with 115 in 2007 and 102 in 2006 and is the highest since current record-keeping began in 1980. These alarming statistics are partially due to never-before-seen stress with two wars and repeated, long tours of duty according to Army statistics.

The Army operates one of the largest and most diverse military posts worldwide in Texas at Fort Hood. There are more than 52,000 Soldiers currently assigned and 70,000-plus family members. In fact, one out of every 10 active duty Soldiers in the Army is assigned to Fort Hood and it is the largest single local location employer in the State of Texas—with more than 12,000 civilian employees; and this figure does not account for the additional number of Coast Guard, Navy, Marines, and Air Force personnel in the area.

My district and the surrounding area badly need the mental healthcare that Riverside General Hospital can provide to the countless military personnel in central and southern Texas. Therefore, I wanted this language to be attached to H.R. 2346.

PAKISTAN

I would also like to increase the amount of funding for Pakistan from $400 million to $600 million. This funding can be used for opportunities other than just war funding opportunities. For example, this increase in funding can be used to capacity and nation-building. This is important for the reconstruction of Pakistan.

Again, although these amendments were not included in the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. 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 adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the

rules and adopting House Resolution 377.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 188, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Boucher
Johnson (GA)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner

□ 1402

Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, MCHENRY, and MITCHELL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. 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 247, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—178

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers

Emerson
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Buchanan
Camp
Delahunt
Honda
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner
Wittman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1411

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. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 262, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 262 I was unavailably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING ARMED FORCES DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 377, 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 New York (Mr. MASSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 377.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Boustany
Cantor
Cooper
Delahunt
Franks (AZ)
Jordan (OH)
Langevin
Miller (MI)
Reichert
Sánchez, Linda T.
Serrano
Stark
Tanner

□ 1418

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.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 263 I was unable to record my vote. I intended to vote "yea" on that question.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1137

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ's name from H.R. 1137.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 434, I call up the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 434, the amendment printed in House Report 111–107 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of H.R. 2346, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 434, is as follows:

H.R. 2346

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, 2009, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEFENSE MATTERS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $10,924,641,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $1,716,827,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $1,577,850,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $1,783,208,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $381,155,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $39,478,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $29,179,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $16,943,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $1,373,273,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $101,360,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $14,024,703,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $2,367,959,000: *Provided*, That up to $129,503,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'' account.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $1,084,081,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $6,216,729,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $5,353,701,000, of which—

(1) not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund, to be used in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom;

(2) not to exceed $810,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for payments to reimburse Pakistan, Jordan, and other key cooperating nations, for logistical, military, and other support including access provided, or to be provided, to United States military operations in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That such reimbursement payments may be made, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, 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, 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 these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to friendly foreign forces supporting United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan;

(3) not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall certify that such payments are necessary for confidential military purposes; and

(4) not to exceed $350,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, shall be for counternarcotics and other activities including assistance to other Federal agencies, on the United States border with Mexico: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds to appropriations for military personnel, operation and maintenance, and procurement to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer up to $100,000,000 of this amount to any other Federal appropriations accounts, with the concurrence of the head of the relevant Federal department or agency for border-related activities: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *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, to be merged with and made available for the same purposes and for the time period provided under this heading.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $101,317,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $24,318,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $30,775,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $34,599,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $178,446,000.

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the ''Iraq Freedom Fund'', $365,000,000, to remain available to the Secretary of Defense for transfer until September 30, 2010, of which—

(1) not to exceed $350,000,000 shall be available for rapid response to unforeseen, immediate warfighter needs for Iraq, Afghanistan, and other geographic areas in which combat or direct combat support operations for Iraq and Afghanistan occur in order to minimize casualties and ensure mission success for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom: *Provided*, That these funds are available for transfer to any other appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense to accomplish the purposes provided herein: *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 this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense; and

(2) not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Defense to transport the remains of servicemembers killed in combat operations: *Provided*, That these funds are available for transfer to any other appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense to accomplish the purposes provided herein: *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 this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $3,606,939,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making any obligation or transfer from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of the proposed obligation or transfer.

PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund'', hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, $400,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide assistance to the security forces of Pakistan (including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction) to improve the counterinsurgency capability of Pakistan's security forces, and, on an exceptional basis, irregular security forces: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this provision is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer such amounts as the Secretary may determine from the funds provided herein to any appropriations available to the Department of Defense or, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and head of the relevant Federal department or agency, to any other non-

intelligence related Federal account to accomplish the purposes provided herein: *Provided further*, That funds so 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: *Provided further*, That upon determination by the Secretary of Defense or head of other Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes herein, such amounts may be transferred by the head of the relevant Federal department or agency back to this appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated: *Provided further*, That the authority of the Secretary of Defense to obligate or transfer funds pursuant to this paragraph shall apply only to the funds appropriated for such purposes in this Act, and such authority shall not be continued beyond the expiration date specified in the matter preceding the first proviso: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated or transferred from the ''Pakistan Counter-insurgency Fund'' until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the congressional defense and foreign affairs committees, in writing of the details of the proposed obligation or transfer.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $1,285,304,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $677,141,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $2,233,871,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $230,075,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $8,039,349,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $691,924,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $31,698,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $348,919,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $172,095,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $1,509,986,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $5,138,268,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $57,416,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $183,684,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $1,745,761,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $200,068,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for procurement of high priority items of equipment that may be used by reserve component units for both its combat mission and the units' mission in support of the State governors, $500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of the National Guard and of the Reserve components shall, not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees a listing of items of equipment to be procured for their respective National Guard or Reserve component.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $73,734,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $96,231,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $92,574,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $459,391,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $846,726,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $1,097,297,000, of which $845,508,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, is for operation and maintenance; of which $50,185,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, is for procurement; and of which $201,604,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, is for research, development, test and evaluation.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $137,198,000, to remain available until expended.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

For an additional amount for ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $1,316,746,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the ''Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund'', $4,843,000,000, 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, to procure, sustain, transport, and field Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall transfer such funds only to appropriations for operation and maintenance; 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 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 the Secretary shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for ''Office of the Inspector General'', $9,551,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS TITLE

SEC. 10001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 10002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer between appropriations up to $2,000,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That 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, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329) except for the fourth proviso.

SEC. 10003. Funds appropriated by this title, or made available by the transfer of funds in this title, 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)).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 10004. During fiscal year 2009 and from funds in the Defense Cooperation Account, as established by 10 U.S.C. 2608, the Secretary of Defense may transfer up to $6,500,000 to such appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense as the Secretary shall determine for use consistent with the purposes for which such funds were contributed and accepted: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall report to the Congress all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

SEC. 10005. 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'' provided in this title, and executed in direct support of the overseas contingency operations only in Iraq and Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 10006. (a)(1) Of the funds appropriated in chapter 2 of title IX of Public Law 110–252 under the heading, ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'', $1,000,000,000 is rescinded.

(2) For an additional amount for ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'', $1,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That funds may not be obligated or transferred from this fund until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense notifies the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of the proposed obligation or transfer.

(b)(1) Of the funds appropriated in chapter 2 of title IX of Public Law 110–252 under the heading, ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $125,000,000 is rescinded.

(2) For an additional amount for the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

SEC. 10007. Funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $250,000: *Provided*, That upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $500,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall report to the Congress all purchases made pursuant to this authority within 30 days of using the authority.

SEC. 10008. (a) Beginning in fiscal year 2009, during any year in which funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Commander's Emergency Response Program, the Secretary of Defense may accept contributions of funds from any person, foreign government, or international organization to carry out the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Iraq or Afghanistan.

(b) Funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be credited to ''Operation and Maintenance, Army''.

(c) Funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a) shall become available during each year in which funds authorized to be appropriated have been appropriated.

SEC. 10009. (a) Until September 30, 2009, the Secretary of Defense may enter into an agreement with the head of an executive department or agency that has established internship programs to reimburse that department or agency for the costs associated with the first year of employment of eligible military spouses into positions under the internship program.

(b) The Secretary may provide such reimbursement to the department or agency, from funds otherwise made available for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', including the costs of the salary, benefits and allowances, and training of the military spouse for the first year of employment, for eligible military spouses beginning their internship by September 30, 2009.

(c) In this section:

(1) The term ''eligible military spouse'' means any person married to a member of the Armed Forces on active duty at the time of appointment, other than a person who—

(A) is legally separated from a member of the Armed Forces under court order or statute of any State or possession of the United States;

(B) is also a member of the Armed Forces on active duty; or

(C) is a retired member of the Armed Forces.

(2) The term ''internship'' means a professional, analytical, or administrative position in the Federal Government that operates under a developmental program leading to career advancement.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 10010. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated in this title for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', the Secretary of Defense may transfer up to $30,000,000 to the Department of State ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'' account, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide a long-range air traffic control and safety system to support air operations in the Kyrgyz Republic, including Manas International Airport and Air Base: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 10011. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase motor vehicles for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in Iraq and Afghanistan, up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding other limitations applicable to passenger carrying motor vehicles.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 10012. (a) Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329), the following amounts are rescinded from the following accounts in the amounts specified: ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $352,359,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $881,481,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $54,466,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $925,203,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $81,135,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $23,338,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $62,910,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $1,250,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $163,786,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $57,819,000; ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $250,645,000; ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $30,510,000; and ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $15,098,000.

(b)(1) Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (division A of Public Law 110–116) under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $5,000,000 is rescinded.

(2) Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329) under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $5,000,000 is rescinded.

(c) Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329) under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $100,000,000 is rescinded.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 10013. Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall make the following transfers of funds: *Provided*, That the amounts transferred shall be made available for the same purpose as the appropriations to which transferred, and for the same time period as the appropriation from which transferred: *Provided further*, That the funds shall be transferred between the following appropriations in the amounts specified:

To:

''Military Personnel, Army, 2009'', $100,600,000; ''Reserve Personnel, Army, 2009'', $41,000,000; and ''National Guard Personnel, Army, 2009'', $9,000,000.

From:

Funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329) under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Army, 2009/2011'', $22,600,000; and under the heading ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 2009/2011'', $107,100,000.

From:

Funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (division A of Public Law 110–116) under the heading ''Other Procurement, Army, 2008/2010'', $20,900,000.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 10014. Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329), under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $181,500,000 is rescinded.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 10015. (a) RETROACTIVE PAYMENT OF STOP-LOSS SPECIAL PAY.—In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $734,400,000 is appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended. *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretaries of the military departments only to make the payment specified in subsection (b) to members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components, and former and retired members under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who, at any time during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on September 30, 2009, served on active duty while the members' enlistment or period of obligated service was extended, or whose eligibility for retirement was suspended, pursuant to section 123 or 12305 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law (commonly referred to as a ''stop-loss authority'') authorizing the President to extend an enlistment or period of obligated service, or suspend an eligibility for retirement, of a member of the uniformed services in time of war or of national emergency declared by Congress or the President.

(b) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The amount to be paid under subsection (a) to or on behalf of an eligible member, retired member, or former member described in such subsection shall be $500 per month for each month or portion of a month during the period specified in such subsection that the member was retained on active duty as a result of application of the stop-loss authority.

(c) TREATMENT OF DECEASED MEMBERS.—If an eligible member, retired member, or former member described in subsection (a) dies before the payment required by this section is made, the Secretary concerned shall make the payment to the designated representative or estate of the member.

(d) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS.—A former member of the Armed Forces is not eligible for a payment under this section if the former member was discharged or released from the Armed Forces under other than honorable conditions.

(e) RELATION TO OTHER STOP-LOSS SPECIAL PAY.—A member, retired member, or former member may not receive a payment under this section and stop-loss special pay under section 8116 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329; 122 Stat. 3646) for the same

month or portion of a month during which the member was retained on active duty as a result of application of the stop-loss authority.

SEC. 10016. (a) Section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1392) is repealed.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may retire C–5A aircraft from the inventory of the Air Force 15 days after certifying to the congressional defense committees that retiring the aircraft will not significantly increase operational risk of not meeting the National Defense Strategy, provided that such retirements may not reduce total strategic airlift force structure inventory below the 292 strategic airlift aircraft level identified in the Mobility Capability Study 2005 (MCS–05) unless otherwise addressed in the fiscal year 2010 National Defense Authorization Act.

SEC. 10017. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended to provide award fees to any defense contractor contrary to the provisions of section 814 of the National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

SEC. 10018. None of the funds provided in this title may be used to finance programs or activities denied by Congress in fiscal years 2008 or 2009 appropriations to the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation new start program without prior written notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 10019. 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. 10020. 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 the purpose of establishing any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 10021. (a) REPORT ON IRAQ TROOP DRAWDOWN STATUS, GOALS, AND TIMETABLE.—In recognition and support of the policy of President Barack Obama to withdraw all United States combat brigades from Iraq by August 31, 2010, and all United States military forces from Iraq on December 31, 2011, Congress directs the Secretary of Defense (in consultation with other members of the National Security Council) to prepare a report that identifies troop drawdown status and goals and includes—

(1) a detailed, month-by-month description of the transition of United States military forces and equipment out of Iraq; and

(2) a detailed, month-by-month description of the transition of United States contractors out of Iraq.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—At a minimum, the Secretary of Defense shall address the following:

(1) How the Government of Iraq is assuming the responsibility for reconciliation initiatives as the mission of the United States Armed Forces transitions.

(2) How the drawdown of military forces complies with the President's planned withdrawal of combat brigades by August 31, 2010, and all United States forces by December 31, 2011.

(3) The roles and responsibilities of remaining contractors in Iraq as the United States mission evolves, including the anticipated number of United States contractors to remain in Iraq after August 31, 2010, and December 31, 2011.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter through September 30, 2010, the Secretary of Defense shall submit the report required by subsection (a) and a classified annex to the report, as necessary.

TITLE II—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

CHAPTER 1—AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

For an additional amount for ''Public Law 480 Title II Grants'', $500,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 20101. Amounts appropriated by section 101(a) of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2747) and unobligated as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, until expended, to provide assistance under the emergency conservation program established under title IV of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) for expenses related to recovery efforts in response to natural disasters.

SEC. 20102. (a)(1) For an additional amount for gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed farm ownership (7 U.S.C. 1922 et seq.) and operating (7 U.S.C. 1941 et seq.) loans, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: direct farm ownership loans, $360,000,000; direct operating loans, $400,000,000; and unsubsidized guaranteed operating loans, $50,201,000.

(2) For an additional amount for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: direct farm ownership loans, $22,860,000; direct operating loans, $47,160,000; and unsubsidized guaranteed operating loans, $1,250,000.

(b) Of the unobligated balances available and provided in prior year appropriations acts for discretionary programs in the Rural Development mission area, $71,270,000 is hereby rescinded.

CHAPTER 2—COMMERCE AND JUSTICE

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $1,648,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $1,389,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $4,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $5,038,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

GENERAL PROVISION, THIS CHAPTER

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

SEC. 20201. (a) Of the funds appropriated in chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 110–252 under the heading ''Office of Inspector General'', $3,000,000 is rescinded.

(b) For an additional amount for ''Office of Inspector General'', $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

CHAPTER 3—ENERGY

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Strategic Petroleum Reserve'', $21,585,723, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the ''SPR Petroleum Account'' for site maintenance activities.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For an additional amount for ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'', $55,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER 4—GENERAL GOVERNMENT

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $2,936,000, of which $800,000 shall remain available until expended and $2,136,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2010.

CHAPTER 5—HOMELAND SECURITY

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants awarded under section 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a) in fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(1)(B) and subsection (c) of such section and may award grants for the hiring, rehiring, or retention of firefighters.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 20501. Notwithstanding sections 12112, 55102, and 55103 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for engaging in the coastwise trade for the drydock ALABAMA (United States official number 641504).

SEC. 20502. Notwithstanding sections 55101, 55103, and 12112 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel MARYLAND INDEPENDENCE (official number 662573). The coastwise endorsement issued under authority of this section is terminated if—

(1) the vessel, or controlling interest in the person that owns the vessel, is conveyed after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any repairs or alterations are made to the vessel outside of the United States.

CHAPTER 6—INTERIOR AND ENVIRONMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount to cover necessary expenses for wildfire suppression and

emergency rehabilitation activities of the Department of the Interior, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds provided previously for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and after the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may transfer any of these funds to the Secretary of Agriculture if the transfer enhances the efficiency or effectiveness of Federal wildland fire suppression activities.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount to cover necessary expenses for wildfire suppression and emergency rehabilitation activities of the Forest Service, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds provided previously for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and after the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer not more than $50,000,000 of these funds to the Secretary of the Interior if the transfer enhances the efficiency or effectiveness of Federal wildland fire suppression activities.

CHAPTER 7—HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic, including the development and purchase of vaccine, antivirals, necessary medical supplies, diagnostics, and other surveillance tools and to assist international efforts and respond to international needs relating to the 2009–H1N1 influenza outbreak, $1,850,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no less than $350,000,000 shall be for upgrading State and local capacity: *Provided further*, That no less than $200,000,000 shall be transferred to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to carry out global and domestic disease surveillance, laboratory capacity and research, laboratory diagnostics, risk communication, rapid response, and quarantine: *Provided further*, That products purchased with these funds may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services (''Secretary''), be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 496(b) of the Public Health Service Act, funds may be used for the construction or renovation of privately owned facilities for the production of pandemic influenza vaccine and other biologics, where the Secretary finds such a contract necessary to secure sufficient supplies of such vaccines or biologics: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading and not specifically designated under this heading may be transferred to, and merged with, other appropriation accounts of the Department of Health and Human Services and other Federal agencies, as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, to be used for the purposes specified under this heading and to the fund authorized by section 319F–4 of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That transfers to other Federal agencies shall be made in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That prior to transferring any funds under this heading, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of any such transfer and the planned uses of the funds: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available in this or any other Act.

GENERAL PROVISION, THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 20701. Title II of division F of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–8) is amended under the heading ''Children and Families Services Programs''—

(1) by striking the first proviso in its entirety; and

(2) by striking ''*Provided further*'' the first place it appears and inserting ''*Provided*''.

CHAPTER 8—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

CAPITOL POLICE

GENERAL EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''General Expenses'', $71,606,000, to purchase and install a new radio system for the Capitol Police to remain available until September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That $6,500,000 of these funds shall be designated as ''contingency'' and shall only be available for obligation upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Chief of the Capitol Police may not obligate any of the funds appropriated under this heading without approval of an obligation plan by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

CHAPTER 9—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Army'', $1,407,231,000, of which $810,850,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2010, and of which $596,381,000 for child development centers, warrior in transition facilities, and planning and design shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $68,081,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Army'' under Public Law 110–252, $142,500,000 is rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'', $235,881,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $11,000,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Air Force'', $279,120,000, of which $255,650,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2010, and of which $23,470,000 for child development centers and planning and design shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $12,070,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Air Force'' under Public Law 110–252, $30,000,000 is rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'', $1,086,968,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects in the United States not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $30,000,000 shall be for the planning and design of a National Security Agency data center and $1,056,968,000 shall be for the construction of hospitals: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an expenditure plan for the funds provided for hospital construction under this heading.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program'', $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $263,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

CHAPTER 10—STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', $1,016,215,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which $403,983,000 is for worldwide security protection and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may transfer up to $157,600,000 of the total funds made available under this heading to any other appropriation of any department or agency of the United States, upon the concurrence of the head of such department or agency, to support operations in and assistance for Afghanistan and to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That up to $10,900,000 of the funds made available under this heading for public diplomacy activities should be

transferred to, and merged with, funds made available for ''International Broadcasting Operations'' for broadcasting activities to the Pakistan-Afghanistan Border Region.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Office of Inspector General'', $17,123,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which $7,201,000 shall be transferred to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight: *Provided*, That the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction may exercise the authorities of subsections (b) through (i) of section 3161 of title 5, United States Code (without regard to subsection (a) of such section) for funds made available for fiscal years 2009 and 2010: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General of the United States Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, and the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development shall coordinate and integrate the programming of funds made available under this heading in fiscal year 2009 for oversight of programs in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, within 30 days of completion, the annual comprehensive audit plan for the Middle East and South Asia developed by the Southwest Asia Joint Planning Group in accordance with section 842 of Public Law 110–181.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'', $989,628,000, to remain available until expended, for worldwide security upgrades, acquisition, and construction as authorized: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading in this chapter shall be for providing secure diplomatic facilities and housing for United States Mission staff in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and for the deployment of mobile mail screening units.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for ''Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities'', $836,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Operating Expenses'', $152,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

For an additional amount for ''Capital Investment Fund'', $48,500,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for ''Office of Inspector General'', $3,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, for oversight of programs in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

GLOBAL HEALTH AND CHILD SURVIVAL

For an additional amount for ''Global Health and Child Survival'', $300,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That $200,000,000 shall be made available for pandemic preparedness and response: *Provided further*, That $100,000,000 shall be made available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, except for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–25), for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria: *Provided further*, That the amounts made available under this heading in this chapter are in addition to amounts made available for such purpose in the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–8): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, to include minimum funding requirements or funding directives, if the President determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the human-to-human transmission of the H1N1 virus is efficient and sustained, and is spreading internationally, funds made available under the headings ''Global Health and Child Survival'', ''Development Assistance'', ''Economic Support Fund'', and ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'' in prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs may be made available to combat the H1N1 virus: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of the previous proviso shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''International Disaster Assistance'', $200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Economic Support Fund'', $2,907,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which up to $529,500,000 is for assistance for Pakistan: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than $70,000,000 shall be made available for the National Solidarity Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not more than $556,000,000 may be made available for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses of the United States Agency for International Development, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, to carry out programs in the West Bank and Gaza, and of which $2,000,000 shall be transferred, and merged with, funds available under the heading ''United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Office of Inspector General'' to conduct oversight of programs in the West Bank and Gaza: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, not more than $200,000,000 may be made available for cash transfer assistance to the Palestinian Authority: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading for cash transfer assistance to the Palestinian Authority may be obligated for salaries of personnel of the Palestinian Authority located in Gaza: *Provided further*, That up to $10,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading may be made available for disaster assistance in Burma only for humanitarian assistance to Burmese affected by Cyclone Nargis, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, up to $300,000,000 may be made available for assistance for developing countries impacted by the global financial crisis, including Haiti, Liberia, and Indonesia.

ASSISTANCE FOR EUROPE, EURASIA AND CENTRAL ASIA

For an additional amount for ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'', $242,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, shall be available for assistance for Georgia: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to prior consultations with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For an additional amount for ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', $483,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That not less than $160,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Mexico to combat drug trafficking and related violence and organized crime, and for judicial reform, institution building, anti-corruption, and rule of law activities, and shall be immediately available notwithstanding section 7045(e) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–8): *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the previous proviso shall be made available subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, except that notifications shall be transmitted at least 5 days in advance of the obligation of any funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $106,000,000 shall be made available for security assistance for the West Bank: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in classified form if necessary, on the use of assistance provided by the United States for the training of Palestinian security forces, including detailed descriptions of the training, curriculum, and equipment provided; and an assessment of the training and the performance of forces after training has been completed.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', $98,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which up to $73,500,000 may be made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities relating to nonproliferation, disarmament and weapons destruction, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', $343,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for ''Peacekeeping Operations'', $80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For an additional amount for ''International Military Education and Training'', $2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', $1,349,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That not less than $310,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Mexico and shall be immediately available notwithstanding section 7045(e) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–8): *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available notwithstanding section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than $150,000,000 shall be available for Jordan: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $555,000,000, shall be available for grants only for Israel and shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, grants made available for Israel by this paragraph shall, as agreed by the United States and Israel, be available for advanced weapons systems, of which $145,965,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $260,000,000 shall be made available for grants only for Egypt, including for border security programs and activities in the Sinai: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated pursuant to the previous proviso estimated to be outlayed for Egypt shall be transferred to an interest bearing account for Egypt in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York within 30 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That up to $74,000,000 may be available for Lebanon only after the Secretary of State submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on procedures established to determine eligibility of members and units of the security forces of Lebanon to participate in United States training and assistance programs and on the end use monitoring of all equipment provided under such programs to the Lebanese security forces: *Provided further*, That prior to the initial obligation of funds the Secretary of State shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that all practicable efforts have been made to ensure that such assistance is not provided to or through any individual, or private or government entity, that advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity.

PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY CAPABILITY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a special account to be known as the ''Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund''. For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part I and chapters 2, 5, 6, and 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for counterinsurgency activities in Pakistan, $400,000,000, which shall become available on September 30, 2009, and remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing assistance for Pakistan to build and maintain the counterinsurgency capability of Pakistani security forces, and, on an exceptional basis, irregular security forces, to include program management and the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, and facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction: *Provided further*, That these funds may be transferred by the Secretary of State to the Department of Defense or other Federal departments or agencies to support counterinsurgency operations and may be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred, or may be transferred pursuant to the authorities contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the congressional defense and foreign affairs committees, in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall submit not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report summarizing, on a project-by-project basis, the transfer of funds from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That upon determination by the Secretary of Defense or head of other Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes herein, such amounts may be transferred by the head of the relevant Federal department or agency back to this appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated: *Provided further*, That any required notification or report may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES

SEC. 21001. Funds provided by this chapter may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 21002. (a) Funds provided in this chapter for the following accounts shall be made available for programs and countries in the amounts contained in the respective tables included in the report accompanying this Act:

(1) ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs''.

(2) ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance''.

(3) ''Economic Support Fund''.

(b) For the purposes of implementing this section, and only with respect to the tables included in the report accompanying this Act, the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, as appropriate, may propose deviations to the amounts referenced in subsection (a), subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

SPENDING PLAN AND NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

SEC. 21003. (a) SPENDING PLAN.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report detailing planned expenditures for funds appropriated in this chapter, except for funds appropriated under the headings ''International Disaster Assistance'' and ''Migration and Refugee Assistance''.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Funds made available in this chapter shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

UNRWA ACCOUNTABILITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 21004. (a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds made available in this chapter under the heading ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', not more than $119,000,000 may be made available to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for activities in the West Bank and Gaza.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act a report on whether UNRWA is—

(1) continuing to utilize Operations Support Officers in the West Bank and Gaza to inspect UNRWA installations and report any inappropriate use;

(2) acting swiftly in dealing with staff or beneficiary violations of its own policies (including the policies on neutrality and impartiality of employees) and the legal requirements under Section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(3) taking necessary and appropriate measures to ensure it is operating in full compliance with the conditions of section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(4) continuing to report every six months to the Department of State on actions it has taken to ensure conformance with the conditions of section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(5) taking steps to improve the transparency of all educational materials and supplemental educational materials currently in use in UNRWA-administered schools;

(6) continuing to use supplemental curriculum materials in UNRWA-supported schools and summer camps designed to promote tolerance, non-violent conflict resolution and human rights;

(7) not engaging in operations with financial institutions, or entities of any kind, in violation of relevant United States law and is enhancing its transparency and financial due diligence and diversifying its banking operations in the region; and

(8) in compliance with the United Nations Board of Auditors' biennial audit requirements and is implementing in a timely fashion the Board of Auditors' recommendations.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—Of the funds made available in this chapter under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, $1,000,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds available under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Office of Inspector General'' for oversight of programs in the West Bank, Gaza and surrounding region.

WOMEN AND GIRLS IN AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 21005. (a) Funds made available in this chapter for assistance for Afghanistan shall comply with sections 7062 (Women in Development) and 7063 (Gender-Based Violence) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–

8) and should be made available to support programs that increase participation by women in the political process, including at the national, regional and local levels: *Provided*, That such programs should ensure participation in efforts to improve security and political stability in Afghanistan.

(b) Not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the steps taken to respond to the special security and development needs of women in Afghanistan.

SOMALIA

SEC. 21006. (a) ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.—Of the funds made available in this chapter under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'', $10,000,000 shall be available for assistance for Somalia.

(b) SECURITY ASSISTANCE.—Of the funds made available in this chapter under the heading ''Peacekeeping Operations'' for assistance for Somalia, $70,000,000 is available for equipment, logistical support and facilities for the expanded African Union Mission to Somalia (AMISOM) and for security sector reform.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with relevant Federal departments or agencies, shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the feasibility of creating an indigenous maritime capability to combat piracy off the coast of the Horn of Africa.

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available in this chapter for assistance for Somalia shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IMPACTED BY THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 21007. (a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds made available in this chapter for assistance for developing countries impacted by the global financial crisis should only be made available to countries that—

(1) have a 2007 per capita Gross National Income of $3,705 or less;

(2) have seen a contraction in predicted growth rates of 2 percent or more since 2007; and

(3) demonstrate consistent improvement on the democracy and governance indicators as measured by the Millennium Challenge Corporation 2009 Country Scorebook.

(b) TRANSFER AUTHORITIES.—Of the funds made available in this chapter under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for developing countries impacted by the global financial crisis—

(1) up to $29,000,000 may be transferred and merged with ''Development Credit Authority'', for the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees notwithstanding the dollar limitations in such account on transfers to the account and the principal amount of loans made or guaranteed with respect to any single country or borrower: *Provided*, That such transferred funds may be available to subsidize total loan principal, any portion of which is to be guaranteed, of up to $2,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That the authority provided by the previous proviso is in addition to authority provided under the heading ''Development Credit Authority'' in the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–8): *Provided further*, That up to $1,500,000 may be for administrative expenses to carry out credit programs administered by the United States Agency for International Development; and

(2) up to $20,000,000 may be transferred and merged with ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation Program Account'': *Provided*, That the authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to authority provided in section 7081 in the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–8).

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit a spending plan not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, and prior to the initial obligation of funds appropriated for countries impacted by the global economic crisis, detailing the use of all funds on a country-by-country, and project-by-project basis: *Provided*, For each project, the report shall include (1) the projected economic impact of providing such funds; (2) the name of the entity or implementing organization to which funds are being provided; and (3) if funds will be provided as a direct cash transfer to a local or national government entity: *Provided further*, That funds transferred to the Development Credit Authority and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation are subject to the reporting requirements in section 21003.

EVALUATING AFGHAN AND PAKISTANI CONDUCT AND COMMITMENT

SEC. 21008. (a) FINDINGS REGARDING PROGRESS IN AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Over 40,000 American military personnel are currently serving in Afghanistan, with the bravery and professionalism consistent with the finest traditions of the United States Armed Forces, and are deserving of the strong support of all Americans.

(2) Many American service personnel have lost their lives, and many more have been wounded in Afghanistan. The American people will always honor their sacrifice and honor their families.

(3) Afghanistan and Pakistan are experiencing a deterioration of their internal security resulting from a growing insurgency fueled by Al Qaeda, the Taliban and other extremist networks that continue to operate along the western border of Pakistan, including in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), as well as in areas under central government authority such as Quetta in Baluchistan and Muridke in Punjab.

(4) The United States and the international community have welcomed and supported Pakistan's return to civilian rule after almost nine years with the free and fair elections of February 18, 2008, and have supported the development of a democratic government in Afghanistan.

(5) Since 2001, the United States has contributed more than $33,000,000,000 to Afghanistan and $12,000,000,000 to Pakistan to strengthen each country's governance, economy, education system, healthcare services, and military.

(6) The governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan must expand the writ of the national government across all provinces to secure their borders, protect their population, enforce the rule of law, and tackle the pervasive problem of corruption in order to bring security and stability to their people.

(b) REPORT.—Because the stability and security of the region is tied more to the capacity and conduct of the Afghan and Pakistani governments and to the resolve of both societies than it is to the policies of the United States, the President shall submit a report to the Congress, not later than the date of submission of the fiscal year 2011 budget request, assessing whether the Governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan are, or are not, demonstrating the necessary commitment, capability, conduct and unity of purpose to warrant the continuation of the President's policy announced on March 27, 2009. The President, on the basis of information gathered and coordinated by the National Security Council, shall advise the Congress on how that assessment requires, or does not require, changes to that policy. The measures used to evaluate the Afghan and Pakistani governments' record of concrete performance shall include the following standards of performance:

(1) Level of political consensus and unity of purpose across ethnic, tribal, religious and party affiliations to confront the political and security challenges facing the region.

(2) Level of government corruption and actions taken to eliminate it.

(3) Performance of the respective security forces in developing a counterinsurgency capability, conducting counterinsurgency operations and establishing population security.

(4) Performance of the respective intelligence agencies in cooperating with the United States on counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations and in purging themselves of policies, programs and personnel that provide material support to extremist networks that target United States troops or undermine United States objectives in the region.

(5) Ability of the Afghan and Pakistani governments to effectively control the territory within their respective borders.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO HAMAS

SEC. 21009. (a) None of the funds made available in this chapter may be made available for assistance to Hamas, or any entity effectively controlled by Hamas or any power-sharing government of which Hamas is a member.

(b) Notwithstanding the limitation of subsection (a), assistance may be provided to a power-sharing government if the President certifies in writing and reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that such government, including all of its ministers or such equivalent, has publicly accepted and is complying with the principles contained in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 620K(b)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378b(b)(1)).

(c) The President may exercise the authority in section 620K(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378b(e)) with respect to the limitations of this section.

(d) REPORT.—Whenever the certification pursuant to subsection (b) is exercised, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 120 days of the certification and every quarter thereafter on whether such government, including all of its ministers or such equivalent are continuing to publically accept and comply with the principles contained in section 620K(b)(1) (A) and (B) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378b(b)(1)). The report shall also detail the amount, purposes and delivery mechanisms for any assistance provided pursuant to the abovementioned certification and a full accounting of any direct support of such government.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 21010. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this chapter shall be available under the authorities and conditions provided in the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public

Law 111–8), except that sections 7070(e), with respect to funds made available for macroeconomic growth assistance for Zimbabwe, and 7042 (a) and (c) of such Act shall not apply to funds made available in this chapter.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS ACT

SEC. 30001. (a) Not later than October 1, 2009, the President shall submit to the Congress, in writing, a comprehensive plan regarding the proposed disposition of the detention center at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to include—

(1) a proposed disposition of individuals detained as of April 30, 2009;

(2) a determination that such disposition does not pose a risk that cannot be mitigated if such individual is prosecuted, transferred or released, including a plan for such mitigation; and

(3) a detailed analysis of the total estimated direct costs of closing the detention facility at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any related costs, including the estimated costs of detention, prosecution, security, and incarceration in the United States of the individuals detained at such facility.

(b) The plan required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex, if necessary.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 30002. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS

SEC. 30003. (a) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS DESIGNATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount in this Act is designated as being for overseas deployments and other activities pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 423(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—Each amount in chapters 6, 7, and 8 of title II is designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 423(b) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

RESTRICTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSFER AND RELEASE OF GUANTANAMO BAY DETAINEES

SEC. 30004. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act may be used to release an individual who is detained, as of April 30, 2009, at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia.

(b) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act may be used to transfer an individual who is detained, as of April 30, 2009, at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia, for the purposes of detaining or prosecuting such individual until 2 months after the plan detailed in subsection (c) is received.

(c) The President shall submit to the Congress, in writing, a comprehensive plan regarding the proposed disposition of each individual who is detained, as of April 30, 2009, at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who is not covered under subsection (d). Such plan shall include, at a minimum, each of the following for each such individual:

(1) The findings of an analysis regarding any risk to the national security of the United States that is posed by the transfer of the individual.

(2) The costs associated with not transferring the individual in question.

(3) The legal rationale and associated court demands for transfer.

(4) A certification by the President that any risk described in paragraph (1) has been mitigated, together with a full description of the plan for such mitigation.

(5) A certification by the President that the President has submitted to the Governor and legislature of the State to which the President intends to transfer the individual a certification in writing at least 30 days prior to such transfer (together with supporting documentation and justification) that the individual does not pose a security risk to the United States.

(d) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act may be used to transfer or release an individual detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of April 30, 2009, to the country of such individual's nationality or last habitual residence or to any other country other than the United States, unless the President submits to the Congress, in writing, at least 30 days prior to such transfer or release, the following information:

(1) The name of any individual to be transferred or released and the country to which such individual is to be transferred or released.

(2) An assessment of any risk to the national security of the United States or its citizens, including members of the Armed Services of the United States, that is posed by such transfer or release and the actions taken to mitigate such risk.

(3) The terms of any agreement with another country for acceptance of such individual, including the amount of any financial assistance related to such agreement.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 30005. This Act may be cited as the ''Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may insert extraneous and tabular material on H.R. 2346.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we have a new President who has inherited a war he is trying to end. This bill tries to help him do that. We have no real alternative but to support it. I urge support for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as members of the Appropriations Committee began the process of writing this legislation, I was hopeful that the House would return to its traditional approach to considering appropriations bills under an open rule on the House floor. Unfortunately, that is not the case today.

There are Members of both political parties who have thoughtful and well-intentioned amendments that ought to receive the consideration of the full House. An open rule would ensure that each and every Member has the right and the opportunity to make a good bill even better. But Members on both sides are once again being denied this precious right.

There is one exception to this rule, however. To cover itself politically on a highly sensitive national security issue, the majority leadership has included an amendment offered by my chairman, DAVID OBEY, that is self-executed into the rule on this bill. However, the Obey amendment only pays lip service to protecting our citizens from the release of known terrorists from Guantanamo into the United States.

Mr. WOLF, who is perhaps the most knowledgeable Member of the House on this issue, offered an amendment in the full committee last week which was defeated on a straight party-line vote. Yesterday, Mr. WOLF testified on his amendment at the Rules Committee and he was denied the opportunity to even offer his amendment today on the floor.

I don't say this lightly, but on this issue the majority leadership of the House appears to be more sensitive to the rights of known terrorists than the rights of duly elected Members of this body. What a shameful exercise this has become.

House Members were initially led to believe that this legislation would be kept at the President's original level of $84 billion to fund only the critical needs of the global war on terrorism. As presented today, however, this legislation has grown to $96.7 billion since it was submitted to the Congress 5 weeks ago.

The Members know that we face many crises around the world deserving our attention and thoughtful deliberation. It was President Kennedy who a generation ago reminded us that, when written in Chinese, the word ''crises'' is composed of two characters: one represents danger; the other represents opportunity.

If there is any doubt about what we are doing, let us be mindful that the supplemental provides the necessary resources for our soldiers and civilians to wage a successful battle on multiple fronts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. We know that the Taliban is now increasingly emboldened and the situation on the ground in Pakistan is, at best, fragile.

