

Davis (TN) Kildee Ortiz  
Deal (GA) Kilpatrick (MI) Pallone  
DeFazio Kilroy Pasarell  
DeGette Kind Pastor (AZ)  
Delahunt King (IA) Paulsen  
DeLauro King (NY) Payne  
Dent Kingston Pence  
Diaz-Balart, L. Kirk Perlmutter  
Diaz-Balart, M. Kirkpatrick (AZ) Perriello  
Dicks Kissell Peters  
Dingell Klein (FL) Petri  
Doggett Kline (MN) Pingree (ME)  
Donnelly (IN) Kosmas Pitts  
Doyle Kratovil Platts  
Dreier Kucinich Poeh (TX)  
Driehaus Lamborn Polis (CO)  
Duncan Lance Pomeroy  
Edwards (MD) Langevin Posey  
Edwards (TX) Larsen (WA) Price (GA)  
Ehlers Latham Price (NC)  
Ellison LaTourette Putnam  
Ellsworth Latta Quigley  
Emerson Lee (CA) Radanovich  
Engel Lee (NY) Rahall  
Eshoo Levin Rangel  
Etheridge Lewis (CA) Rehberg  
Fallin Linder Reichert  
Farr Lipinski Reyes  
Fattah LoBiondo Richardson  
Filner Loeb sack Rodriguez  
Fleming Lofgren, Zoe Roe (TN)  
Forbes Lowey Rogers (AL)  
Fortenberry Lucas Rogers (KY)  
Foster Luetkemeyer Rogers (MI)  
Foxy Luján Rohrabacher  
Frank (MA) Lummis Rooney  
Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel Ros-Lehtinen  
Frelinghuysen E. Roskam  
Fudge Lynch Ross  
Gallegly Mack Rothman (NJ)  
Garrett (NJ) Maffei Roybal-Allard  
Gerlach Maloney Royce  
Giffords Manzullo Ruppertsberger  
Gingrey (GA) Marchant Rush  
Gohmert Markey (CO) Ryan (OH)  
Gonzalez Markey (MA) Ryan (WI)  
Goodlatte Marshall Salazar  
Gordon (TN) Massa Sanchez, Loretta  
Granger Matheson Sarbanes  
Graves Matsui Scalise  
Grayson McCarthy (CA) Schakowsky  
Green, Al McCarthy (NY) Schauer  
Griffith McCaul Schiff  
Grijalva McClintock Schmidt  
Guthrie McCollum Schock  
Gutierrez McCotter Schrader  
Hall (NY) McDermott Schwartz  
Hall (TX) McGovern Scott (GA)  
Halvorson McHenry Scott (VA)  
Hare McHugh Sensenbrenner  
Harman McIntyre Serrano  
Harper McKeon Sessions  
Hastings (FL) McMahon Sestak  
Hastings (WA) McMorris Shadegg  
Heinrich Rodgers Shea-Porter  
Heller McNeerney Sherman  
Hensarling Meek (FL) Shimkus  
Herger Meeks (NY) Shuler  
Herseth Sandlin Melancon Shuster  
Higgins Mica Simpson  
Hill Michaud Sires  
Himes Miller (FL) Skelton  
Hinche Miller (MI) Slaughter  
Hinojosa Miller (NC) Smith (NE)  
Hirono Miller, Gary Smith (NJ)  
Hodes Miller, George Smith (TX)  
Hoekstra Minnick Smith (WA)  
Holden Mitchell Snyder  
Holt Mollohan Souder  
Honda Moore (KS) Space  
Hoyer Moore (WI) Speier  
Hunter Moran (KS) Spratt  
Inglis Moran (VA) Stark  
Insee Murphy (CT) Stearns  
Israel Murphy (NY) Stupak  
Issa Murphy, Patrick Sutton  
Jackson (IL) Murphy, Tim Tanner  
Jackson-Lee Murtha Tauscher  
(TX) Myrick Taylor  
Jenkins Nadler (NY) Teague  
Johnson (GA) Napolitano Terry  
Johnson (IL) Neal (MA) Thompson (CA)  
Johnson, E. B. Neugebauer Thompson (MS)  
Johnson, Sam Nunes Thompson (PA)  
Jones Nye Thornberry  
Jordan (OH) Oberstar Tiahrt  
Kagen Obey Tiberi  
Kanjorski Olson Tierney  
Kaptur Oliver Titus