Closer to our shores, the potential closure of Guantanamo has become a symbol of best intentions colliding head-on with political reality. Chairman OBEY's decision to withhold funding for Guantanamo is the clearest indication to date that the Obama administration still has no plausible plan to deal with this complex national security issue.

The President owes it to the American people and this Congress to provide a detailed plan for the potential

relocation of detainees prior to any funds being appropriated for this purpose and prior to any detainees being transferred to our shores.

As presently written, the legislation does absolutely nothing to prevent the release of detainees from Guantanamo into the United States, into our neighborhoods and communities, after October 1 of this year. These detainees, many of them well-known terrorists, trained by al Qaeda, would be released with no security risk assessment or even the prior notification of Members of Congress.

Congressman WOLF and Congressman TIAHRT each had amendments addressing this critical national security issue, and both were denied the opportunity to offer their amendments on the floor. As a result, it is now only a matter of time before known terrorists will be brought to the United States on a permanent basis.

Today, it is less clear, not more clear, what rights they will be afforded when they arrive and under what judicial system they will be tried. And, indeed, in many ways we will be treating them as though they were citizens of the United States.

The insistence of the majority leadership to consider this legislation under a closed rule is disappointing because the bulk of this emergency supplemental was put together with very serious bipartisan cooperation. It is one of the rare instances in recent times when Republicans and Democrats have largely set aside partisan differences to do what is best for our country and what is best for our troops.

I am deeply concerned about legitimate national security questions taking a back seat to political partisanship. But we must pass this legislation, even in its presently flawed form, to ensure that funds continue to flow to support our efforts to bring peace and stability around the world. I urge an ''aye'' vote on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. As all the Members know, most of this bill has been bipartisan. BILL YOUNG and I worked almost every detail out, and it is for the troops in the field and the military families at home.

For military personnel, we include—and I noticed there was a Member up not long ago who said what they did on stop-loss. Well, I will tell you who did what on stop-loss, this subcommittee, this appropriation committee did the stop-loss, put $734 million in for 185,000 military servicemembers. Recognizing the hardship placed on troops, we made sure that they will get $500 a month because of the hardship placed on them for an involuntary draft, in a sense.

Additional military pay. We had several hearings on trying to figure out how much money the military needed to take care of the shortage of pay. Finally, we came down to $2.5 billion and we added that to the bill.

TBI and psychological health. Nobody has been more in the forefront than Mr. YOUNG and myself in trying to make sure that we have money. We put an extra $100 million there.

Since 2001, there have been 42,600 diagnosed cases of PTSD and 58,000 servicemembers treated for TBI. Out at Bethesda not long ago, I just saw the new facility for PTSD.

Orthopedic research and treatment. The bill includes $68 million. Nearly two-thirds of combat-related injuries require orthopedic procedures or treatment.

Amputee rehabilitation. We put $20 million in.

Joint family assistance. The bill includes $125.1 above the request and a total of $739 million for family advocacy programs.

Yellow ribbon. The bill provides $238 million for information, services, referrals, and outreach to the reserves for that program.

We put in money for C–17s, for 130s. We put money in for Apaches, helicopters, all of these things needed in the war effort.

MRAPs. We put in new MRAPs.

Strykers. We put money in for Strykers because it takes twice as long, and these are medical care Strykers, because it takes twice as long to get people to a hospital or to medical care in Afghanistan, and this will help that situation and reduce the time it takes to get to medical care.

Bradley Fighting Vehicles.

National Guard and Reserve. We put $500 million in the bill.

Guantanamo. In the initial stages we took the money out and said give us a plan; and, of course, the chairman has developed a plan for that.

We have withdrawal timelines from Iraq, August 31, 2010.

Training Afghanistan security forces, $3.6 billion.

Pakistan counterinsurgency fund, $400 million.

And contracting.

□ 1430

And on contracting, one of the things the Secretary talks about and we talk about is that it costs us $44,000 more to have contractors in Iraq than it does to have regular troops there. And we finally said to them, Look, you've got to start taking the nationals there, putting their people to work, get the Americans or the foreign people—when I say ''foreign,'' other than Iraqis—out of the country. So we're going to get a schedule of getting the contractors down.

The report includes language directing the Department of Defense to provide monthly reports on the number of contractors in the US CENTCOM Area of Responsibility. We have a heck of a time getting this. But this bill provides the resources and capabilities needed to support deployed U.S. forces.

It is a completely partisan bill, and working with Mr. YOUNG, I appreciate his cooperation and ask the Members to vote positively on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I rise in support of the supplemental. Most of the money in this supplemental is for our troops. It is for the war on terror, and it is to take care of the soldiers that are conducting that war.

As Mr. MURTHA said, we worked together to create this legislation. In fact, the subcommittee met and all the members had an opportunity to have their input. The majority staff worked very closely with the minority staff, and we feel like we have crafted a really good wartime supplemental. So I urge the support for the supplemental, most of which is the defense part of the bill.

I want to say that I agree with Ranking Member LEWIS on the issue of Guantanamo. I don't think we have it all figured out yet. I think just to say we're going to close Guantanamo doesn't really get the job done; there's too much to it.

Last year, the Congress approved my amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill and said you can't close Guantanamo until you do two things: one, have a plan as to what you will do with the detainees; and number two, which doesn't get mentioned very often, have a plan of what you are going to do with the facilities.

As appropriators, we know that we spent close to half a billion dollars creating a medium-security holding facility and a maximum-security holding facility. They're state-of-the-art facilities. If you have to be in prison somewhere, Guantanamo is the place to be, because these are really nice facilities.

What are we going to do with half a billion dollars worth of detainee facilities? I think we need to know the answer to that. In my amendment last year, the legislation required the administration to report within 180 days of what the plan would be on those two issues. That has not happened to this day.

We can't deal with Guantanamo lightly. We can't bring terrorists who have been responsible for killing many Americans into the United States without careful consideration. My preference would be not to bring them into the United States. I may be in the minority on that issue.

But anyway, the overall bill is a good bill, and I do support it. I congratulate Mr. OBEY, the chairman, and Mr. LEWIS, the ranking member. And certainly, having worked with Chairman MURTHA to craft the defense part of this bill, it's one that we can all support without any hesitation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY),

the chairwoman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in strong support of H.R. 2346, the FY09 Emergency Supplemental. This legislation provides the resources our military, diplomatic, and development personnel need to make our Nation more secure. I was very pleased to work in a bipartisan way with KAY GRANGER.

The Obama administration's policy to defeat the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is critical to prevent the region from being a base for terrorist plots against the United States and our allies. H.R. 2346 provides $3.8 billion for economic security initiatives in the region and funds our diplomatic development personnel and their security.

I welcome the administration's efforts to forge a lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. This legislation provides economic, humanitarian, and security assistance to the West Bank and Gaza to encourage stability and political moderation. It ensures that Hamas and other terrorist organizations do not receive taxpayer funds and that a potential unity government and all its ministers publicly recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce violence, and adhere to past agreements before receiving U.S. assistance.

H.R. 2346 also provides $470 million to help Mexico fight violent narcotraffickers with surveillance aircraft, helicopters, and law enforcement equipment, and to support rule of law programs, bringing to $1.17 billion the total appropriated in 2008 and 2009 for these purposes.

The bill meets the President's request for assistance programs and diplomatic operations in Iraq to ensure a smooth transition from the military mission to a civilian-led effort.

In addition, the bill addresses significant humanitarian and development priorities by providing $343 million for refugee programs to address the growing displacement of civilians in Pakistan and other countries; $836.9 million for peacekeeping; $300 million for countries impacted by the global financial crisis, including Haiti and Liberia; and $100 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental does many good things for our troops. It provides needed equipment and services so our men and women in uniform can carry out the will of this Nation, and hopefully and prayerfully, will help them to come home safely to their families. But it does present a hole in the safety for this Nation.

After October 1, hardened terrorists can come to America and eventually can be released to our streets. If they do come to America, where are we going to take them? Earlier in the discussion on the rule, the gentleman from Colorado mentioned that they could go to Fort Leavenworth. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been to Fort Leavenworth to inspect the facilities. It is the premier training base for the United States Army. We invite many troops from other countries to come to America to Fort Leavenworth to train, to become allies, to learn how to work together to keep this country safe. Bringing these terrorists to Fort Leavenworth would actually prevent that from happening in the future. Some nations would not send their troops to America because of it. So Fort Leavenworth should not be a selected base for that purpose.

Neither do they have the facilities in the prison to house these terrorists. One of the things that was designed in the Guantanamo Bay facility is to separate the leaders from the foot soldiers because they stir up the foot soldiers should they be connected either verbally, visually, or in any method of communication. So that is prevented in Guantanamo Bay. It is created for that purpose. We've even created and built the most modern court facility so that these hardened terrorists should never have to set foot on American soil.

Now, when we have people in our own court system that we know are sexual predators, we warn people in the neighborhood to protect their children from these known sexual predators. But in this legislation, we have no notice when a hardened terrorist is going to be released on American soil, and we do know that 30 of these terrorists have been slated for release.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California.

We have a policy in America that if a terrorist is going to be returned to their country of origin and that country of origin is going to either torture or terminate them, we won't send them back. That's the problem we have with terrorists known as Uyghurs, terrorists of Turkish descent that are Chinese. So they are going to be released where? Back to the streets of America. This bill does not prevent that. We had legislation that would have given us that opportunity for an up-or-down vote, but it was denied by the Democrats in the majority.

Americans want to have a voice in this. Do we want terrorists on American soil or not? I say ''no.'' I want them on no Main Street in any city or town in America, but I was denied the opportunity to have that vote.

I think that even though this bill does many good things, we should remember that before October 1 we need to have a clear up-or-down vote in this Chamber on whether or not we want to allow known hardened terrorists to be released on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, in the bill itself we have a list of the top 10 toughest terrorists that are housed in the Guantanamo Bay facility on page 112.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Labor-HHS Education Subcommittee, Mr. OBEY.

As we prepare to enhance our pandemic planning efforts through the supplemental funding bill before us today, I appreciate the committee providing additional funding to State and local governments that have been hit hard by the economic downturn. I am also pleased that we are taking a comprehensive approach to pandemic preparedness.

In an article in this week's National Journal, Donald Thompson, the senior program director for the medical and public health program at the Center for Infrastructure Protection at George Mason University's School of Law, noted that the U.S. has done a poor job of making sure it has enough equipment to tackle a full-blown pandemic. Currently, our national stockpile contains 104 million respirators, 51.6 million surgical masks, but only 20 million syringes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of your subcommittee to verify that this funding bill allows HHS to purchase, replenish, and expand the Nation's delivery devices stockpile.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say that public health at all levels must continue to respond to this current outbreak and the increasing number of U.S. and worldwide cases, but also prepare for the potential of increased severity or for a new, novel strain to emerge. This bill will give HHS the funds needed to develop and purchase vaccines and replenish and expand Federal and State stockpiles of antiviral drugs and other necessary medical supplies, such as masks, ventilators, delivery devices, and other items.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of our committee.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this supplemental, and, frankly, I want to congratulate the majority on the legislation. I am particularly pleased with the military portion that was worked out in negotiations between Mr. MURTHA and Mr. YOUNG. The extra dollars that were provided beyond what the administration requests I think were wise expenditures.

I certainly don't agree with everything in the bill and have my differences over process, both in the committee and more profoundly, frankly, on this floor, where I wish we had the

amendments available that my friend, Mr. TIAHRT, mentioned. But, by and large, it's a great bill and, frankly, it deserves our support.

I think we ought to stop for a minute, Mr. Speaker, and recognize the significance of the vote that we are about to take. With the passage of this proposal, President Obama, in my mind at least, effectively becomes a war President. In his campaign, he said that Afghanistan was the central front in the war on terror, and he also said, if necessary, he would move into other countries to pursue al Qaeda. Since he has been elected, I think he has actually put those views into effect in this legislation and in other actions. He has chosen a new commander; he has increased the size of our forces in Afghanistan dramatically; he has begun a civilian surge, which alters in some ways, and I think appropriately, the nature of our mission; he has requested additional forces from European countries; and, frankly, he has made it clear that he is expanding activity into Pakistan.

This is a major commitment. It's not a commitment that will be over in a year. Frankly, I suspect President Obama will be dealing with this issue throughout his Presidency, whether he's a one- or two-term President. As long as he continues to operate in this capacity, frankly, I think he deserves bipartisan support. I think a war President deserves bipartisan support from Congress. He will certainly have it from me as long as he is consistent with the principles he has laid out and operates under the advice, although reserving the final decision to himself, of the commanders on the ground.

So it's a good piece of legislation and it deserves to be passed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is Military Appreciation Month, so it is appropriate that on the floor of this House earlier this week Members of Congress stood up and showed their support with their words for our troops. Today, we can do something even more important; we can support our military troops and their families with our deeds. That is exactly what the $3.2 billion in military construction in this bill does in four ways.

First, it includes $488 million, the same as the President's request, for five wounded warrior complexes for the Army and two complexes for the Marine Corps. These facilities support many of our most severely wounded combat troops and their families through their important recovery and healing process.

Second, this bill includes $276 million, also the same as the President's request, for 25 child development centers at Department of Defense installations.

□ 1445

These funds will provide additional child care for 5,000 military children, a high priority for our military families, especially with so many parents serving our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Third, the bill adds an additional $1 billion for Department of Defense hospital construction. Why? Because many of our military hospitals are riddled with aging inadequate structures that do not meet current standards for medical care. This is unacceptable in time of peace and unconscionable in time of war.

No Member of this Congress, no Member of the Senate, no citizen of America should want to see a return to the Walter Reed Annex 18 of several years ago when Army soldiers had to live in such deplorable conditions.

The funds in this bill would bring our total investment in military hospitals over the past year to $3.3 billion. This House will initiate the funding to modernize our DOD hospital for our troops.

Fourth, this bill includes more funds for troop housing in Afghanistan. The President's request for projects in the CENTCOM area of responsibility total $876 million, including $84 million to partially fund the foundation and utility work needed to house additional U.S. troops going to Afghanistan. This bill supports 98 percent of the request and includes an additional $214 million to fully fund the troop housing requirement in Afghanistan.

Finally I'd mention that this bill includes $263 million, the same as the President's request, once again, to accelerate and enhance the construction of new DOD hospitals in Bethesda and Fort Belvoir to replace the aging Walter Reed.

By voting for this bill, we can support our troops and their families with our deeds, not just our words. I urge our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the supplemental funding bill that will provide the men and women of our Armed Forces with the resources that they need to do the job. Unfortunately this bill will not just fund operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. It seems to me as if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle never miss an opportunity to use the military to pack a bill with pork.

Under the pretext of funding operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, this bill is loaded with billions of dollars worth of spending that simply does not belong there. It is obvious to me that these programs do not directly impact the ability of our servicemembers to do their job. They are priorities of the majority that should be voted on separately based on their own merits.

We have a lot of questions about the Guantanamo detainees. Will they end up in Leavenworth, as the gentleman from Kansas mentioned? Will they end up in the largest Federal prison in the United States, which happens to be in my district? Let me tell you, I think Americans need to know the answer to that.

Despite the political games that my colleagues are playing, I will support this legislation because I support our troops and believe it's our responsibility to give them the tools that they need.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I urge my colleagues to support this supplemental appropriations bill, and I appreciate the bipartisan support that this bill has received. It makes vital investments in the needs of our troops, responsible policy abroad and security at home.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY and his staff for their hard work in putting this legislation together. The supplemental supports our troops, who are in harm's way, and honors their service when they return home. $1.2 billion for health and support programs for military families, $734 million to compensate servicemembers and veterans for every month their service was extended by stop-loss orders.

The supplemental also makes important commitments to our national security. It follows through on President Obama's commitment to remove all combat troops from Iraq by 2010, and it refocuses our attention on Afghanistan and Pakistan, which remain havens for terrorists seeking to destabilize the region and harm Americans.

American military involvement is an important part of our effort for a stable Afghanistan that no longer harbors terrorists. That effort also includes training Afghan security forces, police development work and a diplomatic surge.

Of the $5.1 billion that this supplemental dedicates to Afghanistan, $3.6 billion is intended for local security forces, a critical component of our objective; $980 million is for efforts to strengthen the economy and the rule of law; and $536 million is for civilian diplomacy. We've also come to understand, as President Obama has repeatedly stressed, that the stability of Afghanistan is intimately tied to the stability of Pakistan, which is under threat from insurgent Taliban.

I believe that this supplemental will help reduce that threat through comprehensive funding for counterinsurgency development and diplomacy programs in Pakistan.

But it is also essential that the Afghanistan and Pakistan governments hold up their end of the bargain. That is why this legislation requires the President to report to Congress by February of next year on the progress of

those governments in five key areas: The level of political consensus to the level of corruption, steps to eliminate it, success in counterinsurgency, cooperation of their intelligence service with our country, and the government's ability to control their own territory.

All of these are critical information points for us to have. This information will be essential to ensuring that our policy remains realistic and wise and we hope successful in this critical region of the world.

Finally, the supplemental makes a number of other important investments in our security. These include funding for pandemic flu preparedness and vaccine stockpiles, the importance of which have been dramatically demonstrated in the past weeks; funding to address violence along the U.S.-Mexico border, a priority I strongly support and observed the need for when I was in Mexico last month; and funding for important international food, refugee and disaster assistance.

I would comment briefly on the issue with reference to Guantanamo. First of all, this does not provide for the release of anybody from Guantanamo. Secondly, the President has widely said, We need a plan for Guantanamo, and is pursuing that. This language provides for that planning process to go forward. Thirdly, I would observe that almost none of those held at Guantanamo have used that courtroom, to which Mr. TIAHRT referred. That is to say, there hasn't been a finding in these cases. There ought to be findings. But in any event, I agree absolutely, and I think everybody on this floor agrees that anybody who is a terrorist ought not be released anywhere. We will have to decide how to resolve this issue. It's a thorny one.

I might observe that the former Secretary of State, Colin Powell, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former national security adviser to the first President Bush, observed that he thought Guantanamo ought to be closed on national television over a year ago and he said, Today, if not yesterday.

Now having said that, this President is pursuing I think a very thoughtful effort to see how that goal can be accomplished. It's a difficult one, but we need to work with him in accomplishing that objective.

I thank the chairman for his work. I thank the Chair and ranking member, Mr. MURTHA and Mr. YOUNG, of the Defense Subcommittee for the work that they've done on this to ensure that our troops have what they need to prosecute the policies of this country and to keep our citizens and the Nation safe.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the smartest things that the President did once elected and all the campaign rhetoric was out of the way, he went ahead and continued the Bush-Cheney policy in the Middle East, primarily by reappointing Secretary of Defense Gates and recognizing that the surge, in fact, worked, basically kept the plans for Iraq and Afghanistan on track, including a new surge in Afghanistan.

There was one sharp deviation from the Bush doctrine that Mr. Obama did not choose to follow, and that was his idea of closing Guantanamo even though the Guantanamo prison has proved to be effective. And we had lots of testimony from people who are in the military and security that these very bad actors need to stay in an island off continental America. That's why we Republicans in committee offered the Wolf amendment that says that if you're going to transfer the Guantanamo prisoners, that we should have the Nation's governors approve the transfers to their States before it happens.

Also that a threat assessment should be done. Now to their credit, the majority party did put in some language that says the President shall submit to Congress in writing a comprehensive plan before October 1, and we're happy about that. But what this plan does not do, it does not require a risk assessment.

Releasing the detainees to American soils could cause problems, and we would also like to see the security assessment include what its impact could be on the safety of American citizens. Also it does not require notification to Congress, governors, State legislators or local communities. We believe that much courtesy should be done. And it does not require the consent of the State governor.

Why is that important? It's interesting to note that when the President was recently in Europe, trying to ask them to take some of the Guantanamo prisoners, they all declined. All the European, all the EU countries want us to close it, but they won't take any of these prisoners. What does that say?

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

We are in agreement on three things that we want to accomplish: We want to win the war against violent extremism, we want to punish those people who are responsible for harming or intending to harm Americans, and we want to make all Americans as safe and secure as possible.

Now, we are engaged in a long war. It is a war against violent extremism, but it will continue forever unless we understand the elements that the enemy is using against us because it's not a war that will lend itself to any military victory.

In fact, our most effective weapon is to simply be true to the values and principles that define who we are as a Nation. And the most lethal weapon that the enemy has in its possession is to point out those instances where we have not been true to our values and principles, where we have been hypocritical, where we have yielded to fear of the unknown, where we have appealed to the most basic instincts. We are a better nation than that.

That's why Guantanamo is important, because there are a limitless number of young impressionable men who, in fact, will be recruited by the enemy for generations to come if we don't stand up and show that we are true to our principles.

Initially in the first few years of the Afghan war, 772 people were rounded up, very few by American forces. They were turned over by tribal chieftains for bounties, $5,000, sometimes less. We took them and put them in Guantanamo because we didn't know what to do with them. We interrogated virtually all of them to see what they might know, whether or not we knew that they had been involved in any hostile action against the United States. And, in fact, 85 percent of them we know were not involved in any hostile action against the United States.

Now we are faced with a decision. Do we move forward with a policy that is obviously causing us to lose ground in this war against violent extremism? Or do we change course? And what we are urging—not in this bill because this bill simply requires us to put together a plan.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. The fact is that Guantanamo is not the punitive place that it used to be, but it does not serve our purposes to keep it open.

We have courts of justice. If people have committed harm against the United States, they need to be prosecuted. They need to be punished. It's not going to work if we try to do that at Guantanamo. And those who we don't have evidence against are going to have to eventually be released.

□ 1500

Now, you know this really is about seizing and holding the moral high ground. And it is about who we are as Americans. That is the only way we win this war against violent extremism.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire the time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 13 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Simon and Garfunkel have a song that they sang in Central Park called ''The Boxer.'' And in it, it says ''Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.'' To a certain extent, the Congress is

just hearing what it wants to hear and disregarding the rest. Eric Holder and the Justice Department was ready to release into our neighborhoods some of these people almost 2 weeks ago. I first wrote the Attorney General on March 13, 2 months ago, to ask a series of questions. And I share what my friend from Virginia said. We are shutting down Guantanamo. That is not the issue that you are dealing with here. You are dealing with what are you going to do and what plan do you have as you shut it down.

On April 23 I wrote a second letter to Eric Holder of the Justice Department asking some other questions, just asking, what is your plan? How are you going to deal with the holding of it? What metropolitan areas will it be? I raised a number of concerns. And, again, no response. The other day we did another letter, the third letter. And when we were in the committee, some of the Members didn't know and said they could be removed and they could not be removed until they checked with the Congress, and that was not the case because Eric Holder was ready to move them out without making a report. What type of security will they go to? Let's just get a report.

This administration needs to be upfront with the Congress. And if the Congress doesn't have this desire to know, then at least they ought to be upfront with the American people because I think the American people know. Do all the Members of Congress know the State Department listed the ETIM, which the Uyghurs are a part of, as a terrorist organization in 2002, the same year the embassy in Beijing indicated ETIM planned an attack on the U.S. embassy in Kazakhstan? Do all the Members know that this group's militants fought alongside al Qaeda and Taliban in Afghanistan? Does the Congress know that a month ago the Obama Treasury Department, to its credit, targeted al Qaeda support network by designating Abdul Haq, the overall leader and commander of the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Party, as a terrorist?

Does the Congress know and should the American people know that Abdul Haq raised funds and recruited new members to further the terrorists' activities? Does anyone know that in 2005, Haq was put on the Sharia Council for al Qaeda? Does anyone know that in early January '08, Haq directed that this group commander attack various Chinese cities, particularly the Olympics? Frankly, I was disappointed that President Bush went to the Olympics. But there were a lot of American citizens there.

So we are asking questions before they do this. And sometimes I think some people are trying to say that it is not about closing Guantanamo Bay or not. Guantanamo Bay, whether you like it or not, is going to be closed. What we are talking about is how do you dispose of and what do you do to the detainees?

And, frankly, this Congress sometimes—we now sit on interrogation memos. No one wants to say that they knew anything. Well, the Congress ought to know everything. If you have the oversight responsibility, you ought to be willing to have it and hold it. So that is what we are saying, nothing more. And I appreciate Mr. OBEY adding some good things in there. I want to pay tribute that he has. And I appreciate it. But I was foreclosed in the committee. And I thought we would have a unanimous bipartisan vote, and we were shut out. So we are just asking.

Three letters, Eric Holder says, ''O, I will not answer the letters. And, lastly, no FBI agent was able to come to my office, or I understand other offices up here on the Hill, to give them a briefing. As I said earlier, that if Attorney General Ashcroft——

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOLF. If Attorney General Ashcroft had prohibited FBI agents from coming to the Hill to speak to Senator LEAHY, you would have heard about it on both sides of the Hill, on both sides of the aisle. And you should have heard about it. We are saying that before they move them, before they close it, we want to see a plan.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, among others, dairy farmers are facing an enormous crisis. And there is some possibility that the Senate may add in the supplemental some money for the milk program. And my request is that you would take that into consideration as best you can.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say that, representing a lot of dairy farmers myself, and being a former cosponsor of the milk program, I obviously would like to see additional help provided to them. The Appropriations Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction. So we would need to work out something with the White House and the proper authorizing committee. But we are open to any reasonable suggestions.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate your efforts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Republican conference chairman, MIKE PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding. I rise today in support of the military funding in H.R. 2346, the fiscal year 2009 war supplemental appropriations bill, which will provide nearly $85 billion to support our men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, those that every day make the sacrifices necessary to ensure our freedom and that of our posterity.

Overall this legislation does reflect a bipartisan effort to provide necessary war funding and essential support for our men and women in uniform. I am particularly pleased that it does so without arbitrary benchmarks and timetables for withdrawal that had been so much the debate of war supplementals in recent years in this Congress. I'm also pleased that none of the funding requested by the administration related to Guantanamo Bay has been included.

And I take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of this committee for his judgment and discretion in leaving out any funding for the purpose of closing Guantanamo Bay. President Obama was simply wrong to announce plans to close Guantanamo Bay without any plan for what to do with the dangerous terrorist detainees who remain there to this day. The American people deserve to know that this Congress and this government are putting their safety and their interests above world opinion in decisions about terrorist detainees. And this legislation, in failing to provide any funding for closing Guantanamo Bay, puts the interests and the security of the American people first.

I do regret that the amendment authored by the gentleman from Virginia who just spoke, Mr. WOLF, was not included in this legislation, an amendment that would have prohibited the transfer of any terrorist detainee within the next calendar year. And I hope for additional language in the conference report.

Now, while I support this war funding bill, let me say on the floor of this Congress, I believe a war supplemental bill ought to be about war funding and war funding alone. It should not include the literally billions of dollars in nondefense-related spending.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any particular objection to Congress considering and debating spending money on international food assistance or the State Department or the staff at the NSC or wildfire or avian flu or police radios. But what are they doing in a war supplemental bill? At a time when Washington D.C. appears to most Americans to be a gusher of red ink, runaway Federal spending, stimulus bills, omnibus bills, and this Congress passed a budget that will double our national debt in 5 years and triple it in 10, we can't even seem to bring a war supplemental bill that just funds the needs of our soldiers in harm's way. I believe we can do better.

I will support this bill because I support our troops. But I will continue to call for this Congress to do a service to those heroes and future generations by practicing fiscal discipline.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have only one remaining speaker, myself. And I have the right to close. I would suggest the gentleman go through his speakers.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker besides myself. I yield 1 minute to the

gentleman from California, the gentleman who knows more about Afghanistan, I believe, than any other Member of the House, Mr. ROHRABACHER.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2346, but I do so reluctantly. I am reluctant because as someone who has spent the last 30 years studying Afghanistan and having been in and out of that country and being someone who has studied the current administration's plan, I am sorry to say that the current administration's plan will not work. It is doomed to failure.

Thus we are here allocating money, supplemental money, for our troops to send them overseas, but we are not backing them up with a political plan, a structure for Afghanistan that will work, that is consistent with the customs of the people of Afghanistan. Also their plan does not focus on drug eradication and how we are going to eliminate the problem in Afghanistan. How will our people succeed without the drug eradication problem that we know, the alternative that exists, that is being ignored? No. We are sending our people over. They deserve our support financially. But we should get together and work with the administration to reform their plan because it will not work.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I neglected the fact that I have one more speaker besides Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) 1 minute.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the President initially received praise for signing an executive order to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay. Unfortunately, this decision was not accompanied by a comprehensive plan to relocate the detainees after the closure. I have not found many folks either at home in Kansas nor here in Washington who would be happy to welcome the detainees as their neighbors. One place I am particularly convinced they should not be located is the disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Little known to many outside of the military and those of us from eastern Kansas is the fact that Fort Leavenworth is home to the Command and General Staff College, a 115-year-old program at the fort that has trained more than 7,200 officers, including Generals Eisenhower, Marshall, McCarthy, MacArthur, Bradley, Arnold, Powell and Petraeus.

The CGSC not only trains our military leaders, but each year students from nations around the world study there. If suspected terrorists are held at Fort Leavenworth, out of protest or out of safety concerns, many of our allies would stop sending their military officers to train there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as we close down this discussion, I want to take just a moment to, one more time, express both the chairman's and my deep appreciation for the very fine work that is done by our staff on both sides of the aisle, especially in this case, the defense subcommittee staff, but beyond that the leadership of the staff from the full committee as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have all noticed by way of the media in the last several weeks that it is one thing to kind of wallow in rhetoric of the campaign trail when one is running for national office. It is an entirely different thing when you are elected President of the United States and then have to implement the policies that some of that rhetoric may affect. The recent discussion regarding intelligence, secure papers, should they be revealed or made public or not made public, is evidence that the President, our President Obama, is learning that reality very quickly.

In the Guantanamo circumstance, the rhetoric said, We should close Guantanamo. I would suggest that as the President moves forward and really learns about these people who are largely trained by al Qaeda, who are committed to jihad and the destruction of our way of life, long before a plan comes forward, I'm sure the rhetoric will be considerably different, or the implementation will be considerably different than the rhetoric. From there, this bill is a bill that reflects largely funding for our national defense, great work done between both sides of the aisle regarding the needs of our military. Because of that, this bill must go to the President's desk. And I urge our Members to give an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old story about a second baseman for the old New York Giants, Eddie Stanky. Leo Durocher was the manager of the club. And during spring training, Durocher was hitting ground balls to the infield, and Stanky dropped two in a row. And so Durocher said, Kid, give me the glove. I will show you how it is done. So he went out to second base, and the very first ball hit to him Durocher dropped. And he turned to Stanky and said, Hey, kid, you got second base so screwed up, nobody can play. That is pretty much the situation that we face with respect to Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1515

And this bill spends $97 billion because we're in a mess. After 9/11, the Bush administration went after al Qaeda hiding in Afghanistan. That was a perfectly understandable response. They hit us and we tried to hit them back. But then the administration diverted their attention and their resources to a tragically wrong-headed war in Iraq, a country with no connection to 9/11.

Seven years later, 33,000 American casualties later, more than 4,000 American deaths later, we now have a new President who has a commitment to try to end American combat in Iraq. He's also confronted with the mess in Afghanistan, which is made much worse because of the diversion of attention that should have been focused on that country over the past 7 years. And that job is made even more difficult because of the impact of events in Pakistan on Afghanistan.

Now, the President cannot wave a magic wand and end that war. He has inherited what I consider to be the worst foreign policy mess from his predecessor in the history of the country, a three-country regional mess. Now, he has decided that he will try to refashion our efforts in Afghanistan to give us a better chance to stabilize the situation. I hope I'm wrong, but I am forced to say that I significantly agree with the gentleman from California. I have a profound doubt that he can succeed, not because of any problem with his policy but because I am dubious that there are the tools available in that region for us to succeed using any policy. The tools we have to rely on for want of any others are the Government of Pakistan and the Government of Afghanistan. And I feel that they are both hugely unreliable reeds to lean upon, which is why I think that in that region we are unfortunately in an Eddie Stanky situation, because those governments are corrupt, they are weak, they are chaotic, they appear to lack the focus and cohesion and effectiveness to turn the countries around.

Nonetheless, it's clear to me that there is a consensus to try to do something to stabilize the situation. If we're going to go down that road, I want the President to get everything that he asked for and then some to maximize his chances for success. And that is what this bill does. I frankly have very little faith that it will work.

I came here in 1969, 3 months after Richard Nixon became President. I was vehemently opposed to the Vietnam War. But Nixon correctly pointed out that he had inherited that war from his Democratic predecessor, Lyndon Johnson. And so I thought, well, it's reasonable for him to ask for some measure of time to see whether he could move the policy forward. So I decided to give him a year before I started speaking out against the war, and that's what I did. I'm pretty much in the same situation today, and that's why this bill contains the following language.

It says: ''Because the stability and security of the region is tied more to the capacity and conduct of the Afghan and Pakistani Governments and to the resolve of both societies than it is to the policies of the United States, the President shall submit a report to Congress not later than the date of submission of the fiscal year 2011 budget, assessing whether the Governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan are, or are not, demonstrating the necessary commitment, capability, conduct, and unity of purpose to warrant the continuation of the President's policy. The President, on the basis of information gathered and coordinated by the NSC, shall advise the Congress on how the

assessment requires, or does not require, changes to that policy. The measures used to evaluate the Afghan and Pakistani Governments' record of concrete performance shall include the following standards of performance:

''Number one, level of political consensus and unity of purpose across ethnic, tribal, religious, and party affiliations to confront the political and security challenges facing the region.

''Two, level of government corruption and action taken to eliminate it.

''Three, performance of the respective security forces in developing a counterinsurgency capability, conducting counterinsurgency operations, and establishing population security.

''Four, performance of the respective intelligence agencies in cooperating with the United States on counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations and in purging themselves of policies, programs, and personnel that provide material support to extremist networks that target U.S. troops or undermine U.S. objectives in the region.

''Five, ability of the Afghan and Pakistani Governments to effectively control the territory within their respective borders.''

So there are no deadlines, no conditions, no timelines. But there are very clear measurements against which we should be able to judge the performance of the Afghanistan and Pakistani Governments. I believe that if this policy fails, it will not fail because of any lack of imagination or effort on the part of this administration.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

If that policy fails, in my judgment it will fail because of the failure of the two governments in the region to do what's necessary to save their own countries.

I hope I can come here a year from now when we are evaluating the President's policy and evaluating the performance of those two governments. I hope I can say my judgment was wrong, these countries have performed far better than we expected. But only time will tell. I think we have no choice but to give the President a shot. It's a miserable situation that he has inherited, and he does not have a good hand to play.

Having said that, I also want to note that, in addition to dealing with this problem, we deal with a number of other problems in this bill. We deal, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) indicated, with the need to renew our ability to provide farm loans. We deal with the need for additional food aid around the world. We deal with the need to add $500 million to the President's request to deal with the pandemic flu problem that could be facing us. We've had over 11,000 layoffs of public health officials at the State and local level, and that is not going to stand us in good stead if we have to deal with the flu pandemic, so we're trying to fill those holes.

So let me simply close, Mr. Speaker, by saying this is a bill that I have very little confidence in, but I have a responsibility as committee chairman to move the process forward. I think we have a responsibility to give the new President, who did not get us into this mess, the best possible opportunity to get us out of it. So that's what this bill attempts to do. I make no apology for it. I urge support for it.

I want to thank the staff especially for their work, especially led by Beverly Pheto of the central office and the staff members on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the hard work done by the Appropriation subcommittee Chairs and ranking members and other members of the committee as well. I appreciate the frustration of each and every Member of this House.

This is a no-win bill no matter how you vote on it. It's a mess. And let's hope that with God's help we can get out of it in a reasonably decent time.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, this past November 2008, the American people made a decisive choice to change the course of American policy. We wanted change. We asked for change. And that's what we got. Today we vote to set in motion further change in the conduct of our foreign and national security policy. H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009, asks us to make some tough choices to achieve that change.

President Barack Obama is prepared to make the tough choices. I believe we must step up to the plate and do the same by voting for H.R. 2346. It is the right choice to responsibly redeploy our troops from Iraq, to secure and stabilize Afghanistan and Pakistan, and to aggressively pursue every avenue of diplomacy to secure international support and cooperation for new policies that will lead to lasting security and prosperity for every corner of the world.

Some might question aspects of the President's strategy. Some might think we can move faster, farther, or smarter. That could be right. But in its totality, this proposal is far-reaching yet pragmatic about the facts we face on the ground in today's global hot spots.

In addition to funding for military operations, this measure includes a number of important policy provisions and support for the tools of ''soft power'' that will save lives. It is high time that we make real investments in American diplomacy—investments that put men and women in suits on the frontline before placing our men and women in uniform in harm's way. The Supplemental Appropriations Act extends the prohibition on construction of permanent military bases or installations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The President will be required to provide Congress with a detailed plan to close the detention facility at Guantanomo Bay. And this legislation will compensate our troops who have had their service compulsorily extended.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, I am troubled by the Iraqis' lack of progress in taking control of their security and economy. I am concerned about how we will navigate the treacherous waters of Afghanistan and now Pakistan. I firmly believe our government and our military must have a coherent exit strategy in the region. Yet I see in this legislation the elements of a long-term strategy to change the course of affairs in a challenging part of the world where we cannot go AWOL.

These are tough times filled with tough choices. But, today, the world believes we are ready to lead. Let us support the President. Give him a chance to take our country in a new direction. Let us pass the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reluctantly support the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009, H.R. 2346.

A lot has changed since we last voted on supplemental spending bills for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American people have spoken and we have elected a new President who has promised to end the conflict in Iraq. The President ordered a full review of our military policy and announced a firm date for the removal of combat troops from Iraq—August 2010. It is not as early as I would have liked, but he has announced that the end is in sight and he will draw that conflict to a close. This bill is consistent with that plan to safely redeploy our troops out of Iraq.

I am, however, deeply concerned about our plans for Afghanistan. Immediately following the attacks of September 11, 2001, I fully supported the initial war in Afghanistan. I support our efforts to destroy terrorist training camps and to pursue and defeat Al-Qaeda wherever it may be. I support providing the military equipment and support to our troops that they need to ensure their safety.

I am more concerned, frankly, with the problem of mission creep. It is one thing to seek to ensure that Al-Qaeda cannot use sanctuaries in Afghanistan to plan attacks on the United States. It is quite another to seek to remake Afghanistan. I doubt very much that we will be able to eradicate their poppy crops, end corruption, and ensure equal rights for all in Afghanistan. Nor is it our job to remake Afghanistan.

I am voting for this bill today, because it provides the funds for an orderly withdrawal from Iraq to an Administration I trust to arrange such an orderly withdrawal as soon as possible. It also supplies funds for aid to Israel, for combating HIV/AIDS, for combating the swine flu, and for many other worthwhile projects. But I want to be clear. I will not support an open-ended long term commitment in Afghanistan. I am concerned that the goals may very well be too ambitious, too vague, and too costly—in lives and treasure—for our country. I will continue to monitor the situation closely, and I will oppose funding for unrealistic mission creep.

I do not take these votes lightly, and these votes do not occur in a vacuum. As circumstances both on the ground and, quite frankly, within the United States government change, each vote for military funding must be considered on its own merits. At this point, with a new Administration here in the United States and with the situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan particularly dire, I have decided to vote in favor of the Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS for their leadership in bringing this important and timely legislation to the floor. H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act establishes funding levels for defense, international affairs, and influenza preparedness, and also addresses a number of key issues, including conditions on aid to Pakistan, assistance to North Korea, and the status of President Obama's plans to shut down

the Guantanamo Bay prison. The Administration requested a net total of $83.4 billion in additional supplemental appropriations for FY2009, comprised of $86.8 billion in new appropriations, offset by $3.4 billion of recessions of previously appropriated funds. H.R. 2346 increases the Administration's request by over $11.8 billion for a total of $96.7 billion. It includes:

Defense. Providing a total of $84.3 billion for the Department of Defense, including military construction, an increase of $8.5 billion to the request of $75.8 billion (net of offsetting rescissions).

International affairs. Providing a total of $9.4 billion for international affairs programs (including P.L. 480 food assistance), an increase of $2.4 billion compared to the request.

Influenza preparedness. Providing $2.05 billion for influenza preparedness, an increase of $550 million over the $1.5 billion requested. Of the total in the bill, $1.85 billion is for the Department of Health and Human Services and the Center for Disease Control & Prevention to supplement federal stockpiles, develop and purchase vaccines, and to expand detection efforts. It includes $350 million in unrequested funds to assist state and local governments in preparing for and responding to a pandemic; and $200 million also unrequested, to support global efforts to track, contain, and slow the spread of a pandemic in the foreign affairs budget for Global Health and Child Survival.

Mr. Speaker as you know, Texas was hit especially hard by the H1N1 virus. The only two deaths from complications with the virus were in Texas, the first—a toddler visiting my district.

North Korea. Rejects a request for $34.5 million in Department of Energy non-proliferation funds to dismantle nuclear facilities in North Korea and rejects $95 million requested for energy assistance to North Korea in the foreign assistance accounts.

Aid to Pakistan. Provides $400 million to the Department of Defense, as requested, for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund to finance training and other assistance to the Pakistani military. The Chairman's mark of the bill originally transferred the funds to the Department of State, but Representative OBEY offered a manager's amendment at the beginning of the committee markup that restored the funds to the Department of Defense. In the foreign assistance portion of the bill, $897 million, ($91 million above the request), is provided for construction of facilities and for diplomatic operations in Pakistan and $529 million of economic assistance.

Conditions on assistance to Pakistan and Afghanistan. Administration officials strongly objected to legislated benchmarks on the performance of the Pakistani government, arguing that conditions on aid would not improve U.S. leverage but would more likely foster resistance to U.S. efforts. Instead of setting benchmarks tied to funding, the Committee included a requirement that the President submit a report to Congress no later than February 2010, when the FY2011 budget is submitted, evaluating the conduct and commitment of the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan. The report is to include assessments of each nation's level of political commitment to confront security challenges; level of corruption and efforts to counter it; performance of security forces in counterinsurgency operations and in establishing population security; intelligence cooperation with the United States; and the ability to effectively control its territories.

Closure of the Guantanamo Bay Prison. The Committee did not authorize the Administration request for $50 million for the Department of Defense to transfer prisoners out of the Guantanamo Bay facility nor did it seek to appropriate the $30 million requested for the Department of Justice to create a task force to facilitate legal activities associated with the closure.

Border security and counternarcotics assistance to Mexico. Approving $350 million requested for the Department of Defense for counternarcotics activities on the Mexican border, including up to $100 million for transfer to other federal agencies. In the foreign aid chapters of the bill, $160 million is provided for Mexico in the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account. This bill will also add $310 million for Mexico in the Foreign Military Financing Program for surveillance planes, helicopters, other equipment, and support activities.

These are truly efforts that the people in my district are dealing with each and every day. As a Subcommittee Chair on the Homeland Security Committee, I am working daily to ensure that we address the violence spilling over from Mexico by coordinating law enforcement efforts and working with our Border Patrol personnel.

PAKISTAN

I have been to Pakistan many times. My belief in this country and its relationship with the United States drove me to co-chair the Pakistan Caucus. This year alone, I have participated in two Congressional Delegation Trips to Pakistan, and I am very passionate about diplomatic relations between our two countries.

Recently we have focused on the internal conflicts in Pakistan; yet we must not forget the external issues affecting the region as a whole and the need for stabilization.

Over the years, our assistance to Pakistan has fluctuated with political events, sending mixed messages and leading most Pakistanis to question both our intentions and our staying power. Today, many Pakistanis believe the United States will cut and run when it serves our purpose, a belief which undermines our long-term efforts to defeat extremists, foster democratic change, support transparency, and assist institutions that promote security and stability in Pakistan.

However, the status quo is not working; while many in the United States believe we are paying too much and getting too little—most Pakistanis believe exactly the opposite. Without changing this baseline, I must agree with the Administration; that there is little likelihood of drying up popular tolerance for anti-U.S. terrorist groups or persuading Pakistani leaders to devote the political capital necessary to deny such groups sanctuary and covert material support. We must continue to support Pakistan if we want a stable Middle East and an end to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

MILITARY AND STOP-LOSS

Finally, Mr. Speaker I want to touch on an issue that is affecting many military men and women in my district and in the nearby community that houses Fort Hood. The largest active duty armored post in the United States, and is the only post in the United States that is capable of supporting two full armored divisions. This bill seeks to appropriate $734 million in unrequested funds for additional pay for more than 170,000 servicemembers who have had their enlistments involuntarily extended since Sept. 11, 2001.

This total allows for payments of $500 per month for every month servicemembers were held on active duty under ''stop-loss'' orders. As you know, stop-loss is a practice that has prevented tens of thousands of our active-duty military servicemembers, and reservists from leaving military service on time if they were scheduled to deploy to Iraq or Afghanistan. More than 13,000 soldiers remain unable to exit the military under the policy, known as stop-loss, which was put in effect after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and then expanded in 2004 as the Army struggled to sustain two large war efforts.

Some 120,000 soldiers have been affected by stop-loss in its various forms since 2001. Even Secretary Gates said that stop-loss ''amounted to breaking faith with those in uniform.'' Secretary Gates recently announced a timetable that would cut in half by June 2010 the number of troops affected by stop-loss, with the practice all but eliminated by March 2011. I applaud his efforts and those made by Congressman MURTHA and Chairman OBEY with H.R. 2346.

For the number of troops affected by stop-loss increased sharply under the troop increase for Iraq that President George W. Bush ordered in early 2007. According to Pentagon statistics, 13,200 people are now under stop-loss orders: 4,458 in the Army National Guard, 1,452 in the Army Reserve and the rest from the active component.

At its core, the stop-loss policy meant that all troops headed to Iraq and Afghanistan would remain in service throughout their unit's deployment—even if the time on an individual soldier's enlistment contract expired before the deployment ended. The Army has said the rule was required not just to sustain the numbers necessary to carry out two wars, but also to maintain continuity in leadership and cohesion within units that trained for and then were deploying to war.

This policy has been abused for far too long, and like the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—it must end soon. It is a strain on our troops and their families.

I urge my colleagues to think of these reasons along with the many others as they cast their votes today. We must support those that wish to serve, are currently serving, and have served our great Nation. This supplemental appropriation will do just that.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill, albeit very reluctantly.

This supplemental appropriations bill contains a number of provisions I'm pleased to support. This bill provides long-overdue retroactive ''stop loss'' compensation payments to more than 170,000 servicemembers who had their enlistments involuntarily extended. It also provides nearly $5 billion for additional Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles for U.S. forces in Afghanistan and Iraq. The bill renews our commitment to meaningful engagement in the Middle East by providing Israel with $555 million of the $2.8 billion of the 2010 request for security assistance, as well as $665 million in bilateral economic, humanitarian, and security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza. I am also pleased that the bill provides $2 billion for pandemic flu response, as well as $500 million for global

emergency food assistance. These are all worthy and necessary expenditures.

As the chairman of the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel (SIOP), I want to briefly discuss our work on this bill. The SIOP reviewed the intelligence activities contained in this request. While the dollar amounts are classified, I can tell my colleagues that this bill contains many of the same justifiable activities we have seen in previous years with two exceptions. The first exception is the administration's request, which this bill includes, for additional funding for the operations in Afghanistan. Intelligence has been a vital component of our overseas military activities, and this bill ensures that proper intelligence will be available to those on the front lines in Afghanistan. The second exception is that this administration has begun the process of shifting continuing activities from emergency supplemental bills to the base appropriations bill.

Overall, however, I have grave concerns about the direction of our spending and policy focus in Afghanistan. I recognize that this conflict was neglected for far too long because of our misadventure in Iraq and that we are now paying the price for that neglect. I am concerned that in our haste to try to recover lost ground—literally as well as figuratively—we may commit some of the same errors that bedeviled our efforts in Iraq.

I have heard many people in this body and elsewhere in our government say that ''the United States cannot afford to lose in Afghanistan.'' That statement presumes that it is a war that is solely ours to win or lose—that the outcome will be decided by our willingness to commit still more blood and treasure to this conflict. That is a fallacy, the same fallacy that caused us to misdirect our efforts in Iraq for so long with such disastrous consequences. We would do well to remember what U.S. counterinsurgency specialist William Polk said in his 2007 book Violent Politics:

> We should begin by noting what is common to all insurgencies. No matter how they differ in form, duration, and intensity, a single thread runs through them all: opposition to foreigners.

As in Iraq, we cannot solve the Afghan's problems for them; we are foreign occupiers of their country and will forever be seen that way by the population. We can support them in their effort to build a stable and just society, but they must be the leaders in that effort.

To that end, we should also bear in mind the words of the authors of the current U.S. Army and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual:

> Long-term success in [counterinsurgency] depends on the people taking charge of their own affairs and consenting to the government's rule . . . Political and military leaders and planners should never underestimate its scale and complexity; moreover, they should recognize that the Armed Forces cannot succeed in [counterinsurgency] alone.

The supplemental appropriations bill before us spends $47.7 billion on the ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq compared to $4.3 billion for international affairs and stabilization activities in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Perhaps the ratio should not be reversed, but it should certainly be far more balanced than it is—and there should be some type of timeline for the transition of security responsibilities from our forces to the government of Afghanistan.

My recent visit to Iraq with Speaker PELOSI convinced me that the certainty of our withdrawal from that country has focused the minds of Iraq's leaders on the need to deal with their many unresolved domestic problems. We need to create that same sense of urgency among Afghanistan's leaders, but I fear that this bill will not have that effect. I intend to join like-minded House colleagues in seeking ways to create that sense of urgency in this body, and ultimately on leaders in Afghanistan and Pakistan. As a first step, I have co-sponsored a bill by my friend from Massachusetts, Representative JIM MCGOVERN, that would require the Secretary of Defense to present to Congress an exit strategy for Afghanistan. The conflict in Afghanistan, and the emerging conflict in Pakistan itself, cannot be solved by us through military means—it can only be solved politically through a joint effort by us and our allies. I hope we will be able to begin making that transition in the Fiscal Year 2010 budget later this year, and by passing Representative MCGOVERN's bill as soon as possible.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote against H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. While I have great faith in the new Obama administration and support many of the provisions within the supplemental, I have a number of concerns that precluded me from supporting the bill in its current form. I recognize that our new administration believes that this supplemental is a necessary carryover from the previous administration, but I cannot support the continuation of the Bush Administration's failed modus operandi in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq, and the mis-proportioned 90–10 doctrine of assistance allocation—that is, 90 percent for military investments and only 10 percent for political, economic, and social development.

For the past several weeks, I have been working with Congressional Progressive Caucus (CPC) Co-chair GRIJALVA to convene a series of panels featuring Afghan and Pakistani diplomats and security experts to discuss a variety of security issues related to Afghanistan and Pakistan. As I reported to President Obama in early May on behalf of the CPC, this six-part forum has produced a number of recommendations for essential elements that should be a part of our strategy going forward, including: (1) building the countries' infrastructure, industry, markets and workforce; (2) involving local leaders at all levels of decision-making; (3) supporting the countries' most effective indigenous reconstruction, stabilization and conflict resolution strategies; (4) educating girls and integrating women into political and economic leadership; and (5) ensuring oversight so that foreign resources support the goals mentioned above.

This Supplemental represents our first opportunity to correct the failed approaches of the past, but unfortunately we have not done so. Going forward, I hope that we can work closely with the President to ensure a policy more aligned with the 80–20 model often quoted by General David Petraeus, which would invest 80 percent of resources into political capacity and institutions with only 20 percent for military.

In this regard, I, along with other members of the Progressive Caucus, have presented our findings and specific recommendations to our colleagues in Congress, with the intention of informing and improving U.S. policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Again, while I am not supporting this current Supplemental, I was pleased to hear in our meeting with the President, that his FY2010 budget request will move in this direction.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns raised by many about whether this bill reflects the ''perfect'' strategy for Afghanistan and Iraq.

The stakes are high in Afghanistan and the challenges are complex. As then-Senator Barrack Obama noted in July 2007, ''the Afghan-Pakistan border region is where the 9/11 attack was plotted. It is where most attacks in Europe since 9/11 originated. It is where Osama bin Laden lives and his top confederates still enjoy safe haven, planning new attacks. And it is where we must urgently shift our focus . . . using the totality of America's strength, not merely our military, incredible as it is.''

For the first time since I have been here in Washington, discussion about a supplemental has focused on where most of our efforts since 9/11 should be: Afghanistan.

I am encouraged that we finally have a President who is committed to a redeployment of our troops from Iraq so that we can focus on where the threats from Al-Qaeda originated on September 11 and which unfortunately we have seen the threat to our country, to Afghanistan, and to Pakistan grow in the past few years. The Supplemental is consistent with the President's plan to begin winding down the number of combat troops in Iraq over the next several months.

While I wish we did not need to have military forces in Afghanistan, the deteriorating security situation will necessitate more U.S. troops—at least for a time—to help ''disrupt, dismantle, and destroy'' safe havens for Al-Qaeda. Creating a situation in Afghanistan that prevents the return of the Taliban and al Qaeda is clearly a priority for our national security.

It's a decision I take with a heavy heart and after much deliberation. I err on the side of peace. I never look forward to sending more of our brave young soldiers to the battlefield or for war. Yet, it is unfortunately clear to me that military forces must continue to be a part of our effort in Afghanistan to help protect innocent Afghan civilians.

This increase in forces must be accompanied by clear guidelines to minimize civilian casualties that have only inflamed public opinion in Afghanistan against the U.S. and its coalition partners.

We cannot win any war where we lose the support of the local populace.

The use of airstrikes that may have killed some terrorist leaders but also killed or injured more innocent civilians—such as the attack from earlier this week—and fanned anti-American sentiment must be reexamined at the highest levels of our defense establishment.

But if we have learned anything from the situation in Iraq, it is that military force alone is not sufficient in and by itself to achieve our nation's foreign policy objectives in combating terrorism. I remain concerned that a strategy that relies on our military alone—who have served and continue to serve with valor, honor, and dedication and done all that their country has asked of them—to address the vast range of challenges facing the Afghanistan government and people is not a viable way forward in Afghanistan.

Yet, without security, the Taliban will continue to disrupt and destroy U.S. and international efforts to boost health care, governance, and economic growth in the country, as

evidenced by the continuing attacks against innocent girls who have now been empowered to go to school and get an education.

I am also concerned about the growing influence of the Taliban on Afghanistan's government and what that would mean for the respect for human rights, including the rights of women and the future of women and girls if we allow Afghanistan to become a failed state.

Development in Afghanistan cannot occur if we do not protect and empower the 50 percent of the population that are women. However, the prospects for women and girls in Afghanistan under the Taliban or a government heavily influenced by the Taliban are chilling.

We saw this growing influence I believe with the March 2009 approval by Afghan's parliament of a law that would, according to news reports, legalize marital rape, strip mothers of custodial rights in the event of a divorce, and prohibit a woman from leaving her home unless her husband gives his approval.

This law violates the basic human rights of women under several international treaties and convention and appears to contravene Afghanistan's own constitution.

This law has been rightly condemned by President Obama and others around the world and I urge President Karzai to officially reject it as well.

Its passage is a troubling omen of what the future holds for many of the committed women and girls who have courageously stepped out of the shadows since the fall of Taliban rule in Afghanistan in 2001.

I have advocated for a comprehensive strategy in Afghanistan and a comprehensive strategy will include the appropriate and judicious use of our military forces—otherwise it would not be comprehensive. It is clear that the Afghan security forces are overwhelmed and under-resourced to combat Al-Qaeda. In Afghanistan—a country that has both a larger population and a larger geography than Iraq—current U.S. forces are one-fifth the size of the forces in Iraq.

We must support efforts by the Afghanistan government to improve security for the millions of innocent Afghans whose future is threatened by the Taliban and Al-Qaeda.

An important piece of a comprehensive strategy is an exit plan. That is an unfortunate gap in the bill before us, but nothing prevents the House or Congress from addressing that issue in the days or weeks ahead.

I am an original cosponsor of legislation by Congressman JAMES MCGOVERN that asks the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a plan for an exit strategy for U.S. military operations in Afghanistan by the end of the year. I look forward to helping move it through the House as soon as possible.

Additionally, the increase in fighting forces in Afghanistan undertaken by this Administration must be matched by concomitant increases in diplomatic, development, and other nonmilitary aid.

The FY 2009 supplemental remains the most immediate avenue available at this point to secure the $7 billion in foreign aid requested by the President to support his boost for such efforts in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and elsewhere. In fact, this bill would add $3 billion to the President's request.

The $5.1 billion in the bill for Afghanistan is a significant step in the right direction. The $3.6 billion for training Afghan security forces and police; $980 million for economic development and expanding the rule of law and combating corruption; and $536 million for increased U.S. civilian and diplomatic staff are key parts of the Administration's new strategy for the region and will hopefully pave the way for the Afghan government to take the lead in securing its territory and meeting the needs of its people. On that point, today, 17 members of the Wisconsin National Guard—most of them based in Milwaukee—will return home after 10 months in Afghanistan training and advising the Afghan National Police.

I don't need to mention the critical need for the Pakistan assistance as troubling media reports surface by the hour that graphically illustrate the challenge facing that country and its government in its battle against Al-Qaeda and insurgent groups. The House bill would provide over $2 billion for Pakistan, almost $600 million more than requested by the President to boost State Department and civilian staffing, to strengthen governance and economic development efforts.

While I wish the mix between military aid and development and other aid in the bill were different, I also realize that this bill is taking an important step to better balance that mix while acknowledging a difficult reality for there are hundreds of thousands of troops still in war zones and at the same time, there is a lack of staffing at USAID and State that will need to be addressed to properly support a more forceful role for those agencies going forward.

The bill also addresses a number of other priorities including compensating all members of our military who were subject to the DoD's stop loss policy after September 11, boosting funding for MRAP's to protect our troops from IED's, and providing over $1 billion for medical care to servicemembers and their family members, including research and treatment of PTSD and TBI.

The supplemental would also provide millions in funding for new wounded warrior facilities to help soldiers wounded in combat to recover and to support their families through that process. It would speed up the construction of new military hospitals in Bethesda and at Fort Belvoir and provide over $1 billion for family support programs including improving access for families to child psychologists, child care, child development centers, financial counseling and other support.

Important funding is also included to facilitate the Middle East Peace process including economic aid and security assistance for Israel, Egypt, West Bank and Gaza, Jordan, and Lebanon.

The bill also makes investments in efforts to combat pandemic flu, to aid developing countries negatively affected by the global financial crisis, and to extend the compassion and aid of the American people though the provision of food aid, refugee assistance, and support of peacekeeping operations.

While I am disappointed by the fact that there are no deadlines or timelines in the bill before the end of Fiscal Year 2009 which is covered by the funding in this bill, Congress will certainly have the opportunity to examine whether or not these new policies are working and how to make effective changes both for the sake of our national security and for the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

This bill is not "perfect" and can be improved. I hope it will get better and stronger when it goes to conference including the addition of more funding for the State Department to conduct diplomacy, build schools, hospitals and roads, and promote economic growth. Any efforts to reduce funding for these goals and funding for some of the important programs I have outlined below the levels in this bill will be of concern to me.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great strengths of our nation is our collective ability to learn from our mistakes—to reject conventional thought and embrace innovation. During his short time in office, the President has been the physical embodiment of this strength. He has challenged the status quo where he has found it and laid bare the contradictions inherent in policies and modes of thought that have outlived their usefulness. From reforming our domestic auto industry, to turning away from outdated forms of energy production, to finally recognizing that a person's health and a person's ability to work are, in fact, intimately related, the President is leading our nation toward progress.

It is unfortunate then, that the President has not challenged our most pervasive and dangerous national hubris: the foolhardy belief that we can erect the foundations of civil society through the judicious use of our many high tech instruments of violence. That belief, promoted by the previous administration in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, assumes that the United States possesses the capacity and also has a duty to determine the fate of nations in the greater Middle East.

I oppose this supplemental war funding bill because I believe that we are not bound by such a duty. In fact, I believe the policies of empire are counterproductive in our struggle against the forces of radical religious extremism. For example, U.S. strikes from unmanned Predator Drones and other aircraft produced 64 percent of all civilian deaths caused by the U.S., NATO, and Afghan forces in 2008. Just this week, U.S. air strikes took another 100 lives, according to Afghan officials on the ground. If it is our goal to strengthen the average Afghani or Pakistani citizen and to weaken the radicals that threaten stability in the region, bombing villages is clearly counterproductive. For every family broken apart by an incident of "collateral damage," seeds of hate and enmity are sown against our nation.

I must also oppose this resolution because of the decision to strip $80 million in funding for the closure of the detention center located at Guantanamo Bay during deliberations in the Appropriations Committee. Here as well, I implore my colleagues to consider the message we send to the world about our commitment to the rule of law. Closing this sordid chapter in our national history is a tremendously important part of our campaign to win the hearts and minds of the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

There are those who will say that the Taliban and the tribal warlords of the Pashtun will not yield to reason or diplomacy. This may be true. However, this vote is a referendum on our means, not on our goals in the region or our commitment to defeating those who would wish us harm. The President has assembled the best minds that our nation has to offer. He has all of the myriad tools of statecraft at his disposal. With these factors in mind, I refuse to believe that constraining these tribal warlords and extremists, whose influence is limited to a mountainous and economically derelict region halfway around the world, requires the mightiest nation in the world to indefinitely

commit our precious national resources in this particular manner.

Obviously, Afghanistan is not Iraq. It presents unique geographic, economic, and cultural challenges that will be orders of magnitude more difficult to solve. Let us remember that we are on the verge of extracting our troops and treasure from the quagmire of Iraq. Over the last six years, the strength of the forces of arrogance has waned as a direct result of our national experience with the horrors, costs, and futility inherent in a military occupation. Yet, here we are—on the precipice of hastily injecting our military men and women into a far more difficult and unwieldy situation.

Should we support this measure, we risk dooming our nation to a fate similar to Sisyphus and his boulder: to being trapped in a stalemate of unending frustration and misery, as our mistakes inevitably lead us to the same failed outcomes. Let us step back; let us remember the mistakes and heartbreak of our recent misadventures in the streets of Fallujah and Baghdad. If we honor the ties that bind us to one another, we cannot in good faith send our fellow citizens on this errand of folly. It is still not too late to turn away from this path.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation, which makes emergency supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year 2009. H.R. 2346 provides our troops what they need for their missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, provides appropriate Congressional oversight for our military and national security efforts, and ensures the continued safety and security of our citizens.

This bill contains $96.7 billion to support our efforts to fight in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan and to protect against pandemic flu. As the representative of Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, I'm pleased that this bill provides $3.2 billion for quality of life initiatives—including funding for military child care centers, military hospitals and wounded warrior facilities. It includes an additional $500 per month for each soldier who has served involuntarily after their enlistment ended, recognizing the sacrifices that they have made in necessary service to our country.

The legislation supports the President's plan to end the war in Iraq and bring our soldiers home, and supports his efforts to refocus our efforts to root out terrorism in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It also contains an important provision to prevent the release of prisoners from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the United States and requires the President to submit a comprehensive plan regarding the proposed closing of the Guantanamo Bay facility to Congress before any action is taken.

As the representative of a rural district that has seen farmers lose contracts and put on the brink of foreclosure, I am pleased that this bill contains emergency funding to address the shortfall in farm loan programs. North Carolina and 46 other states have loan backlogs that today cannot be funded, and the $71.3 million in this bill will help keep our farmers in business and our nation's food supply secure.

Mr. Speaker, as we start to address the legacy of the failed policies of the past eight years and the deficit that we inherited, we must still invest in our priorities and ensure the safety and security of all Americans. This bill is the last time that we will address critical war funding needs outside of the regular budget process, and is a necessary step to providing a new direction for our military, our economy, and our nation. I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress as well as the President and the Administration, to provide a new direction in Iraq and to meet the critical needs of the people of North Carolina's Second Congressional District.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, a little over 100 days ago, President Obama took the mantle of Commander in Chief and assumed responsibility for the tragic war in Iraq and the under-resourced conflict in Afghanistan. True to his promise, and my pledge to Oregonians, this Supplemental Appropriations bill starts the process of bringing the war in Iraq to a close. We are on track to end the combat mission in Iraq by mid–2010 and remove all U.S. military forces by the end of 2011.

I have routinely opposed Supplemental Appropriations bills for the wars in the past as open-ended funding for a tragic conflict. For too long this type of emergency funding has been used to support misguided policies: avoiding responsible budgeting and thoughtful adjustments in the direction of our foreign and military policies. That's why I'm pleased that the Obama administration has also committed to transparency in war funding, both in this final Supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan, and for including future costs in the baseline budget.

There is much that is good and important in this bill, including substantial investments in humanitarian assistance overseas and in preparing for the next pandemic, which we fear swine flu may become in the future.

Nevertheless, it was difficult to cast a vote in support of this Supplemental. I am troubled by some of the funding, including an increase in defense acquisitions and military assistance for some countries that haven't earned it, like Egypt. My greatest unease is perhaps the direction that has been taken in Afghanistan. I am not comfortable with the escalation there; my discomfort was heightened when I said goodbye on May 2 to the largest contingent of Oregon National Guard members sent overseas since World War II.

I will give the new administration the benefit of the doubt because there is much in this bill to support and because they have inherited dire circumstances not of their making. But from this point forward, these conflicts are in the hands of the Obama administration and I will hold them to the same standard of accountability.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the supplemental appropriations bill for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In Iraq, the American people were misled into a war that has cost our country almost $670 billion, with over 4,300 American lives lost and estimates showing hundreds of thousands of Iraqis killed. While President Obama's plan to scale down the troop levels in Iraq is a move in the right direction, I simply cannot justify any more spending for an illegitimate war.

In Afghanistan, over 600 Americans have been killed and more than 4,000 have been wounded. After years of mismanagement by the Bush Administration, we lack a clear objective and have no exit strategy.

At a time when our country is facing serious economic peril at home, it is unconscionable that we would be sending almost $100 billion to further fund war efforts that have no clear goals and continue to undermine America's standing abroad.

President Obama is moving America's foreign policy in a better direction, and he has shown superior judgment to President Bush on when we should send our troops into harm's way. However, I cannot support any more funding for these wars.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. The funding in this bill will provide our men and women in uniform the tools they need to protect our nation, while recognizing the sacrifices they and their families have made for this country.

Unlike past war funding supplementals, this year's measure will focus on supporting a clear plan for ending the war in Iraq and bringing our men and women home safely and responsibly. This will be balanced with adequate resources to support a "whole of government" approach to combat Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan and to support our allies in Pakistan as they fight a violent insurgency that threatens to envelop their country.

This supplemental also supports Congress's critical oversight responsibilities by requiring the President to report on the performance of the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan in five key areas by February of 2010. This will allow the Congress to evaluate the effectiveness of our new strategy in Afghanistan and ensure that we are providing everything troops need to get the job done.

On the home front, the supplemental ensures that our nation is ready to respond to a full flu pandemic by providing funding for antiviral drug and vaccine stockpiles as well as assisting state and local responders with the tools to fight such an outbreak.

This bill ensures the safety of our nation by balancing our war efforts overseas with disaster response at home, and I urge passage of H.R. 2346.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. I am supporting this legislation because it contains necessary funding for our troops at war in Iraq and Afghanistan and ensures they have the proper equipment and resources they need. However, I am pleased this is the last time we will use emergency supplementals to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which grows our federal budget deficit and places the burden of paying for the wars on our children. From now on, we must keep our word and use supplemental appropriations only for true emergencies, like natural disasters, pandemic flu outbreaks, and terrorist attacks.

In addition to providing funds for continued drawdown of troops from Iraq, refocusing military efforts in Afghanistan, and new strategic initiatives in Pakistan, this legislation contains much-needed funding to respond to urgent humanitarian crises involving refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). While I thank the Committee for including this assistance, I believe much more is necessary to respond to the dire situation Iraqi refugees and IDPs find themselves in since the beginning of the Iraq War. The United States has both a moral obligation to assist this displaced population—the largest since the Palestinian Diaspora of 1948—and also a strategic interest in stabilizing the region so young Iraqi men and women turn toward the future of their country rather than to violence and extremism because they have no place else to go.

H.R. 2346 also contains relief for our troops who have been forced to remain on duty

through multiple tours of often intense combat missions. This bill contains $734 million to retroactively provide service members and veterans $500 for every month they served under stop-loss orders since 2001.

This bill has many other important provisions that I am pleased to support, like funding for pandemic flu response, fighting growing violence along the U.S.-Mexico border, and international food assistance during the global economic crisis. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' for H.R. 2346.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the work of our Chairman, JOHN MURTHA, our Ranking Minority Member, BILL YOUNG, and the Democratic and Republican staff of the House Appropriations Committee on Defense. Unlike years past, this legislation demands that our President provide us with a plan as we move forward in Afghanistan; demands that our President provide us with a plan as we close down Guantanamo Bay; provides more funding for ''stop loss'' and helps to protect our country against flu pandemics. This bill provides direction for the President and American citizens; is disciplined in its approach regarding Afghanistan, Pakistan and Guantanamo Bay; and is diligent in ensuring the wise use of tax dollars.

First and foremost, I must thank Chairman MURTHA and Ranking Minority Member YOUNG, along with 118 of my colleagues, who helped to fight to preserve funding for the Stryker Medical Evacuation Unit. On April 1, 2009, I sent this letter signed by my colleagues to Chairman MURTHA to fight for funding for the Stryker MEV. Secretary of Defense Bob Gates recommended that this program be zero funded for the Supplemental, which would have had a devastating effect on the State of Michigan and others as well. I am a proud Progressive, and did not support the War in Iraq. Regardless of whether you support the war or not, we all agree that those servicemembers who voluntarily put themselves in harm's way should have the best equipment available. This Supplemental will provide close to $340 million for the Stryker. Without funding in the FY09 Supplemental, General Dynamics would be forced to cut more than 1,000 employees in Michigan, Ohio, Alabama, Florida, and Pennsylvania. I am proud to have fought for the funding for this program that will allow the building of over 250 Strykers.

An estimated 795 supplier companies would be impacted in 40 States. The direct economic impact to Michigan would be a loss of $241 million along with more than 19,000 jobs.

The Stryker MEV or battlefield ambulance, which is what I, along with my colleagues, have been working to fund, offers our troops the best medical treatment. Its mobility, speed and protection levels have saved the lives of wounded soldiers. The Stryker MEV ambulance, which would be used to replace Vietnam-era M113s, offers greater interior space, carries more wounded soldiers, medics and medical supplies. It also features the latest in life support and medical monitoring systems and has air conditioning. Our servicemembers deserve this much for their battlefield ambulance.

The Strykers have been deemed the soldier's ''first choice.'' Strykers are eight-wheel, armored combat vehicles that can be transported in a C–130 plane. There are 10 configurations of the Stryker including the Infantry Carrier Vehicle, ICV, and the Mobile Gun System, MGS.

The contract for Strykers was awarded in 2000 to General Dynamics Land Systems and a former subsidiary of General Motors, GM Defense. They were designed in Sterling Heights, Michigan and are manufactured in Lima, Ohio and Anniston, Alabama, by General Dynamics Land Systems, with many of the key components of the Stryker designed and built by the United Auto Workers labor union.

The first Stryker vehicles were deployed in 2002. Since then, more than 2,700 vehicles have been delivered and more than 18,000 soldiers have been trained. The fleet has accumulated 22 million miles.

Key characteristics of the Stryker are survivability and mobility. The vehicle allows soldiers to maneuver in close quarters, offers protection in open areas and can quickly transport troops to key battlefields. The Army selected the Stryker because it provides the best protection, performance and value for the Army's Bridge Combat Teams. The Stryker, named after two individuals who earned the Medal of Honor, is one of the preferred vehicles of the U.S. Marine Corps. Perhaps Col. Robert Brown, commander of the 1st Brigade, 25th Infantry Division, Multinational Force—Northwest which is equipped with Strykers, could make the best argument for the Stryker:

> The Stryker brigade has fought from Fallujah, Baghdad, Euphrates River Valley and then up in the Tigris River Valley and all the way up to Mosul in northern Iraq and out to the border out in Syria over the last year.
>
> The Stryker's fantastic. It has incredible mobility, incredible speed. It has saved hundreds of my soldiers' lives. I'm telling you hundreds of their lives. We've been hit by 84 suicide VBIEDs, and I've had the greater majority of soldiers walk away without even a scratch. It's absolutely amazing. If I were in any other type vehicle, I would've had huge problems.
>
> The other thing is it carries, you know, the infantry men in the back that no other vehicle can do; nine infantry men that come out of that Stryker and are incredible in urban operations. You could ask any one of my soldiers, and they would choose the Stryker of any vehicle they could possibly ride in.

This bill mandates that President Obama submit every 90 days a report to Congress that includes how the government of Iraq is assuming responsibility for reconciliation initiatives; how the draw down of military forces complies with the President's guidelines to withdraw all U.S. combat brigades from Iraq by August 31, 2010, and requires accountability from the contractors who are doing business in Iraq. The legislation also states that there will be no permanent bases in Iraq.

Appreciating that the President has issued the closure of Guantanamo Bay's detention facilities, we ask the President to submit to Congress a comprehensive plan for what the Administration plans to do with detainees still held at Guantanamo Bay; and a detailed analysis of the total estimated cost of closing this detention facility and any related costs.

The bill also gives the President a year to come up with a comprehensive, cohesive plan for Afghanistan and Pakistan. By February 2010, the bill gives the President time to assess whether the Governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan are, or are not, demonstrating the necessary commitment, capability, conduct and unity of purpose to warrant the continued policy of the President. Our people deserve to know what our goals, objectives, and timetables are if we are going to commit the lives of their husbands and wives, sons and daughters, children and grandchildren and the scarce resources of the American taxpayer.

I am proud that this bill includes an increase in the funding for the mental health of our servicemembers, to treat Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD, and Traumatic Brain Injuries, TBI. Families of our servicemembers who have children with disabilities will get an increase in the help that they receive through this legislation, as well as compensating our troops who have served under ''stop loss'' conditions. Recognizing the hardship placed on troops and their families by being forced to remain on active duty longer than they planned, Congress ordered a special $500 per month payment for any servicemember who had to serve under stop loss. For the U.S. Army, the average compensation would be $4,000; for the U.S. Navy, $7,500; for the U.S. Marine Corps, $4,500; and for the U.S. Air Force, $5,500.

We owe our servicemembers a great debt. I am proud of our work on this bill to ensure accountability and responsibility from our Administration; to protect American citizens from pandemics and disease; to partially compensate our servicemembers and their families for their sacrifice; and boost the economy of the State of Michigan. I look forward to quick consideration in the Senate of this legislation and that it is signed into law soon.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, let me first say at the outset that I support President Obama and his Administration in their overall foreign policy objectives and implementation. However, I cannot vote for this War Supplemental request because I believe that it does not represent the departure from the past that we all hope for and which is urgently needed to move our country forward in a new course.

While I understand that there's a momentum building toward winding down our involvement in these conflicts and the move away from the war-making culture, I believe that there must be a sharp departure from past policy in order for us to achieve that goal.

This War Supplemental budget will significantly expand our military presence in Afghanistan, while at the same time it does not go far enough in eliminating our longstanding presence in Iraq, either.

I am very concerned by the fact that almost 90 percent of the funds are going for military operations and equipment replacement. While it contains some beneficial items like economic development and agriculture programs in Afghanistan, efforts to strengthen rule of law in Iraq, humanitarian assistance for Gaza—which I strongly support—wildfire suppression, and efforts to fight against the spread of a new flu pandemic, all these items combined amount to less than 13 percent of the total budget.

I also believe that funding for the war and military occupation and funding for diplomatic, humanitarian and other benevolent efforts must be separated. It is disingenuous and deceptive to combine these two and force the lawmakers to make the choice they shouldn't have to make; that is, supporting funding for the wars in order to get humanitarian assistance for Gaza.

President Obama has made strong, inspirational statements that signal positive change of policy toward the Muslim world, but this budget will send a contradicting message to those statements. Approving this budget will send the message to the Muslim world and the international community at large that we are not serious in getting to the root-cause of the problem, which is our extensive engagement in war-making. At the end of the day, the best way to achieve our objectives is to send consistent messages that demonstrate our unwavering determination to scale down our military footprints.

Supporting this bill will surely perpetuate military operations that are likely to fail or become a pyrrhic victory.