Tonko Wamp Wexler  
Towns Wasserman Whitfield  
Tsongas Schultz Wilson (SC)  
Turner Waters Wittman  
Upton Watson Wolf  
Van Hollen Watt Woolsey  
Velázquez Waxman Wu  
Visclosky Weiner Yarmuth  
Walden Welch Young (AK)  
Walz Westmoreland

## NOES—2

Flake  
Paul

## NOT VOTING—14

Alexander Green, Gene Sánchez, Linda  
Berkley Kennedy T.  
Bonner Larson (CT) Sullivan  
Connolly (VA) Lewis (GA) Wilson (OH)  
Costello Peterson Young (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1440

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 344, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 545

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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 the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

SEC. 2. The Chair may postpone further consideration of the conference report to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 545.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Res. 545 provides for consideration of the supplemental conference report, legislation that supports our military in the field in both Iraq and Afghanistan. This spending plan provides our troops with everything they will need during the remainder of this fiscal year, and the President has said this will be the last supplemental spending request he will send to Congress. I hope this will be the case.

I, along with a majority of my colleagues, share the President's goal of winding down the war in Iraq and leaving behind an Iraq run by Iraqis. This conference report takes a step towards that goal by providing for the training of security forces, economic development, and diplomatic operations.

We are also looking to secure Afghanistan, and this conference report provides for training of Afghan security forces and counterinsurgency measures in bordering Pakistan.

Although there are no deadlines or timelines in this conference report, I think we share in the desire to have troops wrap up their missions abroad and return home to their families. It's my hope that we will see the beginning of that troop drawdown this year.

This report also provides for a few key domestic economic priorities like the Cash For Clunkers program, which will allow Americans to trade in old vehicles for new ones with higher fuel efficiency.

This conference report also includes \$1.5 billion for response to the swine flu pandemic to help State and local governments but also to fund global efforts to track, contain, and slow down the spread of this flu.

Although it is not perfect legislation, it provides some essential funding, and I will support it and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, 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. Let me begin by thanking my friend from Utica for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I have to say that it's with extreme disappointment and sadness that I rise in opposition to this rule, having been very supportive of it when we had it just, it seemed, a few weeks ago.

The underlying measure of the supplemental appropriations bill that's supposed to fund our troops began auspiciously as a wonderfully bipartisan effort. In fact, when the House first considered the funding measure last month, Republicans were very proud to have what was our first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, our first opportunity of this 111th Congress to consider a major bill that had been developed in a bipartisan way.

□ 1445

I noted on that occasion that the President's call for bipartisan action had previously been completely thwarted by the Democratic majority; and, frankly, the record proves that to be the case. But finally when it came to the issue of funding our troops, even the Democratic leadership that had thwarted efforts to follow the Obama directive for bipartisanship, we had concluded that they weren't about to politicize the process of funding our troops. While the bill that we considered last month was not perfect, it did accomplish the key issue at hand, adequately providing for the protection and welfare of our troops. And as I said, we were very proud to do it in a bipartisan way, something the President wants, something that the American people want, and frankly, it's something that I believe a majority of Democrats and Republicans in this House want. But unfortunately the Democratic leadership does not seem to have that same goal.

Now the Democratic leadership is, unfortunately, back to what has very unfortunately been determined to be business as usual, which is concerning a measure which should have been as depoliticized as possible, considering it in an extraordinarily partisan way.

The conference report before us actually cuts troop funding in order to pay for billions of dollars of additional non-troop non-emergency spending. This includes \$5 billion for the International Monetary Fund in order to provide additional global bailouts. Now any country, Mr. Speaker, can apply for this money. So there's nothing to ensure that United States taxpayer dollars don't go to countries like Iran or Venezuela. The question of whether to provide this new IMF funding is a controversial one; and it may end up being a right decision; but it's one that should be fully debated, not airdropped into a conference report. Again, whatever the outcome of that debate on IMF funding, it is clearly something that should not be considered as emergency funding. It should be part of the regular appropriations process, which we're in the midst of right now, where tough decisions are made, priorities are set, and a proposal to send \$5 billion to the International Monetary Fund can be weighed against other priorities that Members of this House may have, like transportation funding or some other issue that it may be determined through the deliberative process is a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, our military is on the verge of running out of money. We all know that. That, frankly, is why we're here. The resources needed for our troops to conduct their mission and return home safely are nearly depleted. This, the issue of troop funding, is a true emergency. This is what this supplemental appropriations bill is all about—to protect and support the men and women in harm's way defending our country. The Democratic leader-