President Obama will give a major speech in Egypt on how he would reduce those military footprints and increase civilian-led involvement. But the figures in this War Supplemental budget, over $75 billion for military operations versus merely $7 billion for state and foreign operations, will perpetuate the picture of how much we still prioritize war-making over diplomacy and development.

With these reasons, and despite my continued support for the President and the Administration, I cannot support this War Supplemental budget request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, but not without reservations and some concern.

I fully support the funding that is in the bill for the military—the bill addresses their immediate needs by providing protective equipment in supplies, and supports the sacrifices they and their families are making by retroactively providing servicemembers and veterans $500 for every month they served under stop-loss orders since 2001. It also plans for the end of combat operations in Iraq and refocuses our efforts in Afghanistan.

Following a news report by KHOU in Houston on Monday about troops in Iraq not having sufficient supplies, specifically individuals were having to ration water, find their own, or drink bulk water not intended to be potable, we need to ensure DoD has funding to supply our troops, and this bill provides for that.

My main concern however is that this supplemental did not include funding, or any assistance for areas affected by Hurricane Ike. We still have great unmet needs, and while there is funding to address other natural disasters such as wildfires, the Gulf Coast is still struggling to recover.

Ike was one of the most devastating hurricanes since Katrina, yet the small amount of funding that has been appropriated for the disaster has not been passed through by the Federal agencies to meet local needs. Of the nearly $6 billion in CDBG funding that was included in the combined Defense, Homeland Security, and VA Appropriations bill, nearly two thirds of that is still being held by HUD.

What has been delivered was divided among all areas hit by a natural disaster last year, meaning the Gulf Coast has received a tiny fraction of what is needed and what has been delivered to previous areas devastated by category 3 and category 4 hurricanes.

The 2009 hurricane season is nearly upon us, and we have yet to address the needs of what is left from the 2008 season. Additional funding would be ideal, but at a minimum, local areas like Galveston City and County need the local-match for disaster recovery assistance waived, and I intend to continue working with the Appropriations Committee and House Leadership to provide that assistance at a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support what is in this bill for our troops and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it. However, I hope to work with you moving forward to provide assistance to an area still devastated and recovering from Hurricane Ike.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I support the supplemental funding bill that is before the House today, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

A lot has changed since the last time Congress debated funding for the ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan eleven months ago. Earlier this year, President Obama stated that we will begin to draw down our forces in Iraq and complete the removal of combat troops by August 2010. Further, the President has also announced a new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. The plan acknowledges our national interest in combating terrorism and the Taliban in Pakistan and Afghanistan and the need for stability in the region, especially with regard to safeguarding Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. At the same time, the President's plan correctly recognizes that we need a comprehensive strategy that does not rely on U.S. military force alone.

The President's plan therefore calls for increased resources to build schools, roads and hospitals, and strengthen democratic institutions and the rule of law in both Pakistan and Afghanistan. The strategy also calls for greater dialogue, intelligence sharing, and border cooperation between the U.S., Afghanistan and Pakistan. The challenges before us are formidable, but I think we need to give President Obama's strategy a chance to work. This bill begins the effort by providing funding for the training of Afghan and Pakistani security forces as well as funds for economic development, strengthening governance, expanding the rule of law, and boosting our diplomatic efforts in the region.

One thing that hasn't changed is the imperative to provide our troops in the field with the equipment and support they need to protect themselves and accomplish their mission.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2346 the Supplemental Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2009, which addresses the President's request for additional funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, overseas diplomatic efforts and wildland fire suppression and emergency rehabilitation of burned areas. I also want to express my support for funds that were approved in this bill to respond to the recent swine flu outbreak, which still presents a very real threat of a worldwide pandemic.

We are all encouraged by the robust actions of our various public health agencies in the United States, including the Centers for Disease Control, in response to this threat. It is clear that the health and security of the American public remain a top priority, and we support the substantial and serious efforts that are being made to protect our population against the H1N1 swine flu virus and to prepare for the possible consequences. Because we do not know at this point the path that this particular strain will take within our population and around the world, it is entirely prudent to implement widespread precautionary steps in case the outbreak is more virulent than it now appears, or in case it re-appears in the fall. Knowing that the 1918 Spanish Influenza outbreak killed an estimated 100 million people around the world, and that modern transportation has greatly increased the speed at which such a pandemic could be spread, we have a serious obligation to prepare for any potential outcome.

At the same time, I believe that Congress, in its oversight role, must assure that the nation is adequately prepared to detect—with some advance capability—this and other types of pandemic disease threats to our population. The earlier we can determine the content and the severity of a biological threat, for example, the more lives can potentially be saved. In this case we have some concern about the nation's ability to analyze and interpret warning signals that suggest the emergence of a biological threat.

What we know is this: By April 22, the Centers for Disease Control, CDC, had identified two cases of a previously unknown strain of Swine flu present in Texas, and that the virus was identical to two previously analyzed cases that occurred earlier in the month in San Diego. By that evening, CDC was able to complete the analysis of samples of the virus that had been raging through parts of Mexico, finally allowing it to ''connect the dots'' and begin the notification of all 50 State public health laboratories.

But it is now also known that CDC received other information earlier that at least suggested the possibility of pandemic threat. CDC received information from a Washington State firm that tracks global disease outbreaks as early as April 6th that suggested the possibility of a pandemic. The company, Veratect, has developed a software platform called Foreshadow that conducts 24-hour, 7-days-a-week tracking and actionable alert generation to detect emerging threats worldwide. Through its analyses, Veratect reported on April 6th that health officials in Veracruz, Mexico, had declared a health alert due to a ''strange'' outbreak of respiratory disease outbreak, possibly caused by contamination from pig-breeding farms located in the area. Ten days later, the company reported that the Oaxaca Health Department had detected an unusual number of atypical pneumonia cases. On April 20, a Veratect official contacted a CDC physician at the agency's emergency operations center to apprise him of the situation in Mexico and to urge CDC to take a look at the growing problem there.

Obviously hindsight is 20/20. As with any intelligence product, it is always difficult to know at the time what is merely ''noise'' and what is truly significant information that requires action. But because of my personal knowledge of the circumstances related to these early warning signals that were sent to CDC and other governmental bodies, I think it is prudent for Congress at this point to assure that we have the appropriate mechanisms in place to guarantee that bona fide information relating to these types of very real threats to public health and safety can be received and interpreted in a timely manner, and that it triggers the necessary and appropriate preventative actions.

In this regard, I am encouraged that the bill includes report language that will require CDC to review its disease detection policies and the

speed with which case samples are analyzed to determine if improvements should or can be made. Part of this review should include a survey of the early detection capability that exists, and whether CDC and other agencies of the federal government have sufficient resources to properly analyze this type of advance warning information.

I thank Chairman OBEY, in particular, for his interest in the issue, and for including this important language in the Committee's report.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to clarify some comments in the Joint Explanatory Statement for the FY09 Consolidated Appropriations Act. That statement said, ''Further, that the Intelligence Community has studied other pay-for-performance efforts, both within the Community and the rest of government is encouraging. The executive branch started implementing this effort of September 14, 2008, and therefore the Intelligence Community is directed to ensure that full implementation of the system follows the principles of merit, transparency and fairness in a manner which is deliberate and methodical.''

I want to clarify that this statement was not intended as an endorsement of the current pay for performance system in the Intelligence Community, known as the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS), but as a statement of principles of what such a system should be.

We all believe that the civil service personnel system should be based on merit principles and be transparent, and fair. It is our commitment to these principles that have led some of us to ask that these systems be reviewed. We have been concerned that the implementation of DCIPS lacks transparency, may adversely affect minorities, and may undermine collaboration. In particular, Chairman SKELTON and I requested that the Administration pause implementation of DCIPS. In response, the Intelligence Community announced to the field that they would be pausing implementation of DCIPS. I welcome this action so the Administration can take the time to review both the substance and implementation plan for DCIPS. I note that the Administration has frozen the implementation of the National Security Personnel System (NSPS), and is reviewing that system as well, and I would welcome similar action in the Intelligence Community.

Mr. OBEY. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for an ''aye'' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 434, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Presently, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2346 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 10, beginning on line 20, strike the last two provisos of the paragraph.

Page 23, beginning on line 3, strike section 10012 (relating to rescissions of Department of Defense funds).

Page 33, after line 5, insert the following:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

DETENTION TRUSTEE

For an additional amount for ''Detention Trustee'', $50,000,000.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For an additional amount for ''Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement'', $150,000,000.

Page 49, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 56, strike line land all that follows through page 57, line 25.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this motion to correct what I believe are three gross errors in the bill.

Whether it's funds to support the needs of our troops, proper support for Pakistan engaged in a vital counterinsurgency effort, or funds to fight the treacherous drug war raging along our border with Mexico, this bill falls short.

How in all good conscience can we increase foreign aid by nearly $3 billion and yet shave support for our troops overseas and our law enforcement agencies here at home? How can we take away support for Pakistan's counterinsurgency efforts and give the money to the State Department?

Mr. Speaker, emergency supplemental bills are about fine-tuning our priorities. This motion gives the Members of this body the opportunity to do just that.

On supporting the needs of our troops, the current bill cuts the 2009 regular defense budget. It unnecessarily cuts defense and prohibits DOD from using those resources on critical requirements that are sadly unfunded. So this motion would simply restore the $3 billion of 2009 moneys, current year, that are cut in this bill.

On the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Funding program, or PCCF, counterinsurgency, this bill puts it in the Defense Department, but the first day of the new fiscal year, it would then be moved to the State Department for fiscal 2010. Well, State does great diplomatic work, but counterinsurgency is not the State Department's forte, and that's what we're facing. Let's be clear. PCCF is not a diplomatic tool; it's a military tool designed for aiding what is arguably one of the most important military counterinsurgency efforts in history. I need not emphasize to the Members of this body the profound importance of keeping Pakistan's nuclear weapons out of the hands of the Taliban and al Qaeda. The Secretary of Defense has been clear that he does not feel the State Department currently has the capacity or ability to administer this counterinsurgency program. Our troops need the flexibility and agility that this fund provides, especially in dealing with the nontraditional Pakistani military forces in remote sections of that country.

Finally, on the Mexican drug war, this bill fails to include one red cent for the vital work of our law enforcement agencies fighting the cartels along our border with Mexico and their tentacles reaching into every city in America. A press release I have in my hand that just came out says that the largest seizure of methamphetamines in the eastern United States has just taken place in Atlanta, Georgia. And we could name Birmingham or Chicago or New York or any other city in America where the drug cartels in Mexico, who control 90 percent of the cocaine entering this country, are waging their battles.

□ 1530

And it's spilling over now into America. This is a war with severe consequences. More than 90 percent of the cocaine comes to us through Mexico, disbursed through a distribution network that touches virtually every major city in our country, not to mention methamphetamines and the other dangerous drugs.

Now, the $350 million in this bill that says it's for counternarcotics operations along the southwest border. Smoke and mirrors. These funds will go to unaccompanied alien children and serve as a contingency fund should we need the National Guard there. Both are important efforts, but, sadly, nothing to support the needs of our law enforcement agencies engaged in this bloody war, and that's what the problem is now. It's an anti-organized crime cartel fight on that border, and you need law enforcement there. Not a penny in this bill for it.

This motion that I have would shift 7 percent of the foreign aid in this bill and invest that in the security and rule of law here at home, just 7 percent of the increase in foreign aid that's in this bill. This motion takes $200 million out of the $3 billion plus-up in the bill for foreign aid and puts it to potent counterdrug programs in the Department of Justice, programs that can help break the back of these heinous cartels on our southern border and in our cities and towns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion that will keep up our military assistance to Pakistan's counterterrorism fight, prevents a cut

on the current year's troop support, and shifts a small part of the bill's increase in foreign aid to keeping the Mexican drug cartels out of American cities.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many a lecture from the other side of the aisle about spending levels, but this proposal would add $3 billion to the spending levels in this bill, and it would eliminate a rescission that saves us money, a rescission that's been endorsed by Secretary Gates.

It also takes $200 million out of the global financial crisis fund, which is the last thing we ought to do at a time when we have a worldwide financial crisis that is threatening our own economy as well as others around the world.

Thirdly, it eliminates the Pakistani counterinsurgency fund for next year, which has already been endorsed by Secretary Gates.

And lastly, with respect to Mexico, it purports to add $200 million to deal with drug problems in Mexico. The bill already contains $400 million directly for aid to Mexico, plus another $350 million in the Department of Defense.

And I would point out that in the stimulus bill, which virtually every Member on that side of the aisle voted against just a few short weeks ago, we provided an over $700 million increase to deal with our border problems. All in all, between the omnibus and the stimulus, we already raised funding for that by 10 percent.

So I would suggest this is a financial double game and that we turn down the motion.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. I have to say I am disappointed in the gentleman. Now, he has only been on the subcommittee that I chair for a very short period of time.

We made a deal and the White House endorsed our deal. They didn't like what we did, but they endorsed our deal. They said this is their supplemental. We added to it, and we fought every inch of the way to get the money for the troops out in the field and for the families at home.

And what you are doing is fighting this thing all over again, the same way you tried to do it in the full committee, and I don't appreciate that. I don't appreciate the fact we make a deal and then we turn around here and we try to change that deal.

This should be defeated, and it should be defeated soundly by the House of Representatives and in committee.

I know what you are trying to do. In the conference, we will try to work something out, but this is the bill that should go to conference.

Mr. OBEY. I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 347.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 237, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

YEAS—191

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Delahunt
Johnson (GA)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner

□ 1601

Messrs. BOSWELL, TONKO, HIMES, TIERNEY, THOMPSON of Mississippi, SCHRADER, CLEAVER, SMITH of Washington, RUSH, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CARTER, FRANKS of Arizona, MARSHALL, CHILDERS, and McINTYRE 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 60, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (TX)
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Fattah
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—60

Baldwin
Campbell
Capuano
Clarke
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Doggett
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Farr
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Honda
Inslee
Johnson (IL)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Paul
Payne
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Royce
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Speier
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—5

Delahunt
McMorris Rodgers
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1610

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2346, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING FALLEN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, if I could just take a moment to have everyone's attention, please. If you look in the gallery, you will notice there are men and women in uniform watching what we do today, and all through the week they have been here watching and listening. But that is not really their purpose in being here this week. This is National Law Enforcement Memorial Week, and I think we should pause for a moment and recognize how fortunate we are to live in a country that has peace and civility and order.

The laws that are enforced here are enforced by the men and women behind me and all across this Nation, and many have fallen this year; one hundred and thirty-three officers have died this past year in the United States protecting us all, as we are all protected here in this House. I would like us all to rise for a moment of silence for those officers who have fallen in the line of duty.

But before we do that, I would like to yield to my colleague, the other sheriff in Congress, Mr. ELLSWORTH.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to thank Sheriff REICHERT for yielding me this time.

As we know, we have seen a lot of uniformed police officers. In this House, we talk a lot about the men and women in uniform who protect our great country, and normally we are talking about the Armed Forces, and that is rightfully so. But this week, let's take a moment to think about the men and women in every Member of this Congress' districts who are protecting us and our families 24/7 every day of the year.

If we could honor them with a moment of silence for those who have fallen in the line of duty, I would appreciate that, and I know their families would, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise for a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

GOLD MEDAL FOR JAPANESE AMERICAN ARMY UNITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 347, 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 North Carolina (Mr. WATT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 347.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—411

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Abercrombie
Boswell
Boyd
Campbell
Costello
Davis (KY)
Delahunt
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Harman
Kosmas
Linder
Marshall
McNerney
Moore (WI)
Obey
Pascrell
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Stark
Tanner
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1620

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.

MEDAL OF HONOR COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1209.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1209.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 848

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 848.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, Madam Speaker, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, as is our custom, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the end of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 2200, the Transportation Security Administration Authorization Act, H.R. 2352, the Job Creation Through Entrepreneurship Act of 2009 out of the Small Business Committee, and House amendments to S. 896, the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he could tell us which days he expects the House to consider the

bills that he has just announced, and I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that question.

We are not sure exactly which days which bill will be considered, but I think they will probably be considered in the order that they are listed. But whether they will be Wednesday and Thursday or Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, I'm not exactly sure. The suspension bills will probably be considered most of Tuesday. I might also say, as the gentleman knows, there are a number of bills pending that may come from conference, and we will address those bills when and if they do come back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, as he knows, the House will break for Memorial Day recess at the end of next week, and since we will not have another colloquy before that recess, I wonder if the majority leader could outline what he expects the House to consider during the 4 weeks that we are in session in June.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First let me say to all Members that I advise them to advise their schedulers not to schedule Fridays in June or July. We're off, obviously, for a week in July for the July 4 work period, but other than that, I would urge all Members to make sure their schedulers understand that we may well be here late into afternoons on each and every one of the Fridays. Now, why? First of all, we're going to consider the Defense Authorization bill and the State Department Authorization bills. But in addition to that, we will be considering the appropriation bills.

It is my hope and objective—and Mr. Whip, you and I have briefly talked and we are going to talk again about the scheduling of these bills—to pass all of the appropriations bills, as Senator INOUYE has indicated he would like to do as well, pass all the appropriations bills, individually, through the Senate and through the House so that we might conference those bills and have them on the floor in the regular order. Those, obviously, 12 bills will take up much of those 2 months.

In addition to that, of course, the committees are considering major pieces of legislation dealing with energy independence and global warming, as well as health care. Now, we do not know whether or not they might be ready for the floor or when they might be ready for the floor, but Members ought to know that those are bills that are clearly on our radar screen to be put on the agenda when they are ready.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And as he has indicated, the cap-and-trade bill and health care reform are items that he indicated may or may not be considered in June, but perhaps during the 2-month period of June and July. But, Madam Speaker, the gentleman did not mention the Panama Trade Agreement or Card Check, and I was wondering if the gentleman, the majority leader, could tell us his expectations as to whether the House will be considering those measures over the next 4 weeks after the Memorial Day recess.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think that, with respect to both those bills, obviously the Senate is discussing the Employee Free Choice Act and whether or not they are going to be moving ahead on that. We hope they will. We believe this is a very important and good piece of legislation, but we also know that there are discussions in the Senate with respect to the various provisions of that bill.

□ 1630

This House, as the gentleman knows, passed that bill pretty handily through the House last year, in the last Congress. So we are hopeful that the Senate will take action and the bill will be in a form that will be effected.

With respect to the Panama Canal Treaty, that has not been submitted by the administration yet, and we will have to wait to see when they will submit that bill. I do know, as you know, that Mr. KIRK has indicated that the administration has discussed the possibility of submitting that trade agreement.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I further say to the gentleman, the majority leader, that we've had a discussion on the floor today about the potential transfer and release of terrorist detainees from Guantanamo Bay. There's also been significant debate on the interrogation of these terrorist suspects, including the potential for congressional hearings and possible legislation.

I say, Madam Speaker, to the gentleman, the Speaker of the House has signaled her intent to create a truth commission to investigate CIA interrogation tactics. I was wondering, Madam Speaker, if the gentleman could tell us the status of that truth commission and when we might expect such a commission to be formed and perhaps produce legislation that would come to the House floor to be voted upon.

Mr. HOYER. There has been discussion of such a commission. I have supported such a commission. The Speaker has discussed it as well, as the gentleman correctly points out. At this point in time, however, there has been no action taken on the creation of such commission.

So at this point in time, I certainly wouldn't anticipate when and if legislation might come to the floor. I would not be surprised if committees of Congress, however, did, in fact, take cognizance of both of the issues the gentleman raises, and there might possibly be legislation from committees. The commission is under active consideration.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would say to the majority leader that there is a concern on this side of the aisle to make sure that any investigation, if there is a creation of a truth commission, as the Speaker has indicated she would like to see, that there be a process by which a clear discussion, if you will, revelation as to whether Members of Congress, which Members of Congress and maybe the Speaker herself was briefed on the process, on the interrogation tactic of waterboarding and would ask the gentleman, is it his intention that if such a commission were to be formed that type of open process would be followed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I certainly think that an open process would be followed.

But let me say to the gentleman, as I have said in the press, and he may have read it, much has been said about who knew what, when and where. Very frankly, my view is what the substance of this issue is what was done, why was it done, and was it done consistent with the law.

There is much opinion that it was a violation of the law and a violation of international law. That is the issue that this country needs to look at. That is the issue that this country needs to examine so that going forward, this country makes a determination as to what is lawful conduct.

In fact, of course, the former President of the United States made it very clear and enunciated, this country does not torture. The problem with that representation, as the gentleman clearly knows, is that many legal experts have indicated that, in fact, torture occurred. So from that perspective, I would tell my friend that what ought to happen is we ought to look at the substance of whether, who knew what, when, why is a distraction. That is my view, I will tell my friend. It is a beating on the table.

What we really need to do is find the facts of what was done, what was the rationale for doing it, was it legal; if it was not legal, why did we pursue it; and was it consistent with our international obligations. And as so many generals have indicated, do we want to subject our own people to such conduct when and if they may be in custody by a foreign power or terrorist?

So I say to my friend that I understand the beating on the table, if you will. But from my own personal perspective, that's not the issue on either side of the aisle, who knew what or when they knew it. What is the issue is what was done. That is my presumption of what a commission would do. I presume as well that committees of this Congress may be interested in that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I think there is certainly a concern to ensure that all laws have been followed. Certainly our primary concern is to make sure that we are protecting Americans in everything we do. And given the growing threat globally, the

terrorist threat that we face, all of us share in that end.

But I would say to the gentleman that somehow there have been statements made by the Speaker and others indicating a certain preconceived bias, like a belief that perhaps the CIA or others have somehow misled us.

I do think the gentleman is correct in saying that we need to focus on what kind of practices occurred, but I also think that in an ongoing manner, to ensure compliance with the law, we need to understand if there is some type of preconceived bias, as was indicated in some of the public statements that may have been made today. And I do think that the gentleman would agree, openness and an indication of a predisposition prior to the revelation now of who knew what when may be somehow shaping the bias in these discussions.

I share with the gentleman the notion, we need to follow the law. But if there is somehow a belief—and I'd ask the gentleman whether he shares this belief—that somehow the CIA or others have intentionally misled this body, because that seems to be some concern that has been raised today.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I have no idea of that. I don't have a belief of that nature because I have no basis on which to base such a belief. I certainly hope that's not the case. I don't draw that conclusion.

What I say to the gentleman, once again, is that to a degree, that is a distraction. It is not irrelevant, but it is a distraction from the central point. I will tell my friend that I think there is far too much discussion about what was said as opposed to what was done.

The truth commission I think has a responsibility—or whatever we call a commission that would look at this issue—not so much for what was done but to ensure that what we do going forward is legal, consistent with our values, consistent with our morals, and consistent, as the gentleman points out, with protecting our Nation and our people.

In my view, we have a responsibility to do all of those. In my view, we can do all of those. They are not inconsistent with one another. And that is what I think we ought to be looking at as we look at what happened so that what happens in the future—because certainly this Nation is going to be under threat now and in the future. I think it's very important. I frankly think that upholding our values is consistent with also protecting our security.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I remain concerned. And I think it is shared by my colleagues on this side of the aisle that if it is the intent of the Speaker and the majority leader to pursue a truth commission surrounding the investigation of terrorists and the interrogation tactics employed, that we do know what interaction this body had, the Members of this body and its committees had, in the oversight of the tactics that were employed. Because if we are all concerned about following the law, which we should be first and foremost here, and if there was acquiescence, if there was knowledge on the part of this body, but yet now allegations made suggesting that certain tactics were used and were against the law, that raises serious questions about the ability for this body going forward to properly exercise its oversight authority so we do uphold the law.

That would be our concern over here, Madam Speaker, that we make sure that there is a full vetting of what transpired so that we don't repeat the type of mistakes perhaps or we don't repeat the omission of action, if you will, on the part of this body.

With that, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 19, 2009, for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

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. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

HELP FOR NEW JERSEY SENIORS AND VETERANS

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

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the struggles of our seniors and our veterans. These are tough economic times. Many New Jersey families, seniors and veterans are struggling to make ends meet. That's why I'm pleased to know that seniors and disabled veterans are receiving a $250 economic recovery payment this month. We have to make sure our seniors and our veterans receive the benefits and relief they need and so richly deserve.

When I reviewed the first draft of the economic recovery package, I realized that retired seniors and disabled veterans were completely excluded from receiving any tax rebate. I worked quickly to fix this oversight, introducing the Safeguarding America's Seniors and Veterans Act which was included in the final recovery package enacted into law. Fortunately, New Jersey seniors and disabled veterans will now be receiving $250 in tax relief this month.

During these tough economic times, we must ensure that we take care of our seniors and our veterans, those who have made our country so great and kept us safe and free. These $250 checks have already started arriving in homes in Burlington and Ocean Counties and in Cherry Hill and are making a great difference in the lives of our seniors.

I'm happy to be part of this process.

CONGRATULATING LAUREN ZUMBACH

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate a remarkable young woman from my district, Lauren Zumbach, who was just announced as a 2009 Presidential Scholar.

The Presidential Scholar program annually recognizes 141 of the Nation's most exemplary high school seniors who have demonstrated outstanding academic performance as well as exemplary leadership, citizenship and community service. Lauren embodies all of these traits.

A poised and confident young woman, Lauren is a leader both in and out of the classroom. As a student athlete at Hinsdale Central High School, Lauren has been a straight A student while contributing to her championship cross-country team.

Her accomplishments do not end there. Outside of the classroom, Lauren has organized work days to improve local forest preserves. She has worked to instruct area children about safe online behavior. And just last fall, Lauren was the impetus behind Trot for the Troops, a 5K race that raised money for the Illinois chapter of Operation Homefront.

In a few weeks, Lauren will graduate from Hinsdale Central High School, and I congratulate her on receiving the 2009 Presidential Scholar award.

□ 1645

THE MEDIA SHOULD HOLD OBAMA ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, last week, the Obama administration increased its budget deficit projection to more than $1.8 trillion and then promptly blamed the deficit on former President Bush. Most of the national

media have blindly accepted this false charge despite facts to the contrary. President Obama did not inherit the current budget which spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. But he did vote for last year's budget as Senator. President Obama didn't inherit the $787 billion so-called ''stimulus package,'' he authored it. President Obama didn't inherit out-of-control government spending. He has presided over it.

At some point the national media needs to hold the current administration accountable for its own spending and the ballooning deficit which will increase inflation and slow economic growth.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. HOYER 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 gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA'S TREASURY IS BARE

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today we passed the supplemental bill. And I'm deeply disappointed about that. I was disappointed also that I wasn't able to get any time to enter into the debate because the time was rather limited and it was a closed rule. But I did want to make a couple of comments and the concerns that I have had about this supplemental.

When the President sent the supplemental over, it was $84.9 billion. And there were some of us that were hoping that we wouldn't be funding the war through supplementals, but it looks like that hasn't changed, the process would continue, even though there were some that believed there would be a change in the way we funded these wars. When that bill came to the House, there was a lot of expression about concern about spending too much money. But by the time it got to the floor, it was $96.7 billion. And things were added, for instance, $2 billion for the flu epidemic that didn't occur, but still, we are going to spend $2 billion trying to figure out whether we are ever going to have an epidemic.

It was very disappointing that even though it was a closed rule, the minority had one chance to do something about it and maybe reduce some of the spending. But lo and behold, when that amendment was offered, it was offered to increase the spending by $2.9 billion. There was a lot of expression of the outcry about this spending and the deficits we have and the deficits exploding and the Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid underfunded, and we are in the midst of a crisis. But it doesn't seem to bother anybody about spending. But the truth is, the Treasury is bare. The Treasury is empty. And yet we continue to spend all this money.

So where do they think they are going to get this money? Well, we can't tax the people any more. The people are broke. And yet still we resort to more borrowing and more printing of money which will not last forever. It will eventually come to an end. And I think that is what we are witnessing.

This process bothers me a whole lot that we come to the floor with the supplementals. We rush them through. We talk about this excessive spending. And lo and behold, when we finally vote, we get a total of 60 people who would say, Enough is enough. And besides, what are we doing? Where are we spending this money? I thought we were supposed to, with this change in administration, that we would be fighting less wars. But no. The war in Iraq continues. We expand the war in Afghanistan. We spread the war into Pakistan. And we always have on the table the potential danger of Iran.

So when will it ever end? We can't even define the enemy. Who exactly is the enemy over there? Is it the al Qaeda? The Taliban? Is it the Government of Pakistan? If you can't define the enemy, how do you know when the war is over? If we are in war, which we are, how can this be anything other than war? When was this war declared? Oh, well, we got this authority 5 or 10 years ago. Who knows when? Perpetual war. This is what we are involved with. Perpetual spending. And then we say, well, we have to do that to be safe. That is what is preposterous. It is the very policy that makes us unsafe. We pursue this policy, and the more we do, the less safe we are. There is a big argument now about whether we are safer now with the new administration or is it making us less safe?

The truth is the policies of the last 10, 15, 20 years have made us less safe. And as long as we occupy countries, as long as we kill other people and civilians are being killed, we are going to build enemies. And as long as we are known throughout the world that we torture people, we will incite people to hate us and want to come here to kill us. So we aren't more safe. We are less safe by this foreign policy. And some day we have to wise up, change our ways and not be the policeman of the world, not to pretend that we can be the nation builder of the world, swear off and make sure we don't torture, because you don't get worthwhile information from torture. All it does is incite people against us. And the occupations can never be of any benefit to us.

What about the financial calamity that is coming? I'm afraid this is the way this will end, through another financial crisis much bigger than the one we currently have, because you can't create $2 trillion of new money every year and expect this system to continue.

The Soviet system collapsed because they couldn't afford it. Their economic system was a total failure. We did not have to fight the Soviets. Even though they were a nuclear power, they collapsed and disintegrated. And that is what we have to be concerned about, because we cannot continue to finance this system and pursue a policy which endangers us.

So if we care about the American people and care about our liberties and care about our Constitution, we ought to look seriously at our foreign policy and not continue to pursue the supplemental appropriations where we continue to spend money that we don't have.

H.R. 1924, TRIBAL LAW AND ORDER ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1924, the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2009. I was proud to reintroduce this legislation designed to address the serious deficiencies and systemic flaws within the Federal agencies charged with providing law enforcement and justice programs in Indian country.

As the at-large Member of Congress for South Dakota, I am proud to represent nine sovereign Native nations. The Federal Government has a unique relationship with the 562 federally recognized tribes. This government-to-government relationship is established in the U.S. Constitution, recognized through hundreds of treaties, and reaffirmed through executive orders, judicial decisions and congressional action.

Law enforcement is one of the Federal Government's responsibilities to federally recognized tribes. Yet on many counts, we are failing to meet that obligation. In April, Oglala Sioux Tribe president, Theresa Two Bulls, testified at the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies' oversight hearing on law enforcement issues in Indian country. President Two Bulls discussed the law enforcement crisis on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. She explained how large, land-based reservations struggle to maintain the level of officers needed to protect tribal members.

President Two Bulls illustrated the seriousness of the public safety crisis by telling the committee of one case. A young woman living on the reservation received a restraining order against an ex-boyfriend who battered her. One night she was home alone and woke up as he attempted the break into her home with a crowbar. She immediately called the police, but due to the lack of land lines for telephones and the spotty cell phone coverage, the call was cut off three times before she reported her situation to the dispatcher. However, the nearest officer was 40 miles away. Even though the young police officer who took the call started driving to her home at 80 miles per hour, by the time he arrived, the woman was severely bloodied and beaten. The perpetrator was nowhere in sight.

All Americans should be outraged by this grossly inadequate law enforcement infrastructure which is clearly ill-equipped to deter, prevent or prosecute crimes and criminals. For families who take a basic sense of safety and security for granted, these stories should serve as a wake-up call.

And it is not an isolated incident. As I meet with tribal leaders throughout South Dakota and Indian country, I know that these tragic stories are not unique to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Amnesty International has reported that violence against Native women is particularly widespread. American Indian and Alaska Native women are more than 2½ times more likely to be raped or sexually assaulted than women in the United States in general. Yet the majority of these crimes go unpunished.

While addressing the lawless conditions in Indian country will require significant changes in the way that the Federal Government works with tribes, as well as a meaningful influx of resources into reservations in most need, H.R. 1924, the Tribal Law and Order Act, is an important step to addressing the complex and broken system of law and order in Indian country. This bill would establish accountability measures for the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice with regard to tribal law enforcement. This bill also seeks to increase local control to tribal law enforcement agencies and to authorize additional resources for tribes to address the safety and security needs of their communities.

Specifically, this bill would clarify the responsibilities of Federal, State, tribal and local governments with respect to crimes committed in tribal communities. It would increase coordination and communication among Federal, State, tribal and local law enforcement agencies. It would empower tribal governments with the authority, resources and information necessary to effectively provide for the public safety in tribal communities. It would reduce the prevalence of violent crime in tribal communities and combat violence against Indian and Alaska Native women. It would address and prevent drug trafficking and reduce rates of alcohol and drug addiction in Indian country and increase and standardize the collection of criminal data and sharing of criminal history information among Federal, State, and tribal officials responsible for responding to and investigating crimes in tribal communities.

Native American families, like all families, deserve a basic sense of safety and security in their communities. The Tribal Law and Order Act is an important step toward meeting the Federal Government's responsibility to Native communities. And I urge my colleagues to join me in moving this important legislation forward.

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

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

THE CAP-AND-TAX BILL

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it looks like the Energy and Commerce Committee is moving forward in addressing and moving on the cap-and-tax bill. And I'm coming to the floor to just talk about the real-world implications of what this bill might do. The basic premise is this: carbon fuels are bad, whether that is coal or whether that is petroleum crude oil. And because it is bad, we are going to have to monetize it, which means put additional cost on that to decrease people's use of that fuel.

There are problems with that premise. We went through the last Clean Air Act amendments in 1990 in the State of Illinois. In the Midwest particularly there were a great deal of problems. This is a picture of miners from the Peabody No. 10 mine in Kincaid, Illinois. They were part of the 14,000 United Mine Workers that lost their jobs in the last Clean Air Act amendments. At this one mine location, over 1,200 miners lost their jobs, and that has caused a devastating effect in southern Illinois.

Now, Illinois wasn't the only State affected. I always like to highlight the State of Ohio. The State of Ohio lost 35,000 mine worker jobs in the last Clean Air Act amendments—35,000 people. And that is not just individuals. That means that affects their families, the small rural communities in which they reside, the tax base for the school districts, the spin-off effects of folks having good-paying jobs averaging from 50 to $70,000 a year with benefits, gone.

□ 1700

This is an editorial in the Wall Street Journal yesterday. They used this picture. Again, a picture paints a thousand words. We know that the economy is struggling today. So this identifies ''Ship USS Recovery'' with Uncle Sam. You would think that Uncle Sam would want to help lift this economy up by throwing a lifesaver to the people who need it and create jobs. Well, Uncle Sam is doing it, but he's showing an anvil which is listed as a big tax to the drowning citizens. Now, we all may chuckle with this, but that is exactly what the cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade bill will do.

And you don't have to take my word for it. Take the word of someone highly respected, the dean of the House, Chairman Emeritus JOHN DINGELL, who said this in a committee hearing just 2 weeks ago, ''Nobody in this country realizes that cap-and-trade is a tax, and it's a great big one.''

If you don't want to take his word for it, take the word of now President Barack Obama, who was quoted as saying, ''Under my plan of the cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers.''

Now, that's real money to real citizens, citizens like these folks right now who are drowning in the inability to either make their own payments or for the manufacturing sector of our society to compete today.

What we fear, if the Democrats are successful, is that we have a hard time competing in the manufacturing sector around the world. We usually are able to compete because of low-cost power and a very efficient manufacturing sector. We can't compete on wages. We can't compete on environmental restrictions of sovereign nations. So if we take another variable off the table of how we can compete, what will happen is this: We will drive more manufacturing companies offshore to countries that aren't going to comply with monetizing carbon. Who are these countries? China, India, who have stated over and over again they don't care what the United States is going to do, they are going to continue to build, in the case of China, one new coal-fired power plant every 10 days. What we could do is we could go all the way down to zero and the world's carbon dioxide emissions are going to increase.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COST OF THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I have come to this floor repeatedly. In fact, I have come to the floor over 300 times to discuss the human costs of war. Our brave men and women in uniform have given their lives in service to our Nation, and tens of thousands have returned home with physical and mental scars. And it isn't over yet.

The costs in treasure and blood will be felt for generations. The National Priority Project has done a comprehensive review of the costs, and they are actually staggering.

Since 2001, 675 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan and more than 2,600 soldiers have been wounded in action. The trend is not encouraging: The U.S. death toll has escalated each year, from 12 in 2001 to 99 in 2005, 117 in 2004, and 155 in 2008. And it's not over.

The war in Afghanistan has cost taxpayers $171 billion. With the supplemental that was passed today, we have just added $77 billion to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan through the year 2009. Obviously, it's not over. An additional $130 billion will fund both wars anticipated in the 2010 budget.

It appears from today's vote that many here in the House of Representatives haven't learned the lesson from our occupation of Iraq. And according to policy experts, Iraq is going to look like a cakewalk compared to the battles that we will be seeing in Afghanistan.

Let's look at what the occupation of Iraq has actually brought: The occupation of Iraq has cost $656 billion so far, with another $52 billion voted on today as part of the fiscal year 2009 war supplemental. At least $2 trillion in future budgetary costs, including veterans' benefits, will be spent in the very near future. Almost 4,300 U.S. servicemembers have died in Iraq so far. And hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been maimed and killed.

Madam Speaker, the costs are too great. We don't have a defined mission in Afghanistan. We do not have a development plan. Our endless military presence will only serve to fuel anti-Americanism throughout the region. But it continues to go on.

So what's the cost here at home? As we experience one of the worst economic recessions in our Nation's history, every taxpayer dollar becomes more valuable. Today the majority in the House decided that funding an endless occupation of two countries is more important than education, health care, and renewable energy right here at home.

For my State of California, the war in Afghanistan has already cost us $21 billion. That means 2.6 million new Head Start places for children that need to go to school. It means 9 million individuals could have been provided with health care, 38.7 million homes could have been provided with renewable electricity.

We make choices every day on the House floor. Today that choice reflects a decision to keep our troops in Iraq until the end of 2011 and in Afghanistan indefinitely. This vote does not invest in SMART Security. It does not take us into the 21st century, because for every dollar in the supplemental dedicated for smart humanitarian investment, $8 will be spent on the military. And it keeps going on.

I want to say we either change the way we meet our obligations and have a different way of coming together with nations that we don't agree with or we're going to be in a lot of trouble as human beings.

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.)

TROUBLES IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY ARE NOT JUST A MICHIGAN PROBLEM; TODAY WE SEE THEY ARE AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I represent a district in southeast Michigan. We are a part of the very heart and soul of our domestic auto industry, an industry that has served our country very well. It's built the weapons that America needed in times of war when our freedom itself was at risk. It's provided millions of Americans an opportunity for a good job with good benefits and a secure retirement.

We all understand that the American auto industry has fallen on very, very hard times. Those of us in southeast Michigan understand it well. It's not a new development. We are painfully aware of it. We've dealt with plant closings and thousands of jobs lost. We've dealt with families torn apart, home foreclosures, and communities devastated. And we've endured massive new unfunded Federal mandates placed upon our industry, which have made it very difficult to compete. We've watched as Federal and State incentives have been offered to foreign competitors to come into our home market on equal terms, even though similar access to foreign markets has not been offered to our domestic companies. We've seen this government negligent in not formulating a manufacturing policy that protects vital American interests and good-paying American jobs. And for years we never asked for help.

But when Wall Street melted down last year, our problems were made even worse because 80 percent of the people who are going to buy an automobile require credit and not enough credit was available, and, of course, auto sales have just fallen through the floor. And when the auto companies came to Capitol Hill to ask for similar assistance that's been given to the Wall Street banks, those whose actions made their problems even worse, the auto industry was treated with disdain and their pleas for help were rejected by this Congress, which seemed indifferent to the problem and to the desire to protect American jobs.

This was a Michigan problem we were told, not an American problem. We tried to remind our colleagues of everything that this industry has meant to our great Nation, and again we received indifference and we were told, Just let them go into bankruptcy.

We were told that these companies needed to shed their legacy costs. Well, guess what. Legacy costs have names. They are people. And we're told that this has to be done because these foreign competitors who were given free access to our market do not have such legacy costs. Or imports which are built by low-wage workers overseas do not have these legacy costs. We are told we need to drive American wages down to match Third World competitors in order to compete.

Well, today we see that this is not just a Michigan problem anymore; today it is an American problem. Today Chrysler is in bankruptcy court, exactly what many in this Congress advocated for. And today Chrysler filed a list of 789 dealerships whose franchise agreements it is asking the bankruptcy court to sever. That means the closure of 789 dealerships in communities all across our great Nation.

These businesses represent not just a place to buy a car, but they represent community leaders, the sponsors of the Little League teams or the chairman of the Rotary. In many cases the biggest job provider in the town. The average dealer in this Nation, Madam Speaker, employs over 50 people. So this move means the loss of over 40,000 more jobs. Now 789 communities across this Nation will feel the pain of a contracting domestic auto industry. The pain of a business shutting down, the pain of jobs lost, the pain of families who will be devastated.

And tomorrow that pain will only get worse as General Motors is also set to release a list of dealers it hopes to shed and a list that will be much, much larger than 789 dealers.

Madam Speaker, this list was submitted as a part of that bankruptcy filing, a bankruptcy that many Members were advocating for when they believed it was just a Michigan problem. And now we see Members lamenting the fact that dealerships in their districts are closing. And they fail to realize that if this bankruptcy had happened last December, when they voted against bridge loans for the auto industry, it would have included every Chrysler dealer, because a disorderly bankruptcy would have led to the liquidation of Chrysler. So some Members got what they advocated for, Chrysler in bankruptcy, which today has led to the loss of 40,000 jobs. And tomorrow it will get worse.

It is time to understand that preserving, protecting, and defending our auto industry doesn't just solve a Michigan problem, it solves an American problem, and it defends jobs in every community in our great Nation.

It is a shame, Madam Speaker, that we had to learn this lesson on the backs and the livelihoods of another 40,000 of our fellow Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BERKLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1715

EMBRACE MARRIAGE EQUALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Today I want to recognize some actions in my home State. Last week Maine became the fifth State in the country to embrace marriage equality.

Same-sex couples live all over our State in loving, committed relationships, raising families and growing old together, yet they have not been afforded the rights and responsibilities that come with marriage. Last week our legislature took a major step towards correcting that injustice.

In the week leading up to the vote, thousands of people filled the Augusta Civic Center to testify on the marriage equality bill. People came from all over our State, men and women, straight and gay, young and old, couples and single people. Many of them waited hours for their turn to speak. When they got to the microphone, the overwhelming majority said it was time for Maine to recognize same-sex marriage.

Maine moved the country one step closer to federally recognizing and protecting the right for two people, regardless of their gender, to be married. Maine has always been an independent State with a forward-looking legislative body and citizens with common sense.

I stand here today to congratulate my home State on the passage of this landmark victory.

The landmark victory didn't come easily or without long debate. Many personal journeys began and ended with this lengthy discussion.

My daughter happens to be the Speaker of the House, and she shared her own personal story, which, with pride, I would like to share a few of her words which reflected our family's feelings. She said, when she got up to testify, ''This issue was brought home for me two summers ago when my husband and I were married. Our island pastor was on a trip abroad and unavailable to perform our wedding ceremony. My husband and I wanted to be married by someone we knew and trusted. We asked a good family friend to perform our wedding; we knew his tone, his presence, and his sense of humor would be perfect. He was honored to do it, and we immediately got to work planning the ceremony. Throughout the preparations for the wedding, he gave us honest and valuable advice about the joys and challenges of a lifetime of commitment to another person. He gave us some of the best advice either of us has ever received about marriage.

''As we drove away from our wedding rehearsal, all of us happy and relieved that everything seemed to be going well, my friend said to me, 'I am honored to perform your wedding. It is going to be great. But it is important to understand that you and Jason have the right to do something very special, and it's a right that I don't have. The friend that married us is a gay man who has been living in a committed and loving relationship with the same man for more than 30 years.

''I was struck in that moment that a person whom I respected and trusted, a person as close to me as some of my dearest relatives, a person whose relationship was a model for trust, compassion, longevity, was legally denied a right and status that my husband and I were about to be granted. There is nothing fair about giving some committed couples in Maine the right to the legal responsibilities and privileges of marriage and denying it to others.''

That was my daughter, Hannah, the Speaker of the House's story, and one that held great meaning to my family and to so many of us across Maine as we considered the plight of many of our friends in committed relationships who haven't been allowed the right to make it legal.

When the deliberation ended at the public hearing and it was time to vote, many of Maine's State legislators found themselves in new territory. As Governor Baldacci made clear just after signing the marriage equity bill into law, he said, ''In the past, I opposed gay marriage while supporting the idea of civil unions. I have come to believe that this is a question of fairness and of equal protection under the law, and that a civil union is not equal to civil marriage.''

Madam Speaker, as we in this body consider the future of issues of equality, it is important that we all take a moment to reflect on the history that was made in Augusta, Maine, this month. Eighty-nine State representatives, 21 State senators, and one Governor put themselves on record supporting fairness and equality, and one more State voted to do the right thing.

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

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

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. QUIGLEY 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 gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HONORING NEUMANN COLLEGE ACHIEVING UNIVERSITY STATUS

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

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable institution of higher education focused on developing graduates, who understand that true reward comes not only through acquiring knowledge, but also the use of that knowledge in the service of others.

In the fall of 1965, the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia opened Our Lady of Angels College, based in both liberal arts and Franciscan traditions, with just 115 female students in Aston, Pennsylvania. In 1980, male students were admitted for the first time and the board of trustees approved changing the college's name to Neumann as a tribute to the significant role former Bishop, and now St. John, Neumann played in the order's early formation.

Forty-four years later, through the tireless efforts of the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia and their many supporters, the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania is home to a new university. On April 30, the Pennsylvania Department of Education recognized more than 2 years of research, planning, applications, and campus

evaluations by issuing a certificate of authority to elevate Neumann College to university status.

The process of converting from a college to a university is lengthy and complicated, requiring the addition of full undergraduate studies in the arts and sciences, professional graduate programs, a doctoral program, and cultural programming open to the community. Neumann College's visionary and perseverant leaders, President Rosalie Mirenda and Vice President for Mission and Ministry, Sister Marguerite O'Beirne, OSF, have worked tirelessly with the entire Neumann staff to make the conversion possible.

In addition to schools of business and nursing, Neumann offers a college of arts and sciences, as well as six graduate and two doctoral programs. What sets Neumann apart from other colleges and universities is its unparalleled ability to educate its students outside of the classroom through programs that sharpen social awareness and ethical concern, which I have observed myself.

As Dr. Mirenda so eloquently writes of Neumann, ''We will give you the opportunity to experience the reality that learning and living are one; that education is truly the combination of the intellect, the body, the heart, and the soul, and that education is about relationships, going deeper into your being to discover the special gift of yourself and all creation that surrounds you.''

As part of its mission, Neumann University has a very strong minority recruitment program. Neumann works aggressively to see that a values-based private education is affordable to as many young men and women as possible. Neumann imbues each student with the notion that learning is a lifelong process.

Achieving university status marks the culmination of a remarkable transformation for Neumann. It is a living testament of the decency, hard work, and absolute commitment of the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia.

Madam Speaker, today I acknowledge the 8,327 living alumni, the 3,037 current students, and the 507 faculty and staff, board of trustees, and President Mirenda especially on achieving their goal of advancing Neumann University as a recognized institution of higher education in the Catholic Franciscan tradition. I commend their dedication to making ours a better community, Nation, and world with so many better students and people.

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

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

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009 AND 2010 FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revised 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations for each of the fiscal years 2009 and 2010. Section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13 permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for overseas deployments and other activities when these activities are so designated. Such a designation is included in H.R. 2346, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. A table is attached.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION

[In millions of dollars]

	BA	OT
Current allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,391,471	1,082,540
Fiscal Year 2010	1,220,843	1,269,745
Change for H. R. 2346 overseas deployment and other activities designation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	90,745	0
Fiscal Year 2010	24,989	34,888
Revised allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,216	1,082,540
Fiscal Year 2010	1,245,832	1,304,633

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE FROM THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, let me welcome America and the rest of the world to the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour. We would like to call it ''The Progressive Message.''

And the Progressive message is something that the Progressive Caucus does every week to project a Progressive vision for America; not a reactionary vision, not a status quo vision, but a vision of America as we believe that it could be, can be, that all men and women are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Progressive Caucus and the Progressive message, tonight, are here to come to bring a message to the people about where we are going, where we have been. And tonight's topic is ''Why I'm a Progressive.''

Why I'm a Progressive; here's why. We are going to talk about it tonight, and it's going to be good. And to help us get kicked off on this subject of why I am a Progressive, I want to yield to the gentlelady from the great State of California, who is also one of our co-Chairs, LYNN WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Colorado for being here, and the gentlewoman is going to be here, too.

Mr. ELLISON. From the great State of Maine.

Ms. WOOLSEY. She just announced to us the great progressiveness of her family and her State. Believe me, I honor you. Thank you for being part of this.

Progressive liberal, liberal Progressive. I mean, how often have we been chastised for being liberals? So we changed the word to ''progressive.'' It means exactly the same thing to me. I am proud if people call me a liberal, and I am proud to be a Progressive, because it is the same thing.

And what does that mean to all of us? What does it mean to me? Why do I want a label? Why do I care?

You know what? It's because I can count on Progressives, the people that I know to be Progressives, to put out their hand when somebody needs help, and that means here, as legislators, to know that our job is to work for those who have less, who maybe have come upon hard times and need a short-term lift. That's why I supported a welfare system that had a floor to it, that would actually help poor people so they didn't fall through the net.

And I am also going to say one more thing about being a Progressive. A Progressive, to me, knows that organized labor made the difference in this country in bringing a middle class to the United States of America, a class where families could work, could afford to buy their own home, could send their children to college and at the same time pay into their own retirement system so they could be independent when they retired, and, oh, what a concept, have health care.

So that's what Progressive values are to me and that's what being a Progressive is about, having the values, having the concerns, having the empathy for others and knowing that it isn't about us. We work for everybody in this country.

Mr. ELLISON. We have been here on the House floor together before, and at that time in the past you shared one of your own personal stories about what motivated you toward Progressive politics.

□ 1730

But leave it to say that the gentlelady from California, our co-Chair, LYNN WOOLSEY, came to Progressive politics not just because of something she read in the book, but because of the life that she lived that helped her understand what the importance of Progressive politics are all about.

I yield back to the gentlelady. Is that right?

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is absolutely true. But I have to tell you, when I was

a mom with my three little kids and my husband that eventually became mentally unbalanced but was very successful before we were 30 years old, I was the one in our group of friends that was arguing for other people.

So I have gone through going on welfare and taking care of my three children and all that. That just solidified for me. Thank heavens, I had that hand up. I certainly think that my job is to make sure others get the same advantage as I had.

But I was fighting for the underdog, for the person who needed help, and for the education of all, way back there when I was very comfortable.

Mr. ELLISON. The fact is that many of us come to our own conclusions about the need for shared prosperity, and some of us find that that helping hand that we would give others, sometimes we need it ourselves.

But, you know what? It's okay, because Progressive politics has a long, strong, proud history in the United States. Part of that history has been fighting for peace. And that fight goes on today.

I want to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative POLIS, who has some views on that. How does Progressive politics inform you as you search for America as a more peaceful partner in the world?

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you. I thank my colleague from Minnesota. Just today, hours ago in this very Chamber, we had a debate—not enough debate—but a debate about American military activities overseas in Afghanistan and Iraq, and specifically around Congress's role in funding these efforts.

I was proud to cast my vote against the supplemental. I think we need to fundamentally rethink the militaristic aspects of our foreign expeditions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

To me, what is a Progressive? It's somebody that questions the status quo. Who always asks, What can be better? Somebody who constantly seeks something closer for humanity to the state of perfection.

We know that it is patriotic to question authority rather than blindly follow authority. And that's an important distinction both in this Chamber as well as with one's friends when we're having discussions.

The most patriotic thing that we can do as Americans is ask ourselves these tough questions: Why are we occupying Iraq? Why are we occupying Afghanistan? Why are we putting our men and women in harm's way and causing many more casualties on the other side as well? What is our role ongoing in these countries?

Of course, Progressives want to protect America. Of course, we're concerned with the terrorist threat; of course, we want policies that protect our citizens and reduce the risk of terrorism here and abroad. But we question the conventional wisdom. Why does attacking a country that had nothing to do with 9/11 reduce the risk of terrorism here?

Mr. ELLISON, do you think that that had any effect on terrorism here?

Mr. ELLISON. The gentleman has yielded to me. The attack on Iraq is the single worst decision any President of the United States has ever made. And I'm proud to say the Progressives stood up and voiced opposition to it. But not only that—Vietnam. Not only that, members of the Progressive community have stood up and questioned the very military buildup itself and the United States posture in the world.

You know, I'd like to share with the gentleman, if I may, and the gentlelady from Maine, that if you took every military budget in the entire world—I'm talking about Palau, Timor-Leste; I'm talking about places like Indonesia, Kenya, wherever—and you added them all up and you compared them to the United States military budget, ours would still be bigger.

We spend more money on military armaments than every other country in the world—and many of our military expenditures go to things that have absolutely positively nothing whatsoever to do with fighting terrorism. They're for fighting Russians—states that are confined within nonporous borders, state actors, not nonstate actors who are fluidly moving throughout the world.

So I toss it back to the gentleman from Colorado and yield to the gentleman from Colorado. Have Progressives stood up for peace? What do you think?

Mr. POLIS. I just have one more thing to add. A majority of Americans agree that Iraq was a mistake—invading Iraq was a mistake. It shows that Progressives were right at the time to question that war. And if you recall, as I do, at that time there were many people saying, Oh, you're against the war; your un-American; you're unpatriotic. You're rolling over to the terrorists.

That war—and this is the majority consensus now, and you have mainstream groups across the ideological spectrum, you even hear this from the other side of the aisle, looking back, saying, If we knew what we knew today, we should not have invaded the country of Iraq.

Asking those tough questions, those critical questions, can be politically difficult at times. But it makes our country greater and it's how Progressive Americans across our country express their patriotism, by asking those questions that nobody else is asking, by not taking the wisdom from on high, be it from a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, that that's the way things are, but to use our own minds and rational thought to look at the information and look at it from an objective perspective and try to make our own opinion—not being pressured by outside groups or groups that might have an economic interest in a perpetual war, but rather to form our own opinions and voice our dissent where appropriate.

Thank you for the time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. Let's now introduce our freshman colleague from the great State of Maine, Representative PINGREE, who comes here with a long-term service of the people of the State of Maine, but who is going to focus on another aspect of what it means to be a Progressive.

There's the peace aspect, there's the question of domestic economic progressivity, but there's also this element of Progressive politics, which says individual liberty is very important.

Let me yield to the gentlelady because she made a very important 5-minute speech today, which we would ask her to elaborate on just a little bit. Let me yield to the gentlelady from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you very much. Thank you to all of my colleagues here today. It's nice to have the opportunity to join the two of you.

I first want to say that I concur. It was an important day to cast the vote that many of us did to recognize that there are serious issues around Iraq and Afghanistan. In spite of many of us coming from States where we have a lot of people serving in the military, and I greatly respect their service and the importance that all of us see in taking care of those who serve their country, this was also an important day to talk about the essential nature of finding an end to the conflict and making sure that we send the President that message.

I thank you for giving me this chance to talk a little bit about what it means to be a Progressive. You're right, I was fortunate to be on the floor just a few moments before we started the Progressive Hour to recognize something that had gone on in my State in the past week.

Maine is now the fifth State in the Nation to recognize the equality of marriage that everyone, regardless of their gender, should have the right to marry. As we all know, this can often be a contentious and difficult debate.

Thousands of people literally turned out at a public hearing in Maine to discuss this topic. People from all walks of life; from all religious backgrounds; people who were married and who weren't married.

I very proudly quoted from my daughter today. My daughter happens to be the Speaker of the House in Maine—far more important than her mother—and she gave a very eloquent speech about the fact she was married only a couple of summers ago by a wonderful friend of our family. And during the conversation preparing for the wedding, it occurred to her that her good friend who was marrying her had been part of a couple for 30 years, but because he was the same gender as her partner, was not allowed to be married.

So the person who gave her good advice, who performed the ceremony, was able to remind her everyone should have this right. I believe fundamentally it should be a Federal right. We should be talking about this at some point in our tenure.

But I'm just so proud of my home State, my own Governor, the State legislators, many of them who thought long and hard about the best way to cast their vote, but in the end said, Our goal is to do the right thing.

I just want to follow up a little bit about some of the things that you were already talking about before I close my remarks, but really on this idea of what it is to be a Progressive because JARED rightfully said that it's sometimes about asking the questions, of searching a little bit further, of taking the tough votes. I also think it is a matter of recognizing that we're all in this together.

For me, getting into politics—and I was first elected to the State legislature in 1992—but I became a school board member in my community years before that. Part of what I learned along the way is that the reason we do this is to recognize that we're all in this together. That if we're not all succeeding together; if we don't have health care; if everyone doesn't have a job; if we're not thinking ahead about the security or everyone, whether you're a soldier or not a soldier, we're not going to get ahead in the world. We're not going to have the kind of world that we want to have.

To me, that is the fundamental of this—our overarching political philosophy is just recognizing that none of us get ahead unless we all do it together. For me, that's always a question when I make a decision, whether it's an economic decision or an issue of health care.

I have been a small business owner. I'm proud to say that I employ other people. But I want to make sure that they're treated well, that they get fair wages, that their health care is covered. I believe that's part of the fundamental of the responsibility that we share to each other in this country and in countries abroad.

For me, that's a fundamental principle, and I'm proud to share these moments with my colleagues from Minnesota and Colorado, where I know those are their fundamental values, as well as many others that they bring to the floor today.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. Do you think that perhaps part of the Progressive tradition is this idea of individual liberty? There are certain things that we as Americans may not agree on, but we will agree that the decision rests with the individual.

I can't tell you, from Maine, how many children you should have, or whether you should have any. I can't tell you who to marry or who not to marry. I can't tell you about these essential decisions that are like your business.

This is a very Progressive idea. Sometimes when you hear about the government getting off people's backs, you associate it with people who are on the ''right'' end of the political spectrum. But when it comes to many other decisions that are essential and private, these are Progressive values.

How does the gentlelady from Maine feel about this idea?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Well, absolutely. Maine is an interesting State. We're about a third Republican, a third Democrat, and a third Independent, but pretty much everybody is independent there. I would say the overarching value that most people share is this idea that there is a right of privacy, of individual liberty; that I'm not going to interfere with your right to live your life in the way you choose as long as you respect my rights as well.

Because of that, even though we're economically quite disadvantaged in my State—it's about 38th in per capita income—people have worked hard to take care of each other, but also to somewhat leave each other alone. We have a lot of independent fishermen and farmers and people who make a living in a variety of ways, and most of them would say, Just preserve my independence and individual liberty and, while you're at it, can you make sure we get health care coverage.

But I think it's because people see those as values that should be shared, that come together.

Mr. ELLISON. If I can turn to the gentleman from Colorado. The gentlelady from Maine makes an interesting point. Part of the Progressive vision is doing things together which we should and could do together, and doing things separately, then maybe we get to make that call on our own. Maybe we should make sure that all Americans have health care, that everyone is safe, that women don't have to live in a home where they fear battering, and that we have a criminal justice system that protects them from that.

But maybe on certain other decisions like marriage or other things, that's just your business and we let people make decisions for themselves on that. How does the gentleman feel about this issue?

Mr. POLIS. If only those who object most vociferously to the government taking a dollar from my wallet to care for my brother and sister in this country would also object to the government appearing at the bedroom door, telling me who to marry, telling a woman whether or not to make the difficult decision to terminate her pregnancy. It is in fact somewhat hypocritical that while there seems to be a lot of care for the material aspects of freedom, there doesn't seem to be as much concern that I hear voiced for the equally, if not more important, personal aspects of freedom.

Truly, each individual is more important than the sum of their assets or a little entry on a ledger book. That might be a part of who you are—a very small part—but that's how you put food on the table and how you live, but there's a lot more to everybody. And when we as Progressives are talking about freedom, we're talking about the rest of the realm of our lives; those important everyday decisions in how you live.

And no, government shouldn't be telling people who to marry or whether or not to end a pregnancy or whether or not to use a certain kind of research that could save lives. No one is forced to engage in that research; no one is forced to even terminate a pregnancy; no one is forced to marry a gay person. But the question is: Should you have the right to do it if you wanted? And I think as Progressives, our answer is an unabashed yes.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentleman would yield, when it comes to this issue of marriage equality, I always say to people that it's not mandatory. It's up to the individual. What about individual liberty?

I just want to ask the two Members with me today, the gentleman from Colorado, the gentlelady from Maine, to just review with me, if you would, some of these things that I believe were Progressive in nature.

□ 1745

When it comes to this issue of the American Revolution, I think it was progressive. Yes, America was a slaveholding country. Yes, women didn't have equal rights. And, yes, there were a lot of problems. But if you look in that day and in that time for the American colonialists to say we are not going to ruled by a king and we are going to choose our leaders, that was a progressive step forward.

We may look at that time and say there were problems, people didn't overcome a lot of social injustices. But if we look at it for what it was, individual citizens saying I don't want a king making up my mind for me, I want to cast a vote and select my own leaders, that, I believe, was a progressive step forward.

The Bill of Rights I think was progressive. Think about the first one: No government religious institution, everyone practices their own religion as they choose; the establishment clause; right to freedom of the press; right to assembly; right to redress grievances. It was a progressive step forward.

Universal white male suffrage. Of course, not all Americans got the right to vote at the same time, but there was a time when being a white male was not good enough to get you a ballot. You had to have some property. You could not be Catholic, you had to be a white male Protestant property owner. So when America said the property thing and the religious thing, those don't apply any more. Of course we would have liked to have more people get the franchise, but a lot of people got it.

Public education; emancipation of the slaves; national park system; food safety; break up of monopolies; antitrust legislation—progressive. The Homestead Act. Land grant universities so that all Americans could really enjoy a university education.

What about this one, I would like to ask the gentlelady from Maine, what about rural electrification, was that a progressive step forward for America?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Absolutely. I am glad you put this list forward today. I think it is an excellent collection of those things that we have done collectively to make sure that we are all better off.

Rural electrification was a very progressive idea. The idea that for economic development, for everyone to succeed, for people to have better opportunities, we all needed to be connected to each other.

I think one of the things that this underscores about Progressive values is the idea that you need to choose those things that will really benefit everybody. We all recognize we can't do everything. People sometimes accuse us of expecting government to do everything. We don't want to do that, and we don't want government to meddle in everything. But this is a very good list of those things that have benefited the greatest amount of people. And coming from a rural State, I know the importance of rural electrification.

In fact, I happen to live in a community that is about to construct a major wind tower, benefiting us as we look into the future, and we are still able to do that because of the organization that is there around rural electrification.

Mr. ELLISON. Would the gentlelady talk for a moment about the corollary of rural electrification and extending broadband access to all of America?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Absolutely. Again, representing a rural State, most people don't know, but Maine happens to be the most rural State in the Nation. Most of us live in small communities without access to cable, and the kinds of things that many other people have. Broadband has become essential for communication, education, and running a small business. Any kind of business, you need to be able to connect to people on the Net.

I personally run a business, and people wouldn't be able to find us if it wasn't for the Internet. But the fact is that many small communities don't have this. This is one of the reasons that this was part of the stimulus package that many of us supported and voted for because we believed it would help communities move ahead. Sometimes it is an inner-city neighborhood, and sometimes it is a distant neighborhood that needs that access to broadband. I think there is a correlation between what went on with the REA and rural electrification and what we are trying to do today to make sure that everybody in America has access to high-speed Internet. It is fundamental for education and now for medicine. We have many doctors who are able to diagnose at a distance in those communities that can't have a full-time doctor or the kinds of medical specialties that they need.

But people want to live and work in those communities. It is a great part of the American tradition. Whether you are a fisherman or a farmer, we want to continue that. It is a very important part of why we need to expand broadband.

Mr. ELLISON. I think it is a Progressive value because it says, look, we know Americans who live in rural America like living there. They grow the crops and they enjoy that life. But if there is no economy out there, then it is difficult to live out there and you see young people moving into the city, not necessarily because they want to but because they feel that they have to.

This rural electrification in one generation, broadband access in another, represents our shared commitment to each other to live our lives as we would choose.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Absolutely. People would say fundamentally, it was a part of America to expand west and be in rural areas. Many people choose the environment of rural America. But, frankly, we are dependent on those people who choose to grow our food, harvest our fish. Many in my State harvest the trees that make our paper and make our furniture. These are people with solid American values. Kids have wonderful schools to attend, and feel safe in their communities. We want to have more people who can have the opportunity to live there.

One of the biggest issues in my State is, How am I going to make a living and support myself? I think it is an important Progressive value to say what exactly does government need to do. We know we need to have security and roads. Maybe a high-speed train. You need to have health care available to you so you can feel comfortable and secure. But you also need broadband access. It is a very important thing.

Mr. ELLISON. Moving down the list, women's suffrage, 1920. It is important for Americans to know that women could not always vote in America. It was progressive women, Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and others who stood up and fought. It was Sojourner Truth and a man by the name of Frederick Douglass fighting for women's right to vote. And it was women in the West who made the claim, we are already voting. You may not have a constitutional right to do it, but we do it in our State, and they helped lead the way.

But what about the abolition of child labor, the 8-hour workday? Pretty progressive. We all hope we can do that. Minimum wage, Social Security, civil rights for minorities and women, voting rights for minorities and the poor. Cleaning up our air, water, toxic dump sights, consumer product safety and Medicare.

Today, I ask the gentlelady from Maine, are we done? Has the Progressive agenda been completed? Do we have more work to do?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. We are both standing here and many of our colleagues are here, many who wouldn't necessarily call themselves Progressive, but they are here because they want to pass more legislation that will foster our Progressive values.

That is a wonderful list that looks at issues that people struggle with in the economy. But the fact is, I would say that one of the number one concerns of people in America today is to have access to health care and have it be affordable. I think that needs to be added to that list. I think many of us won't rest until it is done.

Many Members in this Chamber hear from their constituents every day, Do something about health care. I am thrilled that we passed a budget with $630 billion in it for health care, but we have a lot of work to do to actually design the system and make sure that it is available to everybody, whether you are running a small business or you are an individual who has no coverage, or struggles with coverage that has such a big deductible it doesn't provide you with the care you need when you are sick.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, we have a great progressive history, but we have a tall order to do. We have to get health care to all Americans. We have to make sure that we have a green renewable future so we can live in harmony with the planet. The planet is going to keep on turning. Whether we can continue to survive on it is another question.

I am happy that in the 110th and 111th Congress, we were able to pass legislation like the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which is an important step forward for people to bring pay equity lawsuits when they were victims of gender discrimination on the job.

We were able to pass the children's health insurance program, not health care for all, but health care for children, a very important bill.

We were able to pass the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which is a law that says, Look, you can have your value system as to how you feel about different sets of Americans, but you better not harm them. They are within the protection of the law. They have a right. People like Matthew Shepard will not be harmed. The rest of us will not tolerate it, and that is how we express our values for all human beings.

And as you pointed out the, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the so-called stimulus act which gave a tax cut to middle-class Americans. Progressives aren't against tax cuts; we are just against tax cuts for only the rich people. We believe that working people ought to get a break sometimes, too.

So these kinds of things are things that we are fighting on. This may be the history, but we have a tall agenda

for the future that we want all Americans to partake of.

I want to say briefly that to be a Progressive is to be one who believes, yes we have our individual rights, but we also have things that we proudly share together, like our safety and clean water and like our environmental legal regime.

But on the other side, what a Progressive is not, what a Progressive is not is somebody who basically operates on the basis of fear-based politics. We boldly say we can do this new thing together. We are not afraid to embrace the future. But there is a set of politics that says be afraid, be very afraid. The Russians or somebody is going to get you, and you have to be afraid. You can't share with anybody. You just have to look out for yourself. That is a set of political ideas that is prevalent around here, too; and those ideas are not the ones that made America great. The ones that made America great are the ones listed on this board and the ones that we are talking about now.

I yield to Ms. PINGREE for your final comments.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. You have said almost everything that needs to be said. You have a great chart. In talking about some of the proud things in progressive history, I want to emphasize that virtually everything on that list is where people have said, We are all in this together. What do we need to take care of the basic fundamentals in this world so that we can prosper, so we can be safe and healthy and have a sense of security? That is what we are dedicated to.

I know those are the commonsense values of people in my State, people of vastly different political perspectives and economic perspectives who say, Look, unless we are all in this together—we have to move forward together or we are not going to get anywhere.

As you mentioned, we have a tall order in front of us. We have done a lot in the few months we have been here. And I feel proud as a freshman to have come at this moment in time when we have a President who cares so deeply about our relations around the world, economic justice for people and health care. It is a great moment to be here, but it is certainly a difficult task. Many, many people are struggling in this economy. States like mine are having a hard time balancing their budget and getting ahead. We have a lot of work here to do. I have been pleased to be here tonight, and look forward to many other dialogues like this in the future as we accomplish many of our goals.

Mr. ELLISON. As I just wrap up, this is the Progressive message. We have had Members, including Congresswoman WOOLSEY, Congressman POLIS, and Congresswoman PINGREE, talk about why I am a Progressive, giving their personal testimony and giving their own ideas and values about this critical subject.

We also want folks to be able to check in on the Website right here: http://cpc.grijalva.house.gov. Very important for people who are watching to check in and check out the Progressive Caucus agenda. It is very important. The Progressive Caucus is a moral force within the Congress bringing America to its better half.

I agree with Congresswoman PINGREE, who pointed out that all of these things on this list are things where people said, Look, let's embrace our common life, our shared life. But these are all things, and I think that Congresswoman PINGREE would agree with me, that before they were passed, people said it can't be done. They said this is something that we shouldn't do. But you know what? All of these things were done, and we are all as Americans much better off for it.

Let me also wrap up by saying that it was the words of President Barack Obama, who said in his first address to Congress, ''I reject the view that says our problems will simply take care of themselves, that government has no role in laying the foundation of our common prosperity.'' That rejected view, I submit, is a conservative view because government does have an important role to play in our common prosperity, and our problems will not simply take care of themselves.

□ 1800

President Obama went on to say, ''For history tells a different story. History reminds us that at every moment of economic upheaval and transformation, this Nation has responded with bold action and big ideas.'' I quite agree with the President on this point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL NOMINEE DAWN JOHNSEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate being recognized and having the privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

One of the things that I am able to receive as I come down here and prepare for my hour here is an opportunity to listen to my colleagues and sometimes an opportunity to get an education. And if one listens carefully, Madam Speaker, there is a lot to be learned in this Congress. In fact, I believe that this is the most amazing educational experience that one could ask for.

We are the center of information here in many ways. Washington, DC, is a magnet for information. And as Members, we have staff and committee people that gather that information at our request and give it to us in a means by which we can understand it, process it, and utilize it.

In this information age that we have, this electronic era that we have, the Internet is full of information. The Library of Congress is full of information. There are all kinds of links out there; many of them are very credible, some of them are not very credible. So we sort through, and we are always looking at what is the original source. How do you document the credibility? Well, you figure out who the person was that wrote it and their measure of credibility.

So as I come to the floor and listen tonight, I am rather amazed at what I've learned. I saw this long list of successes of the Progressives. And I've lived through a fair amount of history by now, Madam Speaker, and I've studied a lot of history by now, and I had never equated the Revolutionary War to Progressives. That's a new thing to me. That's a revolution to me. It's a revelation to me that it was the Progressive group that decided that we should throw off the yolk of King George and grasp our freedom.

It seems to me that it was the Founding Fathers and those who shaped this Nation who put down in the document of the Declaration of Independence—that inspirational document—that our rights come from God and that those rights that flow from God into man are granted willingly to the people. That's a structure that—I guess you could call it progressive, but I haven't heard anybody on this side of the aisle that calls themselves Progressive stand up and say that their rights come from God or that there are natural rights and there is a natural order of things and it's ordered by the Master of the universe. That's what our Founding Fathers believed. That was the inspiration that shaped America. It was the inspiration that brought about the Declaration, and it was the inspiration that caused the perseverance that allowed the United States to prevail over the British in the Revolutionary War.

The Nation was forged on those fundamental values that haven't been openly rejected by the Progressives, but neither have they been embraced by the Progressive Caucus. But almost night after night I hear these things. The American Revolution, a success of the Progressives. That's a new one. I had not heard that one before.

The emancipation of the slaves. Well, that's an idea that is related to change. The institution of slavery had existed for thousands of years. But I didn't know that Abraham Lincoln and the abolitionists were considered to be Progressives. I thought they were, Madam Speaker, Republicans. In fact, I'm sure they were Republicans. I have no doubt about it.

The history of my family and the history of my understanding of the Republican Party is it was forged in order to abolish slavery. That's why they came about. That's why they formed together and nominated Abraham Lincoln because he was the abolitionist

candidate, the first Republican candidate, the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, emancipated the slaves.

What would Abe Lincoln think if he were able to listen tonight and answer to the rhetoric that is here on the floor of the House of Representatives that claims that emancipation, the end of slavery at the loss of 600,000 free people who gave their lives in the clash to put an end to slavery and to establish the States' rights issue and to tie the Union back together, all those things tied together. All of that blood that was spilled by the sword that paid for the blood that was drawn by the lash was spilled because Republican abolitionists stepped forward and said we're going to put an end to the atrocity called slavery. They didn't think of themselves as Progressives. I don't think the word existed in politics in the fashion that we hear it today.

There are a group of Progressives in this Congress today. I don't know how they associate themselves with the success of the American Revolution, inspired by the rights that come from God, or the end of slavery that was paid for in blood and inspired and led by people who formed the Republican Party for, at least in part, the specific purpose to abolish slavery.

And then I go on and I see the National Park System, Teddy Roosevelt. I would call Teddy Roosevelt—not a Progressive. I would call him a populist, but not a Progressive. So he was responsible for establishing the National Park System. When I first looked at it, I thought, well, the Progressives are the ''national pork system.'' I would agree with that, Madam Speaker. But, no, the typo didn't exist. The chart said, ''National Park System.'' So let's give that to the prairie populous, or the populous, not the Progressives.

Civil rights for minorities and women was another piece on this poster board; civil rights for minorities and women, passed by Republicans, majority of Republicans—more Republicans voted for the Civil Rights Act in 1964 than did Democrats. It gets distorted if you read the history off the poster. If you go back and look at the reality and the facts of it all, it's entirely different.

When I see rural electrification, it gets my attention. There have been a couple years of my life that I didn't use electricity that came from a rural electric cooperative. But almost every other year—most of the years of my life that has been our primary source of power. And I know where rural electrification came from. My families grew up on farms that didn't have electricity. They remember when the first wire got out there to the end of the line and they hung a light bulb in the barn so they could go out there and milk the cows in the dark; not by the lantern any longer, but by a 40-watt bulb that hung on a wire out of the ceiling of the barn. You pulled a little chain, turned the light on, then you could milk in the shadows of the light bulb instead of the shadows of the flickering lantern. That got there because of cooperatives.

And cooperatives, I believe at the very closest you could bring them towards progressivism would be taking them towards populism. It was the people out on the prairie and in the open range, the La Grange in the West, the populism that exists today within the politics of the people from where I live and points on west, that politics that decided we're going to settle this countryside and we're not going to live out here and live in darkness without water, sewer, water, lights or roads. We're not going to try to farm this countryside and take it back from the wilderness and turn it into a productive region unless—we can do it if we can bring electricity out, if we can bring services out, if we can bring telephone out.

And so they went to work and they set up cooperatives. They didn't view themselves as Progressives. They didn't even view themselves as populists. The people that established the RECs years ago, the rural electric cooperatives—and I have known many of them face to face, personally, as neighbors, most of them passed away by now. They shaped their cooperatives because it was the only way they could get electrical power out to the farms.

I happened to have followed that history from the time it was shaped together when they decided to build their first power plant. The network that comes to my part of the country that flows all the way up from what was South Crawford REC, now it's Western Area Power—or connected to Western Area Power, then on up through Basin Electric all the way up into the coal mines in Wyoming—which, by the way, Wyoming is one of the most punished States under the Waxman-Markey cap-and-tax piece of legislation. But they shaped this so that they could have electricity go to the farms.

And they had to join together to do it. They had to have a little help because it cost a lot more money to string a wire from farm to farm a half a mile to a half a mile than it does to string it from house to house in the city or into an apartment complex or into an office complex within a city. So they shaped the cooperatives to do that.

I noticed on that board that took all this credit for Progressives—the accomplishments of creative individuals that wanted to simply operate in a free enterprise economy—that it didn't have our grain cooperatives there, but we established those, too; the grain cooperatives so that the farmer-owned cooperatives could set up a grain elevator to store and dry their grain and ship it and market it, and also mix and grind feed and sell fertilizers and chemicals and make this all work.

It's the same kind of a function in the grain cooperatives as we had in our electric cooperatives. But in neither case was it Progressives that put this together, just like it wasn't the Progressives that fought and won the American Revolution or emancipated the slaves. In fact, of all these things that I've listed, it was a majority of Republicans—if you would identify their politics—that brought about these changes, most of which are good changes or they wouldn't have been listed on that poster board. But I think it's revisionist history, Madam Speaker, and I could not let that moment pass without raising that issue.

I will just stick with this subject for a moment, Madam Speaker, because I know what a Progressive is and I think America needs to know what a Progressive is. Now, it is not someone who has emancipated the slaves or fought and won the American Revolution or established a rural electric cooperative, not somebody that did those things.

It wasn't really somebody that—they may have played a part in, but they weren't a central part—that established the civil rights. It's people that believed in the intrinsic value of the individual, the rights that come from God regardless of what your race or ethnicity might be. That's not a Progressive thought. That's a thought of rights that come from God.

So here's what a Progressive is. And, Madam Speaker, anybody that's curious about this can just simply go to their Google page—that's the one thing that hasn't been nationalized at this point—and they can just Google in there dsausa.org—that's the Democratic Socialists of America, dsausa.org—and the screen will come up, and on it will say, ''What is Democratic Socialism?'' And when you read through this Web site—which I happen to have right here, Madam Speaker, and I will enter this into the RECORD—and this document that is the socialist Web site, peruse through it a little bit, dsausa.org.

WHAT IS DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM?

Questions and Answers From the Democratic Socialists of America

Democratic socialists believe that both the economy and society should be run democratically—to meet public needs, not to make profits for a few. To achieve a more just society, many structures of our government and economy must be radically transformed through greater economic and social democracy so that ordinary Americans can participate in the many decisions that affect our lives.

Democracy and socialism go hand in hand. All over the world, wherever the idea of democracy has taken root, the vision of socialism has taken root as well—everywhere but in the United States. Because of this, many false ideas about socialism have developed in the US. With this pamphlet, we hope to answer some of your questions about socialism.

Q: Doesn't socialism mean that the government will own and run everything?

Democratic socialists do not want to create an all-powerful government bureaucracy. But we do not want big corporate bureaucracies to control our society either. Rather, we believe that social and economic decisions should be made by those whom they most affect.

Today, corporate executives who answer only to themselves and a few wealthy stockholders make basic economic decisions affecting millions of people. Resources are used to make money for capitalists rather than to meet human needs. We believe that the workers and consumers who are affected by economic institutions should own and control them.

Social ownership could take many forms, such as worker-owned cooperatives or publicly owned enterprises managed by workers and consumer representatives. Democratic socialists favor as much decentralization as possible. While the large concentrations of capital in industries such as energy and steel pay necessitate some form of state ownership, many consumer-goods industries might be best run as cooperatives.

Democratic socialists have long rejected the belief that the whole economy should be centrally planned. While we believe that democratic planning can shape major social investments like mass transit, housing, and energy, market mechanisms are needed to determine the demand for many consumer goods.

Q: Hasn't socialism been discredited by the collapse of Communism in the USSR and Eastern Europe?

Socialists have been among the harshest critics of authoritarian Communist states. Just because their bureaucratic elites called them ''socialist'' did not make it so; they also called their regimes ''democratic.'' Democratic socialists always opposed the ruling party-states of those societies, just as we oppose the ruling classes of capitalist societies. We applaud the democratic revolutions that have transformed the former Communist bloc. However, the improvement of people's lives requires real democracy without ethnic rivalries and/or new forms of authoritarianism. Democratic socialists will continue to play a key role in that struggle throughout the world.

Moreover, the fall of Communism should not blind us to injustices at home. We cannot allow all radicalism to be dismissed as ''Communist.'' That suppression of dissent and diversity undermines America's ability to live up to its promise of equality of opportunity, not to mention the freedoms of speech and assembly.

Q: Private corporations seem to be a permanent fixture in the US, so why work towards socialism?

In the short term we can't eliminate private corporations, but we can bring them under greater democratic control. The government could use regulations and tax incentives to encourage companies to act in the public interest and outlaw destructive activities such as exporting jobs to low-wage countries and polluting our environment. Public pressure can also have a critical role to play in the struggle to hold corporations accountable. Most of all, socialists look to unions make private business more accountable.

Q: Won't socialism be impractical because people will lose their incentive to work?

We don't agree with the capitalist assumption that starvation or greed are the only reasons people work. People enjoy their work if it is meaningful and enhances their lives. They work out of a sense of responsibility to their community and society. Although a long-term goal of socialism is to eliminate all but the most enjoyable kinds of labor, we recognize that unappealing jobs will long remain. These tasks would be spread among as many people as possible rather than distributed on the basis of class, race, ethnicity, or gender, as they are under capitalism. And this undesirable work should be among the best, not the least, rewarded work within the economy. For now, the burden should be placed on the employer to make work desirable by raising wages, offering benefits and improving the work environment. In short, we believe that a combination of social, economic, and moral incentives will motivate people to work.

Q: Why are there no models of democratic socialism?

Although no country has fully instituted democratic socialism, the socialist parties and labor movements of other countries have won many victories for their people. We can learn from the comprehensive welfare state maintained by the Swedes, from Canada's national health care system, France's nationwide childcare program, and Nicaragua's literacy programs. Lastly, we can learn from efforts initiated right here in the US, such as the community health centers created by the government in the 1960s. They provided high quality family care, with community involvement in decision-making.

Q: But hasn't the European Social Democratic experiment failed?

For over half a century, a number of nations in Western Europe and Scandinavia have enjoyed both tremendous prosperity and relative economic equality thanks to the policies pursued by social democratic parties. These nations used their relative wealth to insure a high standard of living for their citizens—high wages, health care and subsidized education. Most importantly, social democratic parties supported strong labor movements that became central players in economic decision-making. But with the globalization of capitalism, the old social democratic model becomes ever harder to maintain. Stiff competition from low-wage labor markets in developing countries and the constant fear that industry will move to avoid taxes and strong labor regulations has diminished (but not eliminated) the ability of nations to launch ambitious economic reform on their own. Social democratic reform must now happen at the international level. Multinational corporations must be brought under democratic controls, and workers' organizing efforts must reach across borders.

Now, more than ever, socialism is an international movement. As socialists have always known, the welfare of working people in Finland or California depends largely on standards in Italy or Indonesia. As a result, we must work towards reforms that can withstand the power of multinationals and global banks, and we must fight for a world order that is not controlled by bankers and bosses.

Q: Aren't you a party that's in competition with the Democratic Party for votes and support?

No, we are not a separate party. Like our friends and allies in the feminist, labor, civil rights, religious, and community organizing movements, many of us have been active in the Democratic Party. We work with those movements to strengthen the party's left wing, represented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The process and structure of American elections seriously hurts third party efforts. Winner-take-all elections instead of proportional representation, rigorous party qualification requirements that vary from state to state, a presidential instead of a parliamentary system, and the two-party monopoly on political power have doomed third party efforts. We hope that at some point in the future, in coalition with our allies, an alternative national party will be viable. For now, we will continue to support progressives who have a real chance at winning elections, which usually means left-wing Democrats.

Q: If I am going to devote time to politics, why shouldn't I focus on something more immediate?

Although capitalism will be with us for a long time, reforms we win now—raising the minimum wage, securing a national health plan, and demanding passage of right-to-strike legislation—can bring us closer to socialism. Many democratic socialists actively work in the single-issue organizations that advocate for those reforms. We are visible in the reproductive freedom movement, the fight for student aid, gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered organizations, anti-racist groups, and the labor movement.

It is precisely our socialist vision that informs and inspires our day-to-day activism for social justice. As socialists we bring a sense of the interdependence of all struggles for justice. No single-issue organization can truly challenge the capitalist system or adequately secure its particular demands. In fact, unless we are all collectively working to win a world without oppression, each fight for reforms will be disconnected, maybe even self-defeating.

Q: What can young people do to move the US towards socialism?

Since the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s, young people have played a critical role in American politics. They have been a tremendous force for both political and cultural change in this country: in limiting the US's options in the war in Vietnam, in forcing corporations to divest from the racist South African regime, in reforming universities, and in bringing issues of sexual orientation and gender discrimination to public attention. Though none of these struggles were fought by young people alone, they all featured youth as leaders in multi-generational progressive coalitions. Young people are needed in today's struggles as well: for universal health care and stronger unions, against welfare cuts and predatory multinational corporations.

Schools, colleges and universities are important to American political culture. They are the places where ideas are formulated and policy discussed and developed. Being an active part of that discussion is a critical job for young socialists. We have to work hard to change people's misconceptions about socialism, to broaden political debate, and to overcome many students' lack of interest in engaging in political action. Off-campus, too, in our daily cultural lives, young people can be turning the tide against racism, sexism and homophobia, as well as the conservative myth of the virtue of ''free'' markets.

Q: If so many people misunderstand socialism, why continue to use the word?

First, we call ourselves socialists because we are proud of what we are. Second, no matter what we call ourselves, conservatives will use it against us. Anti-socialism has been repeatedly used to attack reforms that shift power to working class people and away from corporate capital. In 1993, national health insurance was attacked as ''socialized medicine'' and defeated. Liberals are routinely denounced as socialists in order to discredit reform. Until we face, and beat, the stigma attached to the ''S word,'' politics in America will continue to be stifled and our options limited. We also call ourselves socialists because we are proud of the traditions upon which we are based, of the heritage of the Socialist Party of Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas, and of other struggles for change that have made America more democratic and just. Finally, we call ourselves socialists to remind everyone that we have a vision of a better world.

It really doesn't take a very heavy read to figure out what's going on. These are the Socialists. They say, ''We believe that social and economic decisions should be made by those whom they most affect.'' Huh. Sounds

like a little bit of what's been going on with the major corporations in America. Sounds a little like what's happened to the auto industry. It looks like they've been taken over and nationalized by the White House and handed over to the unions for control. That would fit. ''We believe that social and economic decisions should be made by those whom they most affect.''

Here's another one: ''We believe that the workers and consumers who are affected by economic institutions should own and control them.'' Exactly what's happening to the automakers today, as they pulled the plug on a good number of Chrysler auto dealers, as they threatened to pull the plug on an even greater number of General Motors auto dealers, and as the stock shares get handed over to the unions at the expense of the investors who were owners of the hard collateral of the business of Chrysler Motors, and now it looks like General Motors as well, all right off the Web page of the socialists. ''We believe that the workers and consumers that are affected by economic institutions should own and control them.

''Social ownership could take many forms, such as worker-owned cooperatives or publicly owned enterprises managed by workers and consumer representatives''; not managed for profit, not managed for efficiency, but nationalized businesses run and managed by workers and consumer representatives.

I started a construction company in 1975. I borrowed money, invested a lot of capital, and the business is going on. It's a second-generation construction company. My older son owns it today. There were a good number of places along the way that it would have been easy to give up and just drop out of business, but I had to make it work. I was determined to make it work. And if I had handed over the management of the company to the employees at any one of those critical points, there's no way that King Construction would have survived.

This is quoting from the sheet again. ''While the large concentrations of capital in industries such as energy and steel may necessitate some form of state ownership''—they're talking again about nationalizing—''many consumer-goods industries might be best run as cooperatives.''

So they want to nationalize large businesses where there's concentrations of capital—energy, steel, a couple of examples. Automakers fall right in that. And on here it says, Well, we're not Communists. Here's the difference. Communists are harder lined than we are, and there's a few other distinctions. I'll ask you to read that, Madam Speaker, thoroughly. I think everybody in this Congress should know what the difference is between a Communist and a Socialist. I don't like either one.

□ 1815

I don't like either one. I like free markets. I like freedom. I like free enterprise. I like capitalism, and I like individual rights that come from God. Those are the pillars of American exceptionalism, not socialism, not Marxism, not communism.

Here is another pretty frequently asked question. Private corporations seem to be a permanent fixture in the U.S., so why work towards socialism? Here is the socialist answer: In the short term, we can't eliminate private corporations.

Now I think, Madam Speaker, that you've been convinced that the Democratic socialists of America want to nationalize the major corporations, and they want to run this free enterprise economy not as a free enterprise economy but as a collectivist state, operating businesses for the benefit of the workers and the customers without regard to profit or the investors. That is clear here.

Also what's clear in this document, which I will submit for the RECORD, is that the socialists are no longer hosting the Web site of the Progressive Caucus. Because in 1999 the issue was raised and the heat got a little too high so the socialists that were managing the Web site of the Progressive Caucus, they decided, and the progressives decided they'd run their own Web site.

So when you see Progressive Caucus come up on a blue board here on the floor, they're saying, go to our Web site, see what all we've got. Look at all the credit we're taking for the things we didn't do. And, by the way, they don't actually announce that they are the legislative arm of the socialists, which you will find in this document that I will introduce into the RECORD this evening, Madam Speaker.

They say here in this document off the Web site, the socialist Web site, that they are not a political party that nominates candidates under their banner. But their legislative arm is the Progressive Caucus, an absolute undeniable link right here on the Web site, socialists tied to progressives. That's what they are, Madam Speaker.

So I get a little disturbed when this Congress and the rest of the Nation tries to mess with the definitions that Noah Webster wrote into our dictionary and our understanding of the English language.

We know what socialism is. If you want to find out what communism is, the socialists define it. If you want find out what a progressive is, the socialists say progressives are them, their arm. And there is a list when you go on the Web site of 72 registered progressives in this Congress that are linked to the socialists directly as their legislative arm. They are the ones advocating for the nationalization of our energy industry, for the oil refinery industry, for the nationalization of our automakers, for example, and all the way up the line. Our financial institutions, large insurance companies, the nationalization that has taken place from President Obama with the full support of the Progressive Caucus and most of the Democrats in this Congress and in the House and in the Senate, Madam Speaker.

I don't think that we can hold the rose-colored glasses along any longer. We have got to understand that our freedoms are being taken from us, and it's happening right in front of our very eyes, under our very nose. And the American people don't understand it yet.

When they go to the Web site and they read through this document, What is Democratic Socialism? on the Web site of dsausa.org, and look to the connection of Progressive Caucus.

And then, by the way, go to the Progressive Caucus Web site. They put it up here. Just Google Progressive Caucus and up will come the Web site that takes the credit for a lot of these things that they didn't have anything to do with, they didn't have any existence then during that period of time. But also they won't take credit for the things that they advocate for that are the mirror image of what comes off the socialist Web site here. One and the same, Madam Speaker. And the American people need to know it, and they know it now.

So that's a little bit of what I didn't come here to talk about, Madam Speaker. But what I did come here to talk about is the nomination of one Dawn Johnsen to the Office of Legal Counsel. Dawn Johnsen is the President's nominee. And the Office of Legal Counsel, for the sake of those who are not all wrapped up in government, is the most important nomination that you've never heard of.

The Office of Legal Counsel is kind of a mini Supreme Court. They issue carefully worded opinions, and they're regarded as binding precedent, and they have the final say on what the President and all his agencies can and cannot legally do, Madam Speaker.

So this is the person that has the opportunity to whisper into the ear of the President on a daily basis, on a regular basis and make recommendations such as, Mr. President, you do or you don't have the authority to issue an executive order to close Guantanamo Bay. That would be one of those whispers into the ear of the President. It might well be a written document that would be formally handed to him as well. I use that as, I'll say, an image, not so much a technicality.

Dawn Johnsen is the person who has offended, I think, a greater number of Americans than any other nominee, even those that didn't pay their taxes. There is a long list of things that Dawn Johnsen has said and done. But I believe at this time it would be useful if I could have the opportunity to yield to the very vigorous and energetic gentlelady from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) for however much time as she may consume.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much, Congressman KING.

You are so right about this very contentious nomination. This position has

been called the Attorney General's lawyer. The Justice Department's Web site explains, ''The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Office of Legal Counsel provides authoritative legal advice to the President and to all executive branch agencies. The Office drafts legal opinions of the Attorney General and also provides its own written opinions and oral advice in response to requests from the Counsel to the President, the various agencies of the executive branch, and offices within the Department. Such requests typically deal with legal issues of particular complexity and importance or about which two or more agencies are in disagreement. The Office also is responsible for providing legal advice to the executive branch on all constitutional questions and reviewing pending legislation for constitutionality.

All executive orders and proclamations proposed to be issued by the President are reviewed by the Office of Legal Counsel for form and legality, as are various other matters that require the President's formal approval.

In addition to serving as, in effect, outside counsel for the other agencies of the Executive Branch, the Office of Legal Counsel also functions as general counsel for the Department itself.''

Congressman KING, you are absolutely right that this individual will have the ear of the President because this position provides authoritative legal advice to the President and all executive branch agencies.

The AAG for the OLC is quite influential when evaluating existing laws and determining legal implications of legislative and administrative proposals. It is not a position for which an ideologue would be well suited.

I really want to go to that end because this, of all the nominations that have come to our attention so far, has really disturbed me the most. And it's disturbed me because, as most people know, one of the things and the heartstrings that I have is my position on life.

I believe that we cannot question when life begins or when it should end. We have to understand that life has value from conception to natural death. Only if we want to wage war against poverty, only when we want to make sure that each and every person in the world has the opportunity to be the best person that they can be, only when we give people the freedom to be what they want to be can this happen if we understand that that freedom begins at conception and that freedom must continue through its natural conclusion.

But this individual holds a much different view on those positions. So I really want to talk for just a few moments about what I call, Life According to Dawn Johnsen. I want to talk about some things that have been said by this individual.

''Pregnancy is equivalent to slavery.'' ''Statutes that curtail her abortion choice are disturbingly suggestive of involuntary servitude, prohibited by the 13th Amendment, in that forced pregnancy requires a woman to provide continuous physical service to the fetus in order to further the state's asserted interest,'' Dawn Johnsen, Supreme Court amicus brief that she authored in Webster v. Reproductive Health Services. I have to be silent for a minute so you can digest the coldness of that statement.

''Protecting life makes women into no more than fetal containers,'' is another one of her beliefs. ''The woman is constantly aware for 9 months that her body is not wholly her own. The state has conscripted her body for its own ends, thus abortion restrictions reduce pregnant women to no more than fetal containers,'' Dawn Johnsen, Supreme Court amicus brief that she authored in Webster v. Reproductive Health Services.

I don't even know how to respond to that. As a mother, yeah, as soon as I felt life, I understood that I had a partner I was going to carry for the next 9 months. That experience only enabled me to begin the love that I have for my daughter and now that I see for her wonderful son. Yeah, pregnancy changes us because it gives us life.

''Abortion brings relief,'' is another one of her statements. ''The experience is no longer traumatic; the response of most women to the experience is relief,'' Dawn Johnsen, Supreme Court amicus brief that she authored in Webster v. Reproductive Health Services. I've talked to women who have had abortions, and they have a much different view.

''Those that become pregnant are losers.'' This one really stings me. She says, ''The argument that women who become pregnant have in some sense consented to the pregnancy belies reality.'' '' . . . and others who are the inevitable losers in the contraceptive lottery no more 'consent' to pregnancy than pedestrians 'consent' to being struck by drunk drivers,'' Dawn Johnsen, Supreme Court amicus brief that she authored in Webster v. Reproductive Health Services.

I don't see women who are pregnant as losers. I see their winning capabilities of having that life inside of them, being a life that will carry on and continue for generations to come.

Another one: ''There is no need to reduce the number of abortions.'' ''Progressives must not portray all abortions as tragedies,''

''Senator Hillary Clinton in a 2005 speech commendable for setting forth a pro-choice, pro-prevention, pro-family agenda, took the aspiration a step in the wrong direction when she called for policy changes so that abortion does not have to ever be exercised or only in very rare circumstances,'' Dawn Johnsen in the Constitution in 2020.

These are her statements. I'm not making these up, Congressman. These are her statements, Madam Speaker.

''Pro-life supporters are comparable to the Ku Klux Klan,'' that's another one of her statements. And she says, ''The terrorist behavior of petitioners is remarkably similar to the conspiracy of violence and intimidation carried out by the Ku Klux Klan,'' Dawn Johnsen, Supreme Court amicus brief that she authored in Bray v. Alexandria Women's Health Clinic.

I can't believe that she would say these things. But again, these are her words, not mine.

Some of her positions and comments, questionable legal arguments, including the assertion that abortion bans might have undermine the 13th Amendment, which banned slavery.

This is a woman who was so entrenched with NARAL and the ACLU's Reproductive Freedom Project, she's compared pregnancy to involuntary servitude, described pregnant women as losers in the contraceptive lottery, and criticized Senator Clinton for then claiming to keep abortions, traumatic experiences, rare.

□ 1830

This is a woman who doesn't have the same view of life that most Americans have. Yes, this is a sensitive issue. But most Americans understand that life is sacred and must be protected. And I believe that most Americans want someone who is the legal counsel of the President to not have such polarizing views. I believe that they want someone that will step back and evaluate decisions based on their constitutionality and their legality and not put forth their own agenda.

This is a person who at every step along her way has put forth her own very proabortion agenda in each and everything that she has done. This is not the right person for this job. And I would only hope that this administration changes its position.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentlelady for coming to the floor and standing up for life and making this announcement on statement after statement, quote after quote, that has come from Dawn Johnsen, the former legal counsel for NARAL, the National Abortion Rights Action League, the one who has inflamed the profamily, prolife, pro-Constitution pro-individual rights of people in this country by making a whole series of outrageous statements. And many of them were mentioned by the gentlelady from Ohio.

I put this one up on abortion protesters, this is the KKK piece, that ''the 'terrorist' behavior of petitioners is remarkably similar to the conspiracy of violence and intimidation carried out by the Ku Klux Klan against which Congress intended this statute to protect.''

People that are outside of the abortion clinics praying for the innocent human life that is being exterminated inside are being described as KKK-type of intimidators. This is the person that we would have whispering into the ear of the President, the Office of Legal Counsel, issuing opinions and decisions

that are de facto judgments on our Constitution and the legality. And that is one example. The gentlelady gave a number of other examples. And I would yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I just want to say, sir, that I am someone who has, throughout my adult life, stood in front of an abortion clinic in the city of Cincinnati. We stand in silence. We stand in prayer. We do not say anything to people as they walk by. We just pray that they have a change of heart and that they understand that all life is precious, including the one they may be carrying inside of their body. I have been doing this since I was in college. And I have yet to see any behavior that would even look like a terrorist's behavior. So for her to say that, I think, is totally out of character.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time from the gentlelady who has been a champion for life for a long time, here is another piece that we have heard about, Dawn Johnsen on abortion, legal but not rare. This is where she even goes in conflict with such known liberals as Hillary Clinton, for example, where Dawn Johnsen said, ''The notion of legal restrictions as some kind of reasonable 'compromise,' perhaps to help make abortion 'safe, legal and rare,' thus proves nonsensical.'' That is her statement of January 25, 2006, not that long ago.

And here our Progressives show up again, as I spoke about earlier, Madam Speaker, ''Progressives must not portray all abortions tragedies. Absent unforeseen technological and medical changes, abortion is unlikely to become truly rare and certainly not nonexistent.''

This lady isn't happy about abortion becoming rare. She has chastised even Hillary Clinton about asking for abortion to be safe, legal and rare. This gives you an example of what Progressives are, also, Madam Speaker. Progressives fit this bill. Can you imagine a Progressive who was antislavery who believed in the value, the intrinsic value of human life, to the extent of laying down their life for their brethren who have lived in bondage, would people like that be advocating for more abortions and calling those who pray outside of abortion clinics equivalent to the KKK? I think we know what a Progressive is today. I don't think there were any Progressives that existed by any defined label that took place around the Revolutionary War time, Madam Speaker.

But Dawn Johnsen does fit. She is a Progressive. I will give her that. And her name should be withdrawn by the President of the United States.

In fact, the gentlelady from Ohio and I are on a letter together. We and 60 other Members of Congress issued a letter to President Obama dated March 24, 2009. It calls upon President Obama to withdraw the nomination of Dawn Johnsen as Office of Legal Counsel. And part of the language here in the second page of the letter to the President signed by 62 of us from the House says: ''Senator Hillary Clinton, in a 2005 speech commendable for setting forth a pro-choice, pro-prevention, pro-family agenda, took the aspiration a step in the wrong direction.'' This is Dawn Johnsen talking about Hillary Clinton. She said Hillary Clinton ''took the aspiration to rare abortions a step in the wrong direction when she called for policy changes so that abortion 'does not ever have to be exercised or only in very rare circumstances.' '' That is a quote of Hillary Clinton.

Dawn Johnsen even calls Hillary Clinton out as not progressive enough, not being enough pro-abortion that she would think that abortions should be rare. That is an affront to Dawn Johnsen's values. And Dawn Johnsen would be in a position to whisper into the ear of the President on what is legal and what isn't, what is constitutional and what isn't. But not only that, she is not just flipping a toggle switch that is a legal opinion, Madam Speaker. She is shaping legal policy and making recommendations to the President that are policy changes.

Now imagine if she wasn't there. And she is formally not there because her nomination is held up by the Senate. It is held up by the Senate because they know many of the things that Mrs. SCHMIDT and I have talked about here tonight and we have talked about for some months now since her nomination emerged. But the Guantanamo Bay issue fits perfectly with the type of thing that I would bring to bear where an Office of Legal Counsel would be there with access to the President continually, generating an activist left-wing, yes, call it a Progressive agenda, because that is not going to be a very good word when we finish describing what it is, coming up with ideas like, Mr. President, you need to issue an executive order to close Guantanamo Bay and turn these prisoners loose.

Well, Madam Speaker, I didn't make that up. I'm not being flippant. I'm simply quoting Dawn Johnsen. It says here on a list of quotes from Dawn Johnsen with regard to Guantanamo Bay under Gitmo that Dawn Johnsen posits two alternatives to deal with the Gitmo detainees, the enemy combatants, the terrorists, the vile al Qaeda terrorists, the worst of the worst that are down there, 241 of them, according to the testimony before the Judiciary Committee today by Attorney General Holder.

She says we only have two choices with the Gitmo detainees: either release them or transfer them to facilities in the United States and consideration of civilian criminal prosecution in the Federal courts. An outrageous idea that seems to be under consideration by this White House at this time.

And I have been down to Gitmo maybe a little over a month ago. They are living pretty good down there, Madam Speaker. No nation has ever treated prisoners of a conflict as well. I didn't say any better. I said no nation has treated them as well as we have treated these enemies at Guantanamo Bay who have a vile oath to kill Americans. And they believe it is their path to salvation. They are attacking American guards an average of 20 times a day. Half the time they are throwing feces and trying to rub it into the face of our guards. That is their own feces. The other half of the time they are physically assaulting them and trying to hurt them with whatever they might have for cuffs and shackles. They are living in climate control. They set the thermostat in the air conditioned Caribbean island vacation resort. Their limitations are they have to live within the fences that keep them from getting away. But even when they are in there, they get a little soccer field. They can go out and play soccer. They have got foosball tables. They get to choose from nine items on the menu every day and they set the thermostat between 75 and 80 degrees because they say that is their cultural temperature. So we would give them air conditioning and give them their cultural temperature while our troops are sometimes out in the sun. They stop for prayer five times a day, 100 minutes a day. Our troops stop and respectfully wait. That is all right with me. Everybody gets a Koran. No one can have a Bible. Of the 800-and-some who were there altogether, there was one who requested a Bible. And it created such belligerence and violence among other detainees that they said, no, you can't have a Bible. They have since released the individual that wanted a Bible. Everybody else gets a Koran, one that is untouched by one of these infidel guards that are getting feces thrown in their face on a regular basis, Madam Speaker.

This is the kind of idea that comes from Dawn Johnsen. Let's turn these people loose or bring them to the United States. She argues that she should have habeas corpus rights. That is a radical Federal Court decision by the way. And it is radical. The Founding Fathers would have never approved such a thing. That is why they wrote the provisions in the Constitution of habeas corpus. She writes that it was there so that when we fight people around the world we can round them up and bring them back on a slow ship with a sail. They didn't have motors on their boats back then, let alone airplanes. Bring before an American court. Give them rights of habeas corpus. If they get turned loose on a technicality, turn them loose into the streets of America. I asked the Attorney General today, Can you assure us that you will not turn these Gitmo detainees loose into the United States? He could not assure of us of that.

Now, I can tell you if I were the Attorney General, I would be able to find out a way. I could tell you under these conditions this is what we are trying to do. I will assure you I would do everything I can. I would at least like not to have these detainees board domestic

American airliners and fly with my children or grandchildren. I would think that maybe we could put them on the no-fly list like TEDDY KENNEDY was. For some reason, we can't even do that.

And as a temporary diversion to this diatribe, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana, who might be able to flesh that story out just a little bit, such time as he may consume.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my colleague from Iowa for taking the lead tonight and my colleague and friend from Ohio as well. Both have been long-time pro-life leaders. And my colleague from Iowa and I have fought on numerous fronts in the various battles here.

Today before I speak on the abortion question which is one thing I want to raise here, of course, but today in the homeland security markup on Transportation Security Administration, I offered an amendment that anybody released in the United States from Gitmo would go on the no-fly list. We thought that the debate was going to be, should this be a recorded vote and the Democrats would propose not having a recorded vote. But it caused such panic that they had long meetings and basically came up with a gutting amendment and knocked the amendment out by stating that only after all the processes with the President were completed, but that didn't even put them on a no-fly list. Now here is the fundamental question that this isn't putting people in prison and detaining them. This is a question of should they be on the no-fly list.

If you were in Gitmo—and understand that I don't favor closing Gitmo. I imagine neither of my colleagues here favored closing Gitmo. Just because you made a stupid campaign statement doesn't mean you have to have a stupid policy once you get in and see the truth. And there has been a number of people who have changed their opinion about that. But we have already released a number of these people. At best, the results have been mixed. Some have gotten already back involved in al Qaeda. And just because it has been hard to come up with the evidence, say, because people get beheaded, because of the type of retribution that occurs, the fearfulness of stating upfront and going through even a military court where it is private, worried that it is going to get out, it was difficult to make some of the cases. It has been very mixed, the ones they did release. So the ones that are there have at least some doubt because they are already not released. Now we transfer them to the United States. The question is what is going to happen? Are they going to await trial? Are they going to be detained? How are they going to sort this through? We don't have a plan. Secretary Napolitano said at our hearing the day before, looking at our budget, clearly homeland security was going to have to keep track of them. If they are going to keep track of them, why in the world wouldn't they be on a no-fly list? If they are too dangerous to be released in the country without homeland security tracking them, why do we want them on an airplane next to us? I just see no logic to this, that we put American citizens on the no-fly list because maybe they have a cousin, they have done some phone calls, we have questions and we are concerned about it.

These people are the people they have held in Gitmo, not the ones they have released, a couple hundred already down there. These are the people who are higher risk at the very least.

Now, the Chinese Uyghurs who were part of al Qaeda-affiliated groups, China won't take them back. They already announced they will release them in Northern Virginia. They can get on airplanes at Reagan Airport.

What kind of a philosophy is this that, oh, we are going to see final resolution of this, we are going to work this through? This is absurd. The last thing we need is a legal counsel over there telling him, oh, wow, these people should have public trials. We have been through this in the Department of Homeland Security. When the New York Times released the classified report, none of us actually know precisely what was in it that caused this reaction. But what we know is terrorists were taking down around the world, networks were broken up in process before they could do that because we heard them get up on their phones because was it a bank account that they didn't know that we knew they were doing it? Was it a phone line they didn't know that was tapped? When you get things in public, you expose your ability to track. And they go other routes. The idea of public trials would be catastrophic to the safety of this country.

Now, the idea that they aren't even going to be on a no-fly list is just incredible. And anybody, in my opinion, who blocks that, and if it isn't in the bill next week, the people who kept it out of the bill should be held responsible if something happens. It isn't like you can't figure out who to blame here. We had an amendment that would have said they are automatically on the no-fly list, if they get on the plane now, without even being more than routinely checked, it would be incredible.

□ 1845

Now I would like to talk briefly about Dawn Johnsen. She's a fellow Hoosier. I do not know her, but she and her husband are well known in Indianapolis. She teaches at the Indiana Law School. There is incredible pressure on our two United States Senators on the vote, and we need their votes against her.

It isn't whether or not she's smart. It's not whether or not they're good people, good neighbors, good people to go to church with. This is about policy and critical policy. This is about basically a person with radical views on abortion being put in a position to give that advice. And we need our two Senators to understand that. We need the American people to understand that. And really we need this President to understand this.

Another thing happened just a few miles outside my district. I represent most of Elkhart County. CARSON and DONNELLY represent about a third; I have two-thirds. And I come up around within about 5 or 7 miles of the University of Notre Dame, and about a third of my district is in South Bend. So there's been a little bit of ruckus about the President's speaking at Notre Dame. He's the eighth President in a row to speak at Notre Dame. It's not so much the controversy of speaking but whether he should get an honorary doctorate since his positions seem to be at odds with the fundamental teachings of the Catholic Church and the Pope.

Now, the administration claims that they aren't as hostile to the pro-life cause as we say. He said at the press conference in an astounding statement that, Oh, I wouldn't be for embryonic stem cell research if there was another alternative. And you wonder is this a kind of cuteness or does he really not know that there are other alternatives that work and embryonic stem cell doesn't work, that embryonic stem cell has been going on for 10 years without even a pig being able to live let alone a human, whereas other forms of stem cells, in fact, have cured people of diseases.

Maybe, however, when you think about it, President Obama was raised in Hawaii and Indonesia and elsewhere. Then he went to Harvard. He worked as a community organizer, lived in an upscale neighborhood of Illinois in Chicago. I'm not sure whether he's really heard a lot of the debate. And to be fair, maybe we need to educate him in a non-yelling way. Some of the problems we are having in South Bend right now, some of the controversy there, we need to win the middle. We lost the last election. If we're going to win the pro-life debate and save children in America, we need to make sure we can try to persuade the middle. And in this, President Obama, if he wants to claim that he really wants to reduce abortion, he needs to show that with his actions, not just say that I favor that. He needs to support methods on adoption. He needs to encourage the Women's Care Centers and Hope Centers. My wife, Diane, volunteers at a Hope Center.

You've been reading some of these statements, but to appoint somebody as Deputy Legal Counsel who says that pregnancy is like slavery, that protecting life makes women no more than fetal containers, that abortion brings relief, that those who become pregnant are losers, that there's no need to reduce the number of abortions, and comparing pro-life supporters to the Ku Klux Klan, among other things that you've been highlighting in these quotes, you're not

neutral trying to reduce abortion. If you appoint a person in a key legal position that interprets policy, you do not have credibility then to go to the University of Notre Dame next Sunday, to go around at a press conference to tell us we're working for a middle ground. There's no middle ground there. That is the radical position of NARAL being put in a position to make legal policy for the United States of America. You have to not talk out of one side of your mouth and do the other.

What we need the President to do is withdraw this nomination.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's coming to the floor and laying out this picture in this fashion, as much as I do the gentlewoman from Ohio doing the same.

As I listened to this, Dawn Johnsen's confirmation of her nomination is in trouble. HARRY REID announced that Tuesday of this week, that he had planned to bring it up for a vote. He was short a couple Democrat votes, and I think more than that.

So we need to ask, I think, Madam Speaker, that everybody weigh in on this from a conscience standpoint and understand that these statements made by Dawn Johnsen are just that, an advocacy for the National Abortion Rights Action League, which she was the chief legal counsel for them. She argued a number of cases before the court. The record is replete. It does not vary. It's consistent. It's liberal. It's activist. It is a danger to life. It's a danger to every unborn child. And she is a danger to fathers.

This is a quote from Dawn Johnsen: ''Our position is that there is no father and no child, just a fetus, and any move by the courts to force a woman to have a child amounts to involuntary servitude.''

But put into that context. Dangerous for babies, unborn babies, dangerous for mothers, who are disrespected. My mother a fetal container? That offends me. It should offend America. We're all children of mothers. They're not fetal containers; they're our mothers. They brought us into this world. They loved us. They nurtured us. There's no substitute for a mother, and I will never get to be one, and I'm a little jealous.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Well, I'm not a fetal container; I'm a mother. And I was very glad to have my wonderful daughter. Just 7 months ago, she had a beautiful little boy, and I think she would be appalled at being called a ''fetal container.'' She was thrilled on Sunday to be called a mother, just as I was thrilled to be called a mother and a grandmother.

But more importantly, when we put people into positions of authority, while we respect that they may have a divergence of views than we might have, we certainly want people in authority that are willing to listen to all viewpoints before rendering a decision. But when you time and again, like Dawn Johnsen, have made statement after statement after statement with inflammatory rhetoric surrounding those statements, as she appears to have done for a better part of her adult life, especially on abortion but on other issues as well, I don't think the American public is going to be comfortable with a person of her position of authority whispering in the President's ear or in bureaucrats' ears her opinion on matters not just on abortion, not just on Guantanamo, but on other issues as well.

I think we want someone that's even-tempered, someone that's willing to look at all viewpoints, someone that's willing to see all sides and render the decision that they believe is the most appropriate for America. I don't think she has the capability of doing that when I read the kinds of statements that she has made.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman.

I'd add a piece that I want to reiterate here. Madam Speaker, if America is not moved enough at this pro-abortion activism and this legal distortion that has taken place as a matter of the professional actions and the public record of Dawn Johnsen, the President's nominee to head up the Office of Legal Counsel, they should be concerned about our national security. A national security that would say turn the Gitmo detainees loose or bring them here to the United States, put them under U.S. courts, and then, by the way, turn them loose and nurture them with our tax dollars so they can get on their feet again. All of that being part of this concept. But also Dawn Johnsen's objecting to surveillance of al Qaeda communications when it was a phone call that took place from a foreign country like, let's say, Afghanistan and ended up in Pakistan. If Osama bin Laden was calling Khalid Sheik Mohammed and if that nexus came back to the United States for the link but no one set foot in the United States, she would object to their not getting a warrant to listen in on that traffic on a telephone signal that would originate in Afghanistan and terminate in Pakistan.

Here is what she said. She attributed that type of surveillance to ''an extreme and implausible Commander in Chief theory.''

Now, this is an implausible and extreme theory, Madam Speaker, but the Commander in Chief is not a theory. It's constitutional. It's strictly defined in the Constitution. The Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces is the President of the United States. And the President of the United States has nominated Dawn Johnsen, who is a radical extremist. And her nomination is in trouble, and 62 of us wrote a letter and said please pull the nomination.

The President, if I were standing before him, I would make such a plea, and I would entreat the President of the United States that the juice is not worth the squeeze. There are plenty of activists that are traipsing through the White House these days. This is a lightning rod activist. Why don't you give us somebody that's not such a lightning rod, maybe somebody that's not going to be quite so radical. You're going to have to appoint somebody there to make these legal opinions, and I would like to have somebody that understands what's constitutional, at least recognize that the President of the United States is Commander in Chief, that constitutional position.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. The naivete is incredible here in the intelligence area. I've worked in the narcotics area on the Intel Committee of Homeland Security. In case people haven't heard, the border is not completely sealed. Clearly we don't even want to put the Gitmo detainees on a no-fly list. If you don't have intelligence, I don't know how we stay safe.

I wanted to add another thing on the abortion issue. About 2 months ago, apparently we had Fetal Container Day. My daughter was going through Fetal Container Day as a mom, and 2 months ago our granddaughter, Reagan Rebekah, was born. My daughter, Brooke, and her husband, Jeff, who apparently, in Dawn Johnsen's mind, wasn't relevant, and I don't know when he became a father if he wasn't a father at the beginning. I don't know when Reagan Rebekah became a human being, because my daughter was having problems and they decided they had to bring Reagan out early, and it wouldn't have been that many years ago that she wouldn't have survived. She came out somewhat over 4 pounds, just under 5 pounds. She yelled just as loud as if she were heavier, but she came out very small. But she survived. She was able to go home. She had a high enough Apgar score. But at one point, and true of my wife too, but at one point my daughter was a fetal container, and Reagan Rebekah was a fetus. And then she came out a month early, where before she wouldn't even have been able to survive, and now she's a human being suddenly, and my daughter is a mom? It doesn't make any sense here.

We cannot have somebody with these radical views in this position of power. If she wants to continue at IU Law School, if she wants to continue with NARAL, fine. But we do not need her.

And, Mr. President, she needs to be withdrawn. We need to have a reasonable alternative that we can try to work with. We know we lost an election. But we do not need radicals in this position that would destroy human life, whether it be because of lack of intelligence in terrorism or in abortion.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman and the gentlewoman.

It sparks my memory, as I listened to the gentleman from Indiana speak. A

mother is not transformed from a fetal container into a mother by the birth. A mother is a mother at conception and from that point on. And we use that language consistently.

But another piece comes to mind when I think about the President of the United States and this subject matter, and that is that I look back on the Saddleback Church debate that took place there, very well handled by Reverend Rick Warren, who offered the prayer just a few feet behind me here on the west portico of the Capitol Building at the inauguration of the President of the United States. But there they sat with JOHN MCCAIN and President Obama, and he asked the question of then-Senator Obama, When does life begin?

Senator Obama's answer was, ''That's above my pay scale.'' When life begins—when his life began—is above his own pay scale.

Now, there is significant evidence that President Obama got a raise put in since August of last year because he decided right away in January that it was in his pay scale. He decided that he would rescind the Mexico City policy which prohibited our taxpayer dollars from funding abortions in foreign lands. By executive order, he wiped that out, that very conscience decision that was debated on the floor of this House over and over and over again and defended by the pro-life effort in this Congress and across the United States. And he also by executive order decided that he wants to fund with Federal tax dollars the ending of human life in the form of experimenting on embryos, little frozen embryos, little snowflake babies, some of whom I've held in my arms that were frozen for 9 years. Loving, giggling, laughing little children wiped out by executive order that now seems to have found its legs and decided life must not begin or it must not be sacred yet if it's in the early stages, when it can't scream for its own mercy. So the Mexico City policy wiped out, the embryonic stem cell prohibition of using Federal dollars to experiment on them has already been moved. And now we see the appointment of Dawn Johnsen. And we have a President that's going to be soon speaking in South Bend, Indiana, at Notre Dame University, directly in conflict with the teachings of the church. It is a hard thing for us Catholics to watch. It's a hard thing for the pro-life people in this country to watch.

□ 1900

But I have seen hundreds of thousands of Americans come to this city to stand up for innocent unborn human life. They will come to this city in greater numbers if Dawn Johnsen is confirmed, and I think the President will keep that in mind, and I pray that he will pull her nomination.

COMMEMORATING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to Member SHEILA JACKSON-LEE. I believe she wanted to address the floor.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman, and as I rise, let me add my appreciation for his leadership of the Asian Pacific caucus and join him in celebrating Asian Pacific history month.

This is a time in our Nation that we are able to celebrate the many diverse cultures that make up those who are of Asian ancestry in the United States of America. And so my hat is tipped to the leadership in this Congress, the distinguished gentleman from California, and the many Members who have been such leaders.

I pay a special tribute to the late Bob Matsui who, of course, was a dear friend and someone that we all cherished.

I will speak briefly about the recent supplemental and the crisis that we face in this Nation. This is more than a tough challenge, to be able to address the concerns and the need for moving forward by a new President and the questions that are raised as this war supplemental makes its way through.

I will be asking questions as relates to our final solution, or legislative vote, as to whether or not language goes into this supplemental that will direct the administration to have an exit strategy for Afghanistan. I believe it is important as this bill makes its way through the Senate and back to the House, through conference, that there is a more definitive mark or standards and procedures for downsizing the war in Iraq, moving out equipment and bringing our soldiers home.

We now face a different conflict in Afghanistan. It is one of insurgents, the rise of the Taliban. We face as well the rising conflict in Pakistan, although the civilian government has maintained, in their visits here to the United States, they are committed to democracy, and I do believe them. Many of us have visited with President Zardari and leaders of his government, and we frankly believe that there is an opportunity to promote continued democracy in Pakistan, a friend of the United States for many years.

Just a few minutes ago I was meeting with a Pakistani American who was leaving to go help the internally displaced persons who are, as a result of the Pakistani Government, trying to rid that area of the Taliban and other insurgents who want to do harm to peace-loving people.

We need to be assured that the nuclear materials that Pakistan has are secure. But this bill, I believe, had merits in that it did promote the developmental assistance, the foreign aid, to help Pakistan get on its feet.

The questions that I had, of course, were the monies used to surge up the war in Afghanistan. And so this will be a time to review how this bill will make its way back, and whether or not we can get an end time, and whether or not we can tell family when their young people will come home, and whether or not we can answer those families whose returning soldiers suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder, as evidenced by the five bodies who came back at the hands of another soldier.

War is horrible, and so I believe it is important, as we have given this vote to the President, that it be such that it is a vote that ends these wars and focuses on building nations and building democracies so that they can take care of their own war and hopefully be unconflicted, if you will.

I am grateful for the resources in this bill that will help military families, mothers and fathers and children, the salary that comes about through those soldiers who lost salaries that have been put in this bill; the disaster aid, although I would have wanted to have a match, a 100 percent match for Galveston that is still suffering from Hurricane Ike. I hope we will be able to work on this issue as we move forward.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me, because I wanted to ensure that the support that has been given by some of us is based upon finding a way to end these conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And in finality, I might say that what I hope to have happen is that we find a way to ensure the end of the tenet, the term, if you will, of Osama bin Laden and of the insurgents that are destroying countries. I would hope, also, that we would be able to work to expand resources for posttraumatic stress disorders, and I am continuing to work to procure such a center in the 18th Congressional District for the large number of active soldiers that are in the Houston and Harris County area, noted as one of the major areas where active soldiers are in place.

This is, of course, an important step. And as we fight for education health reform, I think what we first of all must do is resolve these conflicts so that resources can be used to build a better America.

Mr. HONDA, again, I salute you on this great month and great leaders. You can count me as a friend as we move forward on so many different issues as we improve the lives of all Americans.

Mr. HONDA. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas and always count on her support for the issues that we care about together.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Asian American and Pacific Islander community and to commemorate the Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. As Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus,

what we call CAPAC, I feel privileged to be here tonight with my colleagues to speak of the Asian and Pacific Islander American history and accomplishments. Additionally, I will be highlighting those issues affecting our community and the priorities for CAPAC.

In celebrating the Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, I want to give thanks to the late Congressman Frank Horton from New York and my good friend, former Secretary Norman Mineta, along with Senators DANIEL INOUYE and Spark Masayuki Matsunaga of Hawaii.

It is because of their efforts that May is now designated as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. The first 10 days of May coincide with two important anniversaries: one, the arrival of the first Japanese American immigrants on May 7, 1843, to the United States, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad on May 10, 1869.

In 1992, Congress passed Public Law No. 102–450, the law that officially designated May of each year as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. Today the Asian Pacific Islander community is quickly expanding.

Currently, there are approximately 16.2 million APIs living in the United States. By the year 2050, there will be an estimated 43 million Asian Pacific Islanders, comprising 10 percent of the total U.S. population. My home State of California has the largest Asian population at 5 million. The States of New York and Texas followed at 1.4 million and close to 1 million, respectively.

The population is also growing in States beyond the usual hubs of New York and California. We are also seeing growth in other areas in our country such as Virginia, Nevada, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Florida.

I encourage my congressional colleagues to learn more about the Asian American Pacific Islander populations in their districts and become a member of CAPAC.

At this moment, Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California, the gentlewoman, LAURA RICHARDSON.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, it's with great pleasure that I come here today to stand with my colleague, Representative MIKE HONDA. Some people might ask what would make me come and stand in support.

In my district, very recently, this Congress, in addition, with the support of the President, we authorized the long-time held benefits of Filipino Americans who served in a war side by side with many of our soldiers protecting them, and that was a great day in my district.

As I was growing up and I went to college, I had an opportunity, when I was getting my master's, to travel to China and to go to Shanghai and Beijing and Hong Kong and to see the beauty of different cultures and to understand how people have come here now to the United States, not as a separation or a wall, but, rather, for us to work together and to see the things of how this country could grow. So that's why I am here today, Madam Speaker, and I have a few comments that I would like to share.

I rise today in support of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I proudly represent California's 37th Congressional District, one of the most diverse districts in the United States. Asians make up 11 percent of my district, and I am the 37th largest Asian population congressional district in this country. That means we are in the top 10 percent.

In fact, my district has the largest Cambodian population outside of Cambodia, only second to the population in Cambodia. And for the last 8 years, I have worked with the Cambodian community as we look at the challenges that we have and how we can better assure that folks understand the resources that we worked so hard to deliver to our communities that they know they are there to help them.

Because of this diversity, I am a proud member of CAPAC, which is the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus. I am a member of 30 other caucuses that also advocate to this very Congress. But, together, the three caucuses, the Hispanic Caucus, the Black Caucus, and the Asian Pacific Islander Caucus, were members who worked together advancing the goals of minorities and underserved communities. Although Members represent everyone, there's an inadequate delivery of resources to many of those that we represent.

This year, for Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, the theme is ''Lighting the Past, the Present, and the Future.''

The past is filled with rich contributions of cultural, economic, and technological value from the Asian community. One of the main reasons the month is used, this month of May, to honor the Asian community is, as Mr. HONDA mentioned, the transatlantic railroad that we saw that traveled thousands, hundreds of miles across the United States, that we would not have had, that we would not have progressed at the level and the speed that we did in this country, had we not had working people who wanted to come and to contribute.

The present demonstrates the great progress we have made as a country together. I have much hope for the future, though, even more so of Asian Americans in our country, but realize that we must all work together and work hard to achieve equality amongst everyone.

Dalip Singh Saund was the first Asian American elected to Congress in 1957. Less than a decade later, Patsy Mink, whom many of us think of fondly, became first Asian American woman elected to Congress; both overcame adversity and paved the way, not only for Asian American Members of Congress, but Members such as myself as well.

Today we have seven Members of Congress, and Mr. HONDA is leading the charge of this caucus today. And recently, we had an unprecedented number of three Asian Americans who were recently named to President Obama's cabinet: Energy Secretary, Steven Chu; Commerce Secretary, Gary Locke; and Veterans Affairs Secretary, Eric Shinseki.

One of the simplest ways for Asian Americans to ensure a brighter future that we can all participate in, because isn't that what this country is all about, is to fully participate in the 2010 census. Everyone in our Nation must be accounted for so that Members like Mr. HONDA and I, together, can garner the appropriate resources to those communities which they so richly deserve.

Minorities are historically undercounted, sometimes due to language, sometimes due to a concern of why someone is knocking at their door, and they don't know the process of what's happening every 10 years, and sometimes it's just understanding differences. In other countries, it's very common for many members of the family to live together.

□ 1915

And that may not necessarily be the tradition in all of our cities or all of our communities; but in some, it's very much the case.

Minorities historically have had these challenges. In California, we have the largest Asian population in the United States, which both Mr. HONDA and I serve. Currently, there are over 5 million Asians—and this number is growing rapidly.

Between 2006 and 2007, the population grew 106,000—that's 2.9 percent—which reflects the largest percentage growth of any group of individuals in this country.

In addition to participating in the census, health care is going to be one of the largest and most important issues that we will tackle on this floor this year. It is critical that within the broad scope of health care reform that there's focus on eliminating racial disparities of research and accessibility.

Last year, I introduced a piece of legislation, and I plan on reintroducing it again this year, and it's very similar in building upon the work of former Congresswoman Patsy Mink as she brought forward title IX legislation.

We all know what a tremendous effect title IX had on gender equality in sports and in programs. I was one who benefited from that. I was one of the first girls in my grade school who got to play with the boys on the playground, playing baseball and basketball. And it took legislation like Patsy Mink's to show that we could work side-by-side and that there should be an equality. Today, we face another tremendous challenge, and that inequality is health care.

Finally, I want to thank Congressman HONDA, the chair of CAPAC, which

I proudly serve with him, for organizing this time tonight to celebrate the accomplishments and the work that we still have yet to do. I'm looking forward to celebrating many more accomplishments this year, and beyond, and we're just beginning. I stand side-by-side as we take that trip together.

Mr. HONDA. I have a couple of comments to what you had shared with us. One is I'm very, very pleased that you have taken the initiative to join CAPAC, not only because you believe in it, but also there are folks in your district that need to be represented. Your knowledge and your understanding of the communities; that it has to be disaggregated to understand the different necessities and needs of each community rather than looking at one monolithic community, is greatly appreciated because, as you mention, about the census, it is about the census that drives us constitutionally to make sure that we count every person in this country. The fact that you express that there are different strategies of housing based upon family structures; that many times one family per household does not necessarily exist and that many families do live together to be with each other and give each other support, I wanted to thank you for that observation.

And one not very known fact about Patsy Mink. When she led the effort to pass the title IX legislation, that she did in fact open up quite a bit of avenues for women, but also I still remember the great tennis match between Billie Jean King and Bobby Riggs.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Billie Jean King is from my district, the Long Beach area.

Mr. HONDA. That was a great contest. I believe that Billie Jean King won, didn't she?

Ms. RICHARDSON. Yes, she did

Mr. HONDA. Despite his tactics. And so what we do here has great impact not only in this country but worldwide. So I really do appreciate the time and thought that you have put into this presentation and the the idea that Asian Americans have contributed to this country and in building this country, as you had mentioned, on the transcontinental railroad.

It's interesting to note that when you look at pictures of the golden spike being driven into the ground at Promontory Summit, there are no Asian faces there. I often wonder what happened. Were they given the day off or something like that?

I think it's very clear today that they were excused. And the kind of history that we see that is shared in our history books need to be brought up to date and be accurate.

This kind of forum, where we have a month dedicated to discussions about our contributions and our perspectives of how we see the communities in this country, is greatly appreciated. The fact that we have many people from different backgrounds in our caucus only expresses the understanding and the sensitivity and the consciousness that each individual Congressperson representing their district, even though a district may have 14 percent or 1 percent, the fact that it is stated publicly that you are representing those districts and those communities is greatly appreciated.

So, to my sister from California, I really appreciate your time spent with us.

Ms. RICHARDSON. From my brothers and sisters of the Cambodian community, Arkon. Chem re lear.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you. The Asian American Pacific Islander community is often misperceived as an overachieving monolithic group. However, our community is extremely diverse in our languages, ethnicities, income, educational attainment, language capabilities, special need and challenges.

Stereotypes about our communities make it difficult to understand the unique problems faced by individual communities and subgroups. Data that is disaggregated by ethnicity for our various communities is hard to come by, but critical to the understanding where we must direct Federal attention.

As a country, we need to better address the needs of the AAPI community when we discuss comprehensive immigration reform, health care, economic recovery, and education. We are also barely visible in corporate America, underrepresented in political and judicial offices throughout the country, and misportrayed in our mainstream media.

As our community expands, we must also continue to educate our fellow citizens about the uniqueness of our experiences. Despite the daunting challenges we face, this is a time of great optimism and hope for the communities.

This year, we are marking Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Month under the twin banners of National Service and Recovery. We are at a pivotal moment in our Nation's history where the national spirit is shifting to a new era of volunteerism, public service, and working for the common good.

The Asian Pacific Islander American communities are no stranger to these changes, and our communities have taken hold of a new civic spirit engendered by President Obama's new administration.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield such time as she may consume to our gentlelady from the Aloha State, Mazie Hirono.

Ms. HIRONO. I thank my colleague for yielding me such time as I might use.

Aloha. I rise today to join my fellow congressional Asian Pacific Islander American Caucus members in celebrating Asian Pacific Islander American Heritage Month. Of course, I'd like to thank Congressman HONDA for organizing this Special Order tonight and for his continuing leadership throughout the year and his service as the chair of CAPAC.

In 1978, a joint congressional resolution established Asian Pacific American Heritage Week. The first 10 days of May were chosen to coincide with two key anniversaries: The U.S. arrival of the first Japanese immigrant on May 7, 1843, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad on May 10, 1869. In 1992, Congress expanded the week to a full monthlong celebration of the Asian and Pacific Islander American community.

We certainly have added to the diversity and the cultural richness of our country. As a first generation immigrant myself, having come to this country when I was about eight years old, this country has afforded not just me, but the millions of immigrants, the first generation we call issei and nisei, opportunities that we never would have had in our home countries.

With 16.2 million residents, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are one of the fastest growing populations in the United States. In fact, the Census Bureau estimates that by the year 2050, more than 33.4 million Asian Americans will call the United States home.

Asian and Pacific Islander Americans have made valuable contributions to every aspect of American life—from business to education to politics to the arts to the military. For example, there are approximately 1.1 million APIA-owned small businesses all across the country that employ 2.2 million workers. There are also hundreds of thousands of APIA servicemembers and veterans, including more than 53,500 brave men and women who have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001.

Today, I was glad to join my colleagues in supporting passage of H.R. 347, which appropriately awards a Congressional Gold Medal to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team in honor of their extraordinary and dedicated service during World War II.

Comprised predominantly of nisei, the American-born sons of Japanese immigrants, members of the University of Hawaii's Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the ROTC, aided the wounded, buried the fallen, and helped defend vulnerable areas in Hawaii after the attack at Pearl Harbor.

In spite of these acts of courage, the U.S. Army discharged all nisei in the ROTC unit, changed their draft status to ineligible, and segregated all Japanese American in the military on the mainland out of their units. In the meantime, more than 100,000 Japanese Americans were forcibly relocated from their homes to internment camps.

Undaunted, members of the Hawaii Provisional Infantry Battalion joined the 100th Infantry Battalion in California to train as soldiers. The sheer determination and pursuit of excellence displayed by this battalion in

training contributed to President Roosevelt's decision to allow nisei volunteers to serve in the U.S. military again, leading to their incorporation into the 442nd.

Members of the 100th and 442nd risked their lives to fight for our country and allies in Europe. The 442nd ''Go for Broke'' unit became the most decorated in U.S. military history for its size and length of service, with its component, the 100th Infantry Battalion, earning the nickname ''The Purple Heart Battalion.''

I'd like to thank Congressman SCHIFF, the chief sponsor of H.R. 347, for providing us with the opportunity to bestow this body's most distinguished honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, to these brave soldiers on the behalf of a grateful Nation.

I would be remiss if I did not mention one of Hawaii's favorite sons as we celebrate this month, and that is President Barack Obama. While not ethnically Asian American or Pacific Islander himself, his ties to our community are strong ones, and his support on our issues could not be more heartfelt.

He has appointed, as mentioned earlier, Asian Americans to key cabinet positions: Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy; Gary Locke, Secretary of Commerce. By the way, Gary Locke is the first Asian American to be elected Governor outside of Hawaii. And Kauai's own General Eric Shinseki, Secretary of Veteran Affairs.

One of the issues that President Obama has supported is self-determination for the indigenous people of our State of Hawaii—native Hawaiians who deserve to have the same right to self-determination enjoyed by other indigenous groups such as the American Indians and the Alaskan natives.

H.R. 2314, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act, would set up a process for native Hawaiians to organize a governmental entity. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and our President in passing this important bill.

I would also be remiss if I did not pay tribute to my predecessor, Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii, a trailblazer in every sense of the word. I thank my colleague, Congresswoman RICHARDSON, for mentioning Patsy Mink, for whom title IX was renamed the Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act.

Title IX changed the lives of women and girls across our country. In fact, a couple of years ago, several of the high schools in my district were given a special recognition for really promoting title IX and participation of high school girls in sports. When I attended one of these high schools to present them with a special recognition, one of the girls asked me a question that totally floored me. That question was, If you could pick a sport, what sport would you have participated in? And it floored me because it was a question that had never been asked when I was in high school.

That's the kind of difference that title IX is making. In fact, Patsy's own daughter, when she applied to a particular school and did not get accepted, the reason for that was, they told her, We have enough women in our university. This all preceded title IX. Literally thousands and thousands of lives have been change by title IX.

In closing, I'd like to also once again thank Chairman HONDA for allowing us this opportunity to reflect upon how far our APIA community has come, and yet we must remember how much further our community has to go.

As we say in Hawaii, mahalo nui loa.

Mr. HONDA. Mahalo.

Ms. HIRONO. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. HONDA. I'd like to thank the gentlelady from Hawaii. It appears that the mainland Asian Americans have to strive real hard to catch up to the contributions that many of the folks from Hawaii had accomplished.

You mentioned Patsy Mink. I think a lot of us understand that when we come from humble backgrounds—and she often shared that she was born on a plantation; went for many years without shoes. She understood what it meant to be a woman. And I suspect your background has been very similar.

□ 1930

Mr. HONDA. The idea of title IX and equity for women was probably one that formulated in her life and in her work, and the opportunity came about when she was able to walk the Halls of Congress. She did that, but she didn't stop there because I understand there is a story about her where she led a contingent of women to protest that there were no gymnasiums here for women and only for men. That must have been a real sight.

Ms. HIRONO. I can tell you, having gone to the women's gym in the Rayburn Building, things have changed. We have full-size lockers now. Truly, in terms of gender equality, Patsy was a leader because she had to fight every step of the way. And, in fact, one of the other stories about Patsy is when she applied to medical school. And she was a very smart woman. She wanted to become a doctor. She applied to medical school and was refused because she was a woman. When she finally applied to law school, they put her in the international dorm because they thought she was a foreign person.

We have come a long way.

I did want to mention as long as we are talking about the challenges that immigrants face. There was a historic poll done recently focusing on immigrant women and the fact that so many of them come to this country to truly create a new life of opportunity for their children. Many of them were professionals in the countries from which they came, and so they did not come to make money. Often the kind of jobs they were able to get in this country were very poor paying with not very many benefits.

This was so reminiscent of when my mother brought us to this country. We came literally with nothing, and she started off in a very poor-paying job with no benefits. But what guided her was this immigrant spirit of wanting to create a new life for her children. That kept her going. She wanted for herself to be able to take care of her family, but to have us have opportunities that she never had.

That story is replicated in thousands and thousands and thousands of stories by the waves of immigrants from Japan, Korea, China, the Philippines, over and over. And to know that even now these women and their families face particular challenges should reinforce in us our desire to not only celebrate all of the accomplishments of the APIA community, but to know that there is much more work to be done.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you for sharing that. I guess in English we say you weren't born with a silver spoon in your mouth, nor golden chopsticks. Knowing your history of political participation, being the lieutenant governor of Hawaii and now representing Hawaii, I guess one can say that you are a statistical aberration of probabilities, and who would guess except for the fact that your mom had such great strength.

Ms. HIRONO. One of the things that I always say is that this is a great country, and even if we are not perfect, what a country. I am reminded once again of that with the election of our first African American President.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you very much.

For the record, I know I said I would go until 7:30, but it seems we have gotten verbose and more comfortable with this kind of presentation so we will move on as designated.

Madam Speaker, for the first time we are marking Asian Pacific American Heritage Month with an American President with close ties to Asia, as has been mentioned previously. President Obama grew up in Hawaii and Indonesia. His sister is half Indonesian, and his brother-in-law is Chinese Canadian, and he has maintained close ties with Asian friends and colleagues throughout his life.

President Obama's campaign made unprecedented efforts to reach out to the APIA communities, and we have found a receptive and engaged administration with a close ear to our shared interests.

Many APIA community members have responded to President Obama's call for public service.

The President's Cabinet appointments include a record three Asian Americans: Energy Secretary Steven Chu; Commerce Secretary Gary Locke, the former Governor of Washington; Veterans Affairs Secretary General Eric Shinseki of Hawaii; and General Shinseki is joined at Veterans Affairs by Colonel Tammy Duckworth, who serves as Assistant Secretary.

He has chosen AAPIs for positions in the White House and throughout his

administration, including Peter Rouse, Chris Lu, Tina Tchen, Kal Penn, Nicholas Rathod, Kundra Vivek, and Sonal Shah.

Among many others in the White House, CAPAC's own Victoria Tung transitioned from her position as CAPAC executive director to an appointment Under Secretary Locke at the Department of Commerce.

The ranks of Asian American Pacific Islander Members of Congress also increased this past year with the election of ANH ''JOSEPH'' CAO from Louisiana's Second District, GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN from the Northern Mariana Islands, and STEVE AUSTRIA from Ohio's Seventh District.

Representative CAO has the distinction of being the first Vietnamese American elected to Congress.

Representative SABLAN is the first Member to represent the Northern Marianas, and the only Chamorro person serving in Congress today. Representatives CAO and SABLAN are also the newest members of the CAPAC executive board. Our newest associate members are Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY of New York and Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY of California, and we have many more lined up to join.

It is a testament to our evolving national character as a nation of immigrants to have our newest Members of Congress come from upbringings beyond our shores.

Talking about beyond our shores, the Northern Marianas, the most western outpost of the United States, here to speak with us is the gentleman from Northern Marianas, Congressman SABLAN.

Mr. SABLAN. Thank you very much. I am very happy to join the chairman of our caucus here before you, Madam Speaker, as part of the celebration of the Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

On May 1, 2009, President Obama proclaimed May 2009 as Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

Pacific Islanders and Asian Americans of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands celebrate our heritage and praise those who pass on our history to our children.

The people of the Northern Mariana Islands have much to celebrate: our strength and our relationship with the United States. We have two distinct but related people: the Chamorros and the Carolinians. Our culture and language are witness to the evolution and strength of our people. From the over 300-year occupation of the Spanish beginning in the early 1500s, to the purchase of the islands by the Germans in 1899, to the annexation of the islands by Japan before World War II, to becoming a trust territory for 30 years under the United States after the war, the Chamorro and the Carolinian people remain proud of who they were and who they are today.

The strength is seen in the eyes of our elders and passed on to generations thereafter. Despite the tragedies that have fallen on our elders and their elders before, our people are very hospitable. We have embraced people from all over the world, not just into our islands, but into our own homes. For instance, we have cultural exchanges between our schoolchildren and other children from other nations who come to the Northern Marianas. Families host and have barbecues for visiting military personnel during their R&R visits, and we have several yearly festivals showcasing the many beautiful faces and cultures of the Marianas.

We celebrate the independence of our people as part of our heritage. The people of the Northern Mariana Islands decided the fate of their future after World War II. We chose, as an act of political self-determination, to be a governing commonwealth within the American political system.

Just last month on March 24, we celebrated 33 years of our relationship with the United States. Covenant Day is the recognition of the agreement made between the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States and which granted the Northern Mariana Islanders United States citizenship. Where else but in America can an individual who has only been a citizen for 22 years be allowed to be a Member of Congress?

While Covenant Day celebrates the union between the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States, Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month celebrates the very people who are part of this union. Pacific Islanders contribute much to the United States landscape, including teachers, service in the military, caring for those in need of medical assistance, defending and prosecution under our legal system, and volunteerism in so many ways.

And after 33 years, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands can contribute even more now that they have a voice in Congress. The people can become involved in policies that are beneficial to all, including Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. A voice in Congress is evidence of independence, but at the same time resonates with a theme of working together, which is exactly who we are.

For example, health care reform impacts not only Pacific Islanders on a local level, but affects all people on a national level. Our voice in Congress will seek to protect the people of the Northern Mariana Islands, as well as other people across our Nation.

Lastly, our cultural legacy is only as strong as we remember our past. There are not enough pages for me to list each and every person who has contributed to the preservation of our culture and language. In general, I would like to thank the people who have written books about the Northern Mariana Islands, who have taught our history to our children in classrooms, to the organizations that have sponsored debates, contests, and conversations, and the librarians who archive our important documents for future generations.

While May has been formally recognized as Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, our people celebrate our heritage every day by speaking our native tongue, by reading books of our past, by visiting and paying respect to our elders, by learning from them, and by performing our cultural dances and singing our local music.

Madam Speaker, I recommend the following literature about the Northern Mariana Islands for those who are interested:

□ 1945

''Tiempon I Manmofo'na: Ancient Chamorro Culture and History of the Northern Mariana Islands''; ''We Drank Our Tears: Memories of the Battles for Saipan and Tinian as Told by Our Elders''; ''Estreyas Marianas: Chamorro''; Ancient Chamorro Society''; ''An Honorable Accord: The Covenant Between the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States''; ''History of the Northern Mariana Islands''; ''A Tidy Universe of Islands''; and ''Tiempon Aleman: A Look Back at the German Rule of the Northern Mariana Islands, 1899–1914.''

I would like to say in our native tongue, Si Yu'us Ma'ase, Ghilisow, and thank you.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you very much, Congressman KILILI, as you like to be called.

Many things that happen in the Northern Marianas is that—and a lot of people don't seem to understand or know—is that there is a dire need in those islands that we should be paying attention to. Many times when you're out of sight, you're out of mind; and your presence has brought to our sight and to our understanding the many things that the islands are facing, such as the situation in Saipan.

Could you just share a little bit about that.

Mr. SABLAN. Thank you. Let me put it this way; I have been told, actually, in my seventh week here in Congress, that, look, you can't catch up 33 years of absence in 7 weeks' time.

We are a small island. We have very little resources. I have always said that education is the number one resource we have, and as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I continue to forward that agenda for our islands and for our future. But obviously, because we have not had a Member in Congress since we became a United States Commonwealth, we have had a lack of resources.

Our island, for example, we just don't have 24-hour water. And not just that, but if you're lucky enough to get 2 to 3 hours of water a day, you can't drink that water anyway, so you use it to wash your clothes and bathe and those kinds of things.

Our number one problem is we have major parts of one island in Saipan and the other two islands have absolutely no sewer system. So, yes, we are trying to bring to the attention of Congress

and the Federal Government the needs of these islands.

We have a set of 14 islands in the Northern Mariana Islands that right now three are inhabited. At one time, seven islands were inhabited, but because of the lack of infrastructure in those islands, the absence of schools, public health and running water and utilities, those people actually uprooted and moved into Saipan. So we have the situation where we are so far removed—as you know, we are 15 time zones away from Washington, D.C. We are so far away, it is now 10 o'clock in the morning tomorrow, and so the time difference is amazing.

I would like to also admit that when I came here in January, since then I have been very welcomed by the Members of this Congress and by you, Mr. Chairman. I am so grateful for the hospitality, the courteousness that I was given, the decency and respect with which I am addressed. That just makes me much more convinced that America is truly a Nation of great people and generous people. Thank you.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you. And the admonition of you can't take care of 33 years in 7 weeks, if we all believed that, then we would still be back, perhaps, in the dark ages. Many people in the old days used to say, just be patient and by and by things will happen, but things don't happen without some initiative and some understanding and the information you bring with you. So the people of the Northern Marianas and this country, we are very responsible for many of the things that happened in the Pacific Islands because of the testing we've done out that way and things like that, really does speak to the responsibility of trying to find ways, with technology, to be able to afford and provide the necessary kinds of things that are required for living a quality of life, such as fresh water. So we thank you very much.

Mr. SABLAN. Thank you for having me.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, our Nation was founded by immigrants who valued freedom and liberty, who sought to be free from persecution, from tyranny.

Families fled their home countries to seek refuge in this great Nation because they, too, believed in liberty, justice, and freedom for all. It is in this spirit that CAPAC supports immigration legislation that shifts the debate from an exclusionary, anti-immigrant, enforcement-only approach to one that confronts the social and economic realities behind immigration, honors the dignity of all families and communities, and recognizes the economic, social, and cultural contributions of immigrants to our great country.

Today, AAPIs constitute a growing and vibrant piece of the American fabric. In 2007, approximately 10.2 million of the Nation's foreign born were born in Asia, constituting over one-quarter of the foreign-born population and over one-half of the total Asian American Pacific Island population.

Even with a relatively high naturalization rate, Asian undocumented immigrants living, working, or studying in the U.S. represent approximately 12 percent of the undocumented immigrants in the U.S. These include victims of immigration fraud who have become undocumented due to no fault of their own. Many work and study hard and pay taxes, yet live in fear with no hope of gaining a path to legal permanent resident status.

We must also recognize that reuniting families gives strength to American communities and are the bedrock of a vibrant and stable economy. We must eliminate the long backlogs keeping families apart for years and often decades. We have the tools and resources to remove the obstacles of massive backlogs, insufficient staffing, and unused visas that cause unnecessary misery for our newest Americans.

Let's keep families together. By strengthening the social fabric of our communities and integrating workers, we can get our economy back on track while reuniting American workers with their families.

The American people spoke in a united voice last year when they voted down the politics of division and embraced the politics of change. President Obama, the son of a Kenyan immigrant, has made comprehensive immigration reform a high priority. CAPAC is prepared to work with our colleagues to push through the long-deferred changes needed to ensure a fair, efficient, and secure immigration system. We join with the other caucuses to make sure that becomes a reality.

Madam Speaker, a common misperception of AAPIs is that as a group we face fewer health problems than other racial and ethnic groups. In fact, AAPIs as a group, and specific populations within this group, do experience disparities in health and health care. For example, AAPIs have the highest hepatitis B rates of any racial group in the United States. We must bring attention to and educate our communities about prevention of hepatitis B through testing and vaccination.

In the United States, 12 million people have been infected at some time in their lives with the hepatitis B virus, and more than 5,000 Americans die from hepatitis B-related liver complications each year. Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders account for more than half of the chronic hepatitis B cases and half of the deaths resulting from chronic hepatitis B infections in the United States.

In order to break the silence surrounding this deadly disease and bring awareness to the American people, Congressman EDOLPHUS TOWNS, Congressman CHARLIE DENT, Congressman ANH CAO, and I will introduce a resolution to support the goals and ideals of Viral Hepatitis Awareness Month and World Hepatitis Awareness Day. I hope my colleagues will join me in educating our communities about the dangers of this disease.

Furthermore, according to the Census Bureau, 16.8 percent of AAPIs went without insurance in 2007, up from 15.5 percent in 2006. This means that the uninsured are not only more likely to go without care for serious medical conditions, they are also more likely to go without routine care, less likely to have a regular source of care, less likely to use preventative services, and have fewer visits per year. At the same time, without appropriate language translation services or properly translated materials, limited English-proficient immigrants cannot receive adequate care as well as State and Federal benefits for which they may be eligible.

In the AAPI community, 76 percent of Hmong Americans, 61 percent of Vietnamese Americans, 52 percent of Korean Americans, 39 percent of Tongans speak limited English. Therefore, eliminating health care disparities in the AAPI community must include data collection, linguistically appropriate and culturally competent services, and access to health insurance.

CAPAC has been working with both the Congressional Hispanic and Black Caucuses on the Healthcare Equality and Accountability Act to eliminate ethnic and racial health disparities for all of our communities. The act would expand the health care safety net, diversify the health care workforce, combat diseases that disproportionately affect racial and ethnic minorities, emphasize prevention and behavioral health, and promote the collection and dissemination of data, and enhance medical research. CAPAC has also joined the Congressional Black, Hispanic, and Progressive Caucuses to strongly support a public health insurance plan option, such as Medicare.

In addition to immigration and health care reform, expanding educational access for all Americans is also a high priority for CAPAC. This Saturday marks the 55th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education. As we celebrate, we must remember that education is at the very center of our democratic meritocracy, and it is imperative that every American should be afforded the true opportunity to achieve their highest potential.

I have reintroduced the Educational Opportunity and Equity Commission Act, H.R. 1758, to begin the process of overhauling the country's education system and to finally address the disparities among America's schools. This legislation creates a national commission charged with gathering public opinions and insights about how government can improve education and eliminate the disparities in our educational system. I hope you will join me as cosponsors to this legislation.

As we celebrate Brown v. Board of Education, we must remember the needs of all young people, including Asian American and Pacific Islander students, many of whom struggle in low-income communities, refugee communities, and do not have sufficient English skills. Brown paved the way

for future Supreme Court rulings, such as in 1974, the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in Lau v. Nichols. That decision enumerated the educational rights of English language learners and established that education is a civil right. As Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, we should be proud of our community and its participation in our country's civil rights movement and not forget that we have a long way to go yet.

According to the 2000 Census, only 9.1 percent of Cambodian Americans, 7.4 percent Hmong Americans, 7.6 Lao Americans, 19.5 percent of Vietnamese Americans, and 16.5 of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders who are 25 years and older have a bachelors degree or higher. These numbers show that we must do a better job of disaggregating data and information about our communities and to assess the needs of those hardworking Americans who still falter behind.

To address the disparities between subgroups of the larger AAPI community, we must support greater funding for Asian American and Pacific Islander-serving institutions. This program provides Federal grants to colleges and universities that have an enrollment of undergraduate students that is at least 10 percent AAPI, and at least 50 percent of its degree-seeking students receive financial assistance.

On behalf of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, Congressman DAVID WU and I will be working to increase the availability of loan assistance, scholarships, and programs to allow AAPI students to attend a higher education institution, to ensure full funding for teachers and bilingual education programs under the No Child Left Behind law to support English language learners; and to support full funding of minority outreach programs for access to higher education, such as the TRIO programs, to expand services to service AAPI students.

I am proud of our community's accomplishments, and I would like to recognize many of the AAPI ''firsts'' in the areas of art, film, sports, sciences, academia, and politics.

In 1847, Yung Wing, a Chinese American, graduated from Yale University and became the first AAPI to graduate from an American University.

In 1863, William Ah Hang, a Chinese American, became the first AAPI to enlist in the U.S. Navy during the Civil War.

In 1913, A.K. Mozumdar became the first Indian-born person to earn U.S. citizenship, having convinced the court that he was Caucasian, and therefore met the requirements of naturalization law that restricted citizenship only to free white persons.

□ 2000

In 1922 Anna May Wong, in her lead role in The Toll of the Sea, at the age of 17 became the first AAPI female to become a movie star, achieving stardom at a time when prejudice against Chinese in the U.S. was rampant.

In 1944 An Wang, a Chinese American who invented the magnetic core memory, revolutionized computing and served as the standard method for memory retrieval and storage.

During World War II, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team of the U.S. Army, comprised mostly of Japanese Americans, became the most highly decorated unit of its size in the history of the U.S. Army, including 22 Medal of Honor recipients.

It appears that my time is expiring. So let me quickly indicate that we have young people like Wataru ''Wat'' Misaka who was born in 1947 who became the first ethnic minority and the first AAPI to play in the National Basketball Association, the New York Knicks. Imagine that, an Asian American in basketball.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for this opportunity to share within a short hour the history of the Asian Americans and a variety of communities that reside in this country that have contributed, yet many of these names are still unknown.

Ang Lee is probably the most widely known today, the Chinese American director who was the first to win an Academy Award for Best Director.

Thank you very much, and we would hope that we have opportunities in the near future to be able to share more.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Without objection, the 5-minute request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is vacated.

There was no objection.

THOSE WHO WEAR THE UNIFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It has been said that we sleep safe in our beds because bold men and women stand ready in the night to visit justice on those who would try to do us harm.

Madam Speaker, those bold men and women are those people throughout America that wear the uniform of a peace officer, a law enforcement officer that wears the badge on their chest to represent that symbol, to protect the community from those evildoers.

Each year, 50,000 police officers are assaulted in the United States. Let me repeat. Fifty thousand peace officers in the United States are assaulted by somebody.

On May 17, 1792, New York City's Deputy Sheriff Isaac Smith became the first recorded police officer to be killed in the line of duty. Since then, Madam Speaker, 18,340 police officers have been killed while on duty protecting the rest of us.

In 1961, Congress created Peace Officers Memorial Day and designated it to be commemorated each year on May 15, which is tomorrow. I am proud to be the sponsor of this year's resolution that passed this House unanimously in February.

Every year the President issues a proclamation naming May 15 National Peace Officers Memorial Day. A quote by President George H.W. Bush is engraved on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial located in Washington, D.C., that summarized the mission of the 900,000 current sworn law enforcement officers in the United States.

Here's what it says, Madam Speaker: ''It is an officer's continuing quest to preserve both democracy and decency and to protect a national treasure that we call the American dream.'' That is the mission statement of peace officers in this country, those who wear the American uniform.

Tomorrow, Madam Speaker, on the other side of the Capitol, on the west side of the Capitol, 140 families will be assembled together. They will be surrounded by thousands of other people. Most of those people will be peace officers from somewhere in the United States, wearing their uniforms, standing at attention to honor those 140 families who lost a loved one last year in the line of duty because 140 peace officers of the United States law enforcement community were killed last year in the line of duty. Ten percent of those, 14, were from my home State of Texas.

The names of those 14, Madam Speaker, are:

Deputy Constable David Joubert. He worked for the Harris County Constable's Office, Precinct 7 in Houston, Texas.

Police Officer Matthew B. Thebeau, Corpus Christi Police Department.

Corporal Harry Thielepape, Harris County Constable's Office, Precinct 6, in Houston, Texas.

Senior Corporal Victor A. Lozada Sr., Dallas Police Department.

Trooper James Scott Burns of the Texas Department of Public Safety, working for the Highway Patrol in Texas.

Police Officer Everett William Dennis, Carthage Police Department in Texas.

Sergeant Barbara Jean Shumate who worked for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

A personal friend of mine, Police Officer Gary Gryder who worked for the Houston Police Department.

Another personal friend of mine, Detective Tommy Keen of the Harris County Sheriff's Department. I knew him 25 years ago when I was a prosecutor and he was still arresting outlaws.

Game Warden George Harold Whatley, Jr. who worked for the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department.

Sheriff Brent Lee of the Trinity County Sheriff's Department in Texas.

Police Officer Robert Davis of the San Antonio Police Department.

Just recently in December, Police Officer Timothy Abernathy of the Houston Police Department.

And last on the roll call of the 14 dead, Police Officer Mark Simmons of the Amarillo Police Department.

One hundred and forty individuals who wear the badge, who gave their lives last year, their families will be here tomorrow in solemn tribute and honor of those individuals.

Already in 2009, Madam Speaker, there have been 46 law enforcement officers that have died in the line of duty. Once again, over 10 percent of those are from my home State of Texas.

Madam Speaker, at this time of year throughout the United States, peace officers who wear the badge on their chest will have a black cloth draped across that badge. That black cloth is to honor those brothers and sisters in law enforcement that were killed in the line of duty. Many peace officers are here in Washington already. You can see them throughout the city, wearing their uniforms with that black cloth of sacrifice.

Most peace officers wear a badge, or as they call it, a shield. It comes from hundreds of years ago when individuals who acted as police officers protected the communities with actual shields and swords. Now it has been symbolized, and that's what they wear on their chest.

In Texas, many of the peace officers, especially the sheriff's department, all wear stars. It comes from our history of the old west. In fact, the Texas Rangers still wear a star on their chest. They don't wear uniforms. They dress with a Stetson hat, a white shirt, and then they wear a star.

Whether it's a badge or a star or a shield, all of those symbols and emblems are placed over the heart and chest of our peace officers because they were protecting us from those who wish to do us harm.

I've known a lot of police officers over the years. As I mentioned, I was a prosecutor in Houston. I spent 22 years on the bench as a judge trying criminal cases. So I met a lot of them. I tried cases where police officers were harmed and even killed. It's my opinion that those men and women that wear the uniform, the badge, they represent everything that's good and right about America.

When I was a small kid, I had gone to a parade with my dad in a small town called Temple, Texas. I must have been about 5 or 6 years of age, and a parade was going by. Of course as all parades should be, Old Glory was going by first with a mounted horseman, and then the Texas flag.

I noticed on the street that there was an individual who wasn't involved in the parade, but he was just standing there, watching the parade, observing the crowd. My dad noticed that I was observing this individual, and of course it turned out to be a Temple police officer. That was in the days when they didn't wear uniforms. They just wore a star or a badge and a white shirt and cowboy hat.

He told me something that was really true then and is still true today in 2009. He said, If you are ever in trouble, if you ever need help, go to the person who wears the badge because they're a cut above the rest of us.

That's true, Madam Speaker. They are a cut above the rest of us, and they still are there when we need help, when we're in trouble, we need the help of someone who wears the uniform.

Looking at it another way, peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the fox and the chickens, between the good guys and the bad guys. They're it. They are the only protection we have between the law and outlaws. It's great that they serve in that capacity.

We have a lot of different agencies in this country. It's not just our local police officers. It's not just the sheriff's departments, but there are all the Federal agents that we have.

The U.S. Air Marshals that fly and protect us in the air. The drug enforcement agents, the ATF, and we certainly cannot forget the Border Patrol. Our own Capitol Police who serve us even tonight in this building, near this building, watching, ever vigilant to make sure no harm comes to the Capitol or to the people that serve in government in Washington, D.C.

It wasn't long ago, not too many years ago when right down this hall, the center aisle—as we go out the center aisle, there's the majority leader's office—when two Capitol Police officers gave their lives because somebody came in here with a gun, trying to do harm to Members of Congress. Their tribute is still in that hallway. Capitol Police officers are always vigilant and always on guard.

There are others that wear the uniform that really protect us, other than law enforcement. Those emergency medical technicians and of course the firefighters who serve throughout the country and have died in the line of duty, two in Houston, Texas not long ago, several in California.

Madam Speaker, if we go back a few years to September 11, 2001, all of us remember what we were doing that day. I was driving to the courthouse as a judge, listening to the radio, driving my Jeep.

News came on the radio that an airplane had crashed into one of the Twin Towers in New York City. It startled me like every other American, I'm sure. Then a few minutes later on the radio it said a second plane had crashed into the other Twin Tower in New York City. It wasn't long after that on the radio, which was now giving constant broadcasts of that event in New York City, that a third plane had crashed somewhere in Pennsylvania because of some wonderful Americans on that plane who took matters into their own hands. Then lastly we heard about a fourth plane who flew over this area, Madam Speaker, and crashed into the Pentagon in sight of this very building.

Later that night, I, like probably most Americans, was watching TV, seeing exactly what had happened, and I noticed that when those planes hit the World Trade Center, that thousands of people, good folks from all countries, thousands of people started running as hard as they could to get away from that terror in the sky.

□ 2015

But there was another group of people, not very many, but they were there, that when those planes hit the World Trade Center, they were running as hard as they could to get to that terror. And who were they? They were emergency medical folks. They were firefighters. And they were cops, because that is what they do, Madam Speaker. And while it is important to remember the 3,000 that died that day, it is equally important to remember those that got to live because those emergency people were there to pull them out of the World Trade Center. Marvelous group of folks, those people who wear the badge and protect the rest of us.

And here, Madam Speaker, when that fourth plane came flying near the Capitol and crashed across the Potomac River into the Pentagon where 300-plus were killed, as you know, right next to the Pentagon is Arlington National Cemetery. In Arlington National Cemetery, we have the Tomb of the Unknowns, or as some call it, the Unknown Soldier. It is protected 24 hours a day by an Army unit called the Old Guard. It is important that all Americans go to that tomb and see the changing of the Old Guard every hour or half hour.

But when that fourth plane crashed into the Pentagon, Madam Speaker, those soldiers guarding the Tomb of the Unknown never left their post. In fact, they called for reinforcements. Marvelous group of people that put on the uniform, whether it is the uniform of a peace officer or the uniform of someone in the military.

So tomorrow, May 15, we honor those who have been killed in the line of duty protecting us, those peace officers, the 140 families. Ten days after tomorrow, which will be May 25, we honor those who have served America in the military uniform and given their lives.

On Memorial Day we honor the soldiers that went somewhere in the world and didn't come back. On Veterans Day, we honor those that left and were able to return. So on May 25, Madam Speaker, we will honor those soldiers, marines, sailors and airmen who went to war for this country and did not return.

I believe it is important that we remember our history, that we know our history, all of it, regardless of what it is we should know as Americans about the people who lived before us, because they are people. And some of them were quite remarkable individuals.

The first war really that the country fought, if you don't count the French and Indian War, was the Revolutionary War. About 5,000 Americans died, a relatively high number considering the percentage of the population that 5,000 represented. And it wasn't easy, Madam Speaker. That war lasted over 7 years. And there were those then, like there have always been in this country, the cynics, the critics and the doomsayers that kind of wanted to quit. But those resilient men and women that fought those 7 years never gave up. And they never quit because, you see, some things are absolutely worth fighting for. That is kind of what this country stands for. And liberty is one of those things worth fighting for.

So after 7 years, the country became a Nation. Put it in perspective. The United States, just a bunch of colonial folks, farmers, merchants and lawyers, took on the mightiest empire that had ever existed in the history of the world, the British Empire, and defeated it.

The British didn't get the point, Madam Speaker, because in 1812 they invaded the United States again to reconquer this country. The War of 1812 is something we don't talk too much about. We don't understand that we could have lost our country to the British invasion. They invaded this city. They burned this Capitol to the ground. They burned every building in Washington, D.C., except the Marine barracks right down the street. And then they headed up to Baltimore and were ready to take over Baltimore. But because of defiant Americans in 1814 that were there, the British finally went home, although 2,500 Americans died in the War of 1812.

Then the United States went to war in the Mexican-American War in 1846, about 14,000 Americans, fighting to defend and protect the border of the United States, because that is what that war was all about, the dignity and sovereignty of the United States, especially the southwestern part of the United States. And then the war that most Americans at least remember, the Civil War, or the War Between the States, when the Nation was divided in half, brother against brother in some cases, family against family. In the War Between the States, between the North and the South, 600,000 Americans died. True, they were from the North and from the South. But let me say something, Madam Speaker. They were all Americans, every one of them. And if you put that percentage of 600,000 in 1860 to 1865 to today, that would be about 5 million Americans in today's numbers, all fighting for what they believed in.

I have had the opportunity to travel and see many of our historic battlefields. Many are close by, in Virginia, where hundreds, thousands, of Americans died. Just one example, the Wilderness Battlefield, down the road about 75 miles, fought in 1864. There were 100,000 Union troops and 60,000 Southern troops on one battlefield. That is the amount of troops, 160,000, that is the number of troops that we have tonight in all of Iraq and Afghanistan put together. And if you take all those numbers and put them on one battlefield, that is how many people were on one battlefield in 3 days in May in 1864. In that battle, 30,000 casualties. It is called the ''Wilderness'' because of the massive amount of trees that are there.

And I had the honor to go with my friend from Vermont, PETER WELCH, from the other side of the aisle, from the North, to go together to the Wilderness Battlefield last week to pay tribute to those that died. We went for several reasons. One is because Vermont, from the North, sustained the highest casualties ever in the State of Vermont in any war. And in that battle also 60 percent of the Texans that were in that battle were casualties. So we went to pay honor to them because, like I said before, they were all Americans. And it is unfortunate now we are having to fight another battle with a corporation called Wal-Mart that wants to build one of their beautiful stores right there on the battlefield. Wal-Mart sees profit more important than patriotism.

But be that as it may, that was the type of situation this country faced in the 1860s. Americans all gave their lives, 600,000 of them.

Then it wasn't over. We went to the Spanish-American War right before the turn of the last century, 2,500. That was, as you recall, Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders. And then we went to the war that was supposed to end all wars, that is World War I, the war where millions actually died throughout the world. The United States went into World War I late. But because we were there, in my opinion, it made a difference, and the war was successful. It successfully ended. 4.4 million Americans, they were called ''doughboys'' because their uniforms looked like dough, 4.4 million of them went over there. They went to places they had never heard of and they fought for people they did not know. But they went because America wanted them to go. Of those that went, 114,000 of them did not come back, Madam Speaker.

Of course, World War I did not end all wars. World War II was soon behind where 405,000 Americans were killed. In World War II my dad proudly served as an 18-year-old and went over to France. He had never been more than 50 miles from home, and there he found himself, as many other American GIs in World War II, a long way from home fighting in Europe and in the South Pacific. But it wasn't over. World War II ended in 1946.

Four years later we are at war again in Korea. It is called the Korean ''conflict.'' I don't know why it is called that. It was war. People died. Americans, 36,000 died in Korea trying to protect another nation called South Korea.

And then when it was over, it was Vietnam, the longest war in American history, over 10 years, where 58,000 Americans died. And then the recent Middle East American wars, the Persian Gulf war and the war in Iraq and Afghanistan that are taking place now where over 4,000 Americans have died. I had the honor to travel to Iraq and Afghanistan, to see our troops, to see the NATO troops as well in Afghanistan. I have also talked to the families of people who have lost sons or daughters in Iraq and Afghanistan. Just in my congressional district of Texas, 26 men and women from all races have been killed in Iraq and Afghanistan. And we, like many other offices, honor them and give a tribute to them by having their photographs at the entrance to our offices.

I mention the folks in Iraq and Afghanistan, Madam Speaker, because it is my opinion that they are the finest military that has ever existed in the history of the world that are representing us. And they are all volunteers, Madam Speaker. They all volunteered to join. And they are still joining. And they are joining knowing that they are probably going to go to Afghanistan. But that is what our military does.

Madam Speaker, on the Mall, right across the street here, down at the end of the Mall, where there is the memorial to Abraham Lincoln, the United States decided to build monuments to the great wars of the last century. So the first monument that was built was the cold, black granite monument to the 58,000 that died in Vietnam. And it has their names on that. And every day, Americans go, veterans go and pay tribute to those men and women that died. They put all types of mementos in front of that glorious monument, whether it is flags or flowers. Other Vietnam veterans have put their medals there. It is very sober and very somber. And it is a wonderful tribute to those that served and were treated badly when they came back home. They went because they were told to go, and they did.

That was the first monument that we built. Then we decided to build a monument to the Korean War, which is across the Mall from the Vietnam Memorial. The Korean War monument is a little different. It shows Americans going through a land mine in the snow going off to battle. Good tribute, marvelous tribute to those that served in the Korean War, the 38,000 that did not come home. And between those two monuments, closer to the Capitol, there is a World War II memorial. There are some bureaucrats in Washington that were opposed to building that. They thought it would be unsightly. I'm glad they didn't get their way. And Congress made sure that it got erected, citizens made sure it got erected and veterans made sure it got erected. Anyway, that memorial is a different type of tribute. It has all the pillars of all the States and all the territories, and it names all the battles

that the United States fought in World War II. And if you stand in front of it, Madam Speaker, you will see in the back what appears to be a bronze plate, a massive bronze plate. But if you get closer to this massive bronze plate, you will realize it is not a bronze plate at all, but it is a wall of 4,000 stars. Each star, each bronze star represents 100 Americans killed in World War II, 400,000 young men and women that did not come back home in the great World War II.

But, Madam Speaker, although we have three monuments to our military to show tribute and honor to them of the last century's wars, we don't have a monument to honor all of those that served in the great World War I.

□ 2030

I have here, Madam Speaker, a photograph. This is a friend of mine. His name is Frank Buckles, Jr. Frank Buckles, Jr., as you see him, Madam Speaker, he looks pretty good. He looks great. He's 108 years old.

In World War I, Frank Buckles wanted to get into the Army, but he was too young. So he went from recruiting station to recruiting station, and he lied about his age. Finally somebody took him, and he got into the United States Army. He says he was 16. He was probably 15 if you do the math right.

Anyway, he served in World War I in Europe. He drove an ambulance in France. He rescued other doughboys that had been wounded on the battlefield and those who had been killed. After the Great War was over with, he back to the United States, and soon he found himself in the Philippines during World War II. He was captured by the Japanese and was held as a prisoner of war for 3 years in a Japanese prisoner of war camp. After the war was over, he was liberated, came back to the United States, and now lives in West Virginia. Frank Buckles Jr., 108. He's the last doughboy, Madam Speaker. Of the 4.4 million that went over there, he's the only one that is left over here. One hundred and fourteen thousand of them died.

When our troops landed in France in World War I, it was a trench war stalemate. Neither side was making any progress until the Americans showed up. And our allies were shocked at the tenacious attitude of Americans going into battle, and our enemies were stunned because of the fact that America was making a difference. And these people, Frank Buckles' generation, the fathers of the Greatest Generation, made a difference and ended that war successfully and came home.

Now, on the great mall we have a tribute to Vietnam, to Korea, to World War II, but we don't have a monument to all of those that served in World War I. There is a small monument to those that served in World War I from Washington, D.C. it's in a decrepit state. It's falling apart. Grass is growing up through it. It's a disgrace. Until recently next to it was the park rangers stable where they kept their horses.

So we need a monument for these folks. We don't honor them. Frank Buckles, he's it. They don't have any high-dollar lobbyists. They don't have any more members of the World War I generation here. There's nobody left. The only people left are Americans, who want, I would hope, to show tribute to Frank Buckles and his generation.

Once again, the bureaucrats are balking. They don't think we need another memorial on the Mall. That's unfortunate that they feel that way. It's interesting enough that the word has gotten out and school kids throughout the United States have gotten involved in this memorial for Frank Buckles and his generation. The first school was a school called Creekwood Middle School in Kingwood, Texas, where kids got together, studied World War I and all the survivors that are left throughout the world like Frank Buckles and the other seven throughout the world, and they've started a campaign to build that memorial. I hope they succeed where the bureaucrats have failed.

We have an obligation, Madam Speaker, to honor those who have served in our military and honor those who have served and have died for the rest of us.

Earlier I mentioned Arlington Cemetery. Arlington Cemetery across the Potomac River, you can see it from a lot of places in Washington before you get to Virginia. It's next to the Pentagon. Throughout Arlington Cemetery there are 300,000 markers to those that have died in America's wars. It says, Madam Speaker, on the Arlington Cemetery Memorial where the 300,000 are buried: ''On flame's eternal camping ground, their silent tents are spread, and glory guards with solemn round—the bivouac of the dead.''

Three hundred thousand Americans of all races, all ages, from all wars since the war between the States are buried at that location.

The United States, Madam Speaker, goes to war, has gone to war, the wars that I mentioned, for a purpose every time. That is to preserve the American way of life and to promote liberty. And when we go overseas, unlike nations before in history that were powerful, when we go overseas, we never go to concur. We go to liberate, to spread the word of freedom, hope, democracy. That's what Americans do. Then they come back after those wars are over, except for those that are killed and are buried throughout the world in graves known only to the Good Lord.

On a hill, a place called Normandy, there's a cemetery. Normandy, Madam Speaker, as you know, is a place in France. Here is a photograph of a portion of the Normandy Cemetery. It's hard to comprehend how massive a cemetery this is without being there. You notice in this cemetery there are crosses for those of the Christian faith, the Star of David for the Jewish faith. But in the cemetery in Normandy, Madam Speaker, there are 9,387 Americans, 9,387 Americans. Mostly young men. Almost all of them killed in their first battle. And Normandy occurred because the United States and the other allies wanted to liberate France from oppression, from a dictator, from the Nazi philosophy. And they are still buried over there, those 9,000. On D-day in June of 1944, almost 3,000 Americans lost their lives and, during the entire conflict, 9,000 of whom are buried here in Normandy.

You know, Americans don't go to war to concur; they go to liberate. And that confuses other countries. That confuses our enemies sometimes. And sometimes it even confuses our allies.

It's been said, Madam Speaker, unfortunately, that Americans are somewhat arrogant. Europeans, we have apologized for Americans being arrogant. I don't understand that statement, unless you call these people right here arrogant that died at Normandy, unless you call people like Frank Buckles, the other doughboys that died in France and in Europe. The United States liberated that nation, that continent, twice in the last century. And we didn't do it for any personal gain. We did it because people were being oppressed by a totalitarian state.

I don't think Americans are arrogant; I think they're proud. They're proud of our way of life. And they should be. This is actually the greatest country that has ever existed in the history of the world, thanks to the Good Lord and His blessings on our country. And we should appreciate that, and I don't think there is anything wrong with being proud of that fact.

So, Madam Speaker, tomorrow we honor peace officers that had been killed have been killed in America defending us, May 15. On May 25 we honor Americans like these still buried in Normandy who went to war to protect us from foreign enemies. And we should constantly remember all of those who had the courage to put on the uniform of an American and go and defend the rest of us.

Madam Speaker, it's been said by one of my heroes, Patrick Henry, that the battle is not for the strong alone but it's to the vigilant, the active, and to the brave. I think that's true of our Americans even tonight that wear the uniform of a peace officer or someone in the military. We are fortunate, as American citizens, that there are those who will make that sacrifice and sign up to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

So, hopefully, Americans, especially the young, will appreciate their heritage, appreciate people who have lived before them that gave them the ability to pursue life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And maybe in the next 10 days when you see a peace officer, a firefighter, emergency medical technician, some soldier coming back from Iraq at the airport that we go up and

shake their hand and tell them we appreciate what they do for the rest of us.

And that's just the way it is.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and May 13 on account of family medical situation.

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. HERSETH SANDLIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 21.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 21.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, May 18, 19, 20 and 21.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, May 16.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 15, 2009, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1806. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Table Eggs From Regions Where Exotic Newcastle Disease Exists [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0014] (RIN: 0579-AC47) received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1807. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of Size Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0002; FV09-905-1 IFR] received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1808. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Calcium Lactate Pentahydrate; Exemption from the Requirment of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0093; FRL-8412-5] received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1809. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Candida oleophila Strain O; Exemption from the Requirment of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0164; FRL-8412-9] received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1810. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's second fiscal year 2009 quarterly report on unobligated and unexpended appropriated funds, pursuant to Public Law 111-8, section 7002; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1811. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report entitled, ''Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account'', pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1812. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's biennial strategic plan on research areas of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2352; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1813. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Material Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report on operations of the National Defense Stockpile (NDS), pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(a), section 11(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1814. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amounts of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2010, pursuant to Division C, DoD Appropriations Act, 2009 and Public Law 110-329, section 8026(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1815. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's forty-second report prepared pursuant to Section 3204(f) of the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (Div. B, P.L. 106-246), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1816. A letter from the Special Inspector General, Office of the Special Inspector General For The Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting the Office's quarterly report on the actions undertaken by the Department of the Treasury under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the activities of SIGTARP, and SIGTARP'S recommendations with respect to operations of TARP; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1817. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received May 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1818. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Approval of Revisions to the Knox County Portion [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0676-200820 (a); FRL-8903-6] received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1819. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0020; FRL-8410-3] received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1820. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Texas: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCRA-2008-0755-; FRL-8901-1] received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1821. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Scranton, Pennsylvania) [MB Docket No.: 08-244 RM-11507] received April 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1822. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report for the period January 16, 2008 to January 15, 2009 on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and U.S. participation in that organization, pursuant to Public Law 97-132, section 6; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1824. A letter from the Associate Director, PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Terrorism List Governments Sanctions Regulations — received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1825. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting the Office's report on the actions taken in response to the fiscal year 2008 study completed by an independent Panel of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1826. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA-148-FOR; OSM-2008-0014] received May 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1827. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final

rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel by Vessels in the Amendment 80 Limited Access Fishery in the Eastern Aleutian District and Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XN52) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1828. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XM99) received March 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1829. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Processors Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 071106673-8011-02] (RIN: 0648-XM95) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1830. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 071106671-8010-02] (RIN: 0648-XM94) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1831. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Crustacean Fisheries; 2009 Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Lobster Harvest Guideline (RIN: 0648-XN05) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1832. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 071106671-8010-02] (RIN: 0648-XN09) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1833. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Money Penalties: Certain Prohibited Conduct; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FR-5081-C-04] (RIN: 2501-AD23) received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1834. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Death Valley, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0137; Airspace Docket No. 08-AWP-2] received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1835. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EADS SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0124 Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-15882; AD 2009-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1836. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. ALF502L-2 and ALF502L-2C Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1207; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-15880; AD 2009-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1837. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Northeast Gateway Deepwater Port, Atlantic Ocean, MA and Security Zone; Liquefied Natural Gas Carriers, Massachusetts Bay, MA [Docket Nos.: USCG-2008-0372 and USCG-2008-0301] (RIN: 1625-AA00 and RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1838. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 1274.—-Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Also Sections 42, 280G, 382, 412, 467, 468, 482, 483, 642, 807, 846, 1288, 7520, 7872.) (Rev. Rul. 2009-12) received April 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1839. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 3401(h).-Differential Wage Payments to Active Duty Members of the Uniformed Services (Also Section 3121(a), 3306(b)) (Rev. Rul. 2009-11) received April 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1840. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on the administration of the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program, pursuant to Section 6005(a) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Judiciary.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of May 12, 2009]

Mr. POLIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 427. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2187) to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–106). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted May 14, 2009]

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 689. A bill to interchange the administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111–108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1170. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a grant program to encourage the development of new assistive technologies for specially adapted housing; with an amendment (Rept. 111–109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1088. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a one-year period for the training of new disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representatives by National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute (Rept. 111–110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1089. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the enforcement through the Office of Special Counsel of the employment and unemployment rights of veterans and members of the Armed Forces employed by Federal executive agencies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 111–111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2403. A bill to provide loan forgiveness to teachers of integrated career and technical education coursework at rural secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HARE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HODES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. KILROY):

H.R. 2404. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress outlining the United States exit strategy for United States military forces in Afghanistan participating in Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans enrolled in the health system of the Department of Veterans Affairs the option of receiving covered health services through facilities other than those of the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PENCE, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 2406. A bill to provide for enhanced Federal, State, and local assistance in the enforcement of the immigration laws, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to authorize appropriations to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 2407. A bill to establish a National Climate Service at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2408. A bill to expand the research and awareness activities of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to scleroderma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BACA, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. MASSA, Mr. BRIGHT, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. BOYD):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2410. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, to modernize the Foreign Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 2411. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to fly the flag of a State over the Capitol each year on the anniversary of the date of the State's admission to the Union; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2412. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2413. A bill to provide for enhanced treatment, support, services, and research for individuals with autism spectrum disorders and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, 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. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOYD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MASSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. NUNES, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2414. A bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 2415. A bill to require the Federal Government to use purchases of goods or services through the Federal supply schedules for the purpose of meeting certain contracting goals for participation by small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 2416. A bill to require the Department of Veterans Affairs to use purchases of goods or services through the Federal supply schedules for the purpose of meeting certain contracting goals for participation by small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, including veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. ARCURI (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to preclude use of the social security account number on Government-issued identification cards issued in connection with benefits under Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. BACA:

H.R. 2418. A bill to provide Federal coordination and assistance in preventing gang violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, 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. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 2419. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a medical surveillance system to identify members of the Armed Forces exposed to chemical hazards resulting from the disposal of waste in Iraq and Afghanistan, to prohibit the disposal of waste by the Armed Forces in a manner that would produce dangerous levels of toxins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2420. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 to ensure a uniform Federal scheme of regulation of restrictions in the use of certain substances in electrical products and equipment in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCMAHON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TURNER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 2421. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. REYES,

Mr. OLSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 2422. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 702 East University Avenue in Georgetown, Texas, as the ''Kyle G. West Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2423. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the ''George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse'', and to designate the jury room in that Federal building and United States courthouse as the ''Marcel C. Notzon II Jury Room''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize reviews by the Comptroller General of the United States of any credit facility established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or any Federal reserve bank during the current financial crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SPACE):

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by designating certain certified diabetes educators as certified providers for purposes of outpatient diabetes self-management training services under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the food labeling requirements of the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990 to enable customers to make informed choices about the nutritional content of standard menu items in large chain restaurants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to establish Federal standards for health insurance forms, quality, fair marketing, and honesty in out-of-network coverage in the group and individual health insurance markets, to improve transparency and accountability in those markets, and to establish a Federal Office of Health Insurance Oversight to monitor performance in those markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and 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 Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to require that broadband conduit be installed as part of certain highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2429. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 2430. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for State and local sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for State and local sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the tax-free treatment for distributions from individual retirement plans for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the charitable contributions deduction for food inventory, book inventory, and computer technology and equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary bonus research credit for energy-related research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2439. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on portions of the Outer Continental Shelf located off the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 2440. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide that annual Social Security account statements indicate, in estimating the level of projected benefits of eligible individuals, the effect on such benefits levels of benefit reductions which may be necessary, in the absence of future legislative remedies, by reason of anticipated insolvency of the Social Security Trust Funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELANCON:

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide adequate benefits for public safety officers injured or killed in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to expand the Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to ambulance services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. NORTON:

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to make the funding available for carrying out section 140 of title 23 mandatory instead of discretionary; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income discharges of personal indebtedness outside of bankruptcy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the small rural school achievement program and the rural and low-income school program under part B of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment tax treatment and reporting of wages paid by professional employer organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 2448. A bill to provide for regulation of futures transactions involving energy commodities, to regulate credit default swaps, to strengthen the enforcement authorities of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under the Natural Gas Act, Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978, and the Federal Power Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, 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. WEINER (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 2449. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit fraud and related activity in connection with purchases of certain wireless prepaid access devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HODES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPACE, Mr. STARK, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 437. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Mental Health Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BRIGHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. SHULER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. INGLIS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CAO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FARR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MACK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H. Res. 438. A resolution expressing support for designation of September as ''National Child Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CAO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 439. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Asian American and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 440. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to strengthen the public disclosure of all earmark requests; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, 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. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 441. A resolution honoring the historical contributions of Catholic sisters in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 442. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Child and Adult Care Food Program and its positive effect on the lives of low income children and families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas):

H. Res. 443. A resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for members of the Armed Forces and veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder and their families and urging the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to improve the services and support available to such members, veterans, and families; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. KUCINICH (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H. Res. 444. A resolution expressing the Sense of Congress that the United States needs an industrial policy with regard to automobile, aerospace, shipping, and steel industries, which are vital to national and economic security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON:

H. Res. 445. A resolution recognizing 100 years of military aviation and expressing continued support for military aviators of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 446. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the Environmental Protection Agency's April proposed finding that greenhouse gas emissions are a danger to public health and welfare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHULER (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H. Res. 447. A resolution recognizing the remarkable contributions of the American Council of Engineering Companies for its 100 years of service to the engineering industry and the Nation; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H. Res. 448. A resolution congratulating the University of California, Davis, for a century as a premier public research university and one of our Nation's finest institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

45. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the State Legislature of Maine, relative to H.P. 1009 joint resolution memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Federal order system to ensure that Maine dairy farmers will receive a sustainable price for their milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

46. Also, a memorial of the State Legislature of Maine, relative to H.P. 825, joint resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the United States Congress and the United States environmental protection agency to support the waiver California needs to achieve greenhouse gas reductions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

47. Also, a memorial of the State Legislature of Maine, relative to a joint resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to support the recommendations of the commission to protect the lives and health of members of the Maine National Guard; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 25: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 111: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 179: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 197: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 205: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 240: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 268: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 270: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 329: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 442: Mr. PETRI, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 490: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 557: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 571: Mr. COLE and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 574: Mr. CAPUANO and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 621: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 644: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 653: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 705: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 745: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 836: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MASSA, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 864: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 870: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 874: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 914: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 977: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 981: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 995: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1016: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1021: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MCMAHON.

H.R. 1064: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1066: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1095: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1132: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WU, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1147: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1182: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1191: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1204: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. KISSELL, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1206: Mr. COBLE, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1207: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1208: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1242: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1249: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 1277: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1329: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1352: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1378: Mr. HOLT and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1392: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1410: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1428: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1430: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1521: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1522: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1523: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1547: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1551: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 1558: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 1589: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1600: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1604: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1612: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 1616: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1618: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1621: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1625: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1677: Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1678: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1681: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1684: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1691: Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 1701: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NYE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 1705: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1710: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1723: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1740: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1751: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1763: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1765: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1774: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1815: Mr. CAMP, Mr. SCALISE and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1816: Mr. NADLER of New York.

H.R. 1829: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.

H.R. 1836: Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1869: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1873: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1881: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DICKS, Mr. REYES, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HODES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1894: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1912: Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 1970: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1980: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1981: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1990: Mr. MURTHA and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 1995: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2014: Mr. DENT, Mr. BACA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOYD, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 2027: Mr. BARTLETT and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2030: Mr. SESTAK and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 2057: Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2061: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JONES, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2069: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 2079: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 2084: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2095: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2098: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2099: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 2103: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2105: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2111: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 2124: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2139: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 2149: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2176: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2216: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

H.R. 2222: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2227: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2243: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2254: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2262: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr.

GRAYSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 2266: Mr. PAUL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2267: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2269: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2275: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2277: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2279: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2294: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TURNER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 2296: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2297: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 2300: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2311: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2313: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2322: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2325: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2329: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. Sablan, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2338: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 2345: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2350: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2358: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2360: Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2363: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 10: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. FLEMING.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. LATTA, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H. Con. Res. 58: Ms. NORTON and Mr. SARBANES.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 105: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. MINNICK.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. KRATOVIL, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. PAUL and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 118: Mr. NUNES.

H. Con. Res. 126: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 42: Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 81: Mr. EHLERS.

H. Res. 175: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 185: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 209: Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 225: Mr. POSEY and Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Res. 259: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Res. 260: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 311: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H. Res. 314: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. WU, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 347: Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Res. 355: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 360: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 366: Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 373: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 390: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 397: Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 398: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 407: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 408: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 409: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COLE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAO, Mr. COBLE, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H. Res. 411: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 422: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Res. 428: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. HERSETH Sandlin, Mr. SHULER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 433: Mr. WEINER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 435: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 848: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1137: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. LATTA on H.R. 581: Virginia Foxx and Robert J. Wittman.

Petition 2 by Mr. CARTER on H.R. 735: Virginia Foxx.

Petition 3 by Mr. LATOURETTE on House Resolution 359: Lynn Jenkins, Virginia Foxx, Kay Granger, Greg Walden, Blaine Luetkemeyer, David P. Roe, John Fleming, Joseph R. Pitts, Pete Olson, John J. Duncan, Jr., Robert J. Wittman, Sue Wilkins Myrick, John Kline, Vernon J. Ehlers, Sam Johnson, W. Todd Akin, Ken Calvert, Robert E. Latta, Glenn Thompson, Henry E. Brown, Jr., K. Michael Conaway, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Jeff Miller, Denny Rehberg, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Todd Tiahrt, Marsha Blackburn, Adam H. Putnam, Judy Biggert, Jim Jordan, Jim Gerlach, Steve Scalise, Frank A. LoBiondo, John Sullivan, Michael T. McCaul, Tom Latham, Doug Lamborn, Dan Burton, Joe Wilson, J. Randy Forbes, John Boozman, Charles W. Dent, and Wally Herger.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY: MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

AMENDMENT NO. 6: In the item relating to ''Economic Support Fund'', after the first dollar amount and the fourth dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $119,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''Mitigation and Refugee Assistance'', after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $119,000,000)''.