ship, instead, chose to cut troop funding and load this bill up with other very controversial funding that does not support our troops. Republicans made it clear that we could not support a troop funding bill that does not, in fact, fully fund our troops. So the leadership on the other side of the aisle found itself in a dilemma. They had lost Republican support with their partisanship, their controversial programs and their cuts for troop funding. So what could they do? How could they win the votes necessary to pass this conference report?

The obvious solution would have been to return to bipartisanship. It's what the President of the United States has called for; it's what the American people want; and it's what I believe a majority of Democrats and Republicans in this House would like. But instead, the Democratic leadership chose to push the contents of this bill as far to the left as they possibly could in the hopes of picking up support from the fringes of their own party. Having left the middle ground, the fringe was the only place left to go.

So how did they appeal to the very, very extreme left? First they watered down language related to moving terrorists to U.S. soil from Guantanamo Bay. Well, Republicans have supported much stronger language to ensure that no terrorists are ever moved to or set free on American soil. The original language would have at least required consultation with Congress and slowed down the process until we could act definitively to ensure the protection of our communities. But inexplicably, as Democrats, Republicans and Independents across the country have voiced their outrage over the prospect of having terrorists potentially released on American soil, today's conference report further weakens the already weakened language. It leaves our neighborhoods even more vulnerable to the movement of Gitmo terrorists. Furthermore, the Democratic leadership removed protections to ensure that information that could put our troops in danger would not be released. Many on the far left opposed these protections, so the Democratic leadership bartered for their support of this bill by stripping them out completely. Without those protections in place, our troops in the field will be subject to even greater harm. This was the price the Democratic leadership paid in order to negotiate with the far left rather than return to the bipartisanship and common sense that had guided earlier debates on this funding bill.

To see just how far out of the mainstream this approach is, Mr. Speaker, look no further than the vote on the motion to instruct conferees that we had just this past Friday. It was a Republican motion which handily passed the House by a vote of 267-152. Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 267-152, this House called for a clean bill that restores full funding for the troops and keeps in place the protections to pre-

vent the release of information that could potentially endanger our troops. That strong bipartisan vote just this past Friday in favor of this motion indicates how much support there is in this House for a clean, bipartisan full troop funding bill. For those of us who naively thought that the funding of our troops was the one issue that could not be politicized, this is a very, very sobering moment. Clearly the Democratic leadership cannot help themselves. Even when bipartisanship would be the easy choice, they were compelled to move in the exact opposite direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, demand a clean troop funding bill, one that fully provides the resources they need, one that is stripped of all extraneous controversial non-emergency funding and one that includes full protections for American communities as well as our troops in the field.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that this bill does provide for the troops; and it provides very well for our troops because that is the most important thing that we, as Members of Congress, can do. It provides \$1.9 billion more than requested for MRAPs and \$2.5 billion above the President's request for U.S. troops. Those are the kinds of things that we need to do as a Congress to make sure that our troops are provided for.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I have a question to my friends, and that is: How do we support the troops by keeping them in a war that's based on lies? How do we support the troops by keeping them in another war which keeps expanding and they're getting shot at from all sides? How do we support the troops by festering a war on the Afghan border with Pakistan and putting them in even more peril because they don't have the support?

How do we support the troops? We support them by bringing them home. That's what we should be appropriating money for, not to keep them there. Beyond that, isn't it interesting—we've got another \$80 billion here for war, but we don't have money to keep people in their homes because there are still 13 million Americans who are losing their homes; we don't have money for the 50 million Americans who don't have any health care; we don't have money to save jobs; we don't have money to save our steel mills and our auto plants. What we have is, we have money for war.

Support the troops indeed. America has to start taking care of things here at home, and we can't do it by continuing to support wars that are based on lies. The Democrats took control of the Congress based on an opposition to the war. We should be opposing this

war instead of deferring to the President. We have the constitutional obligation under article I, section 8 of the Constitution to decide whether a war should continue or not. We should end it here. We shouldn't be continuing it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend from Utica who made it very clear that he believes that troop funding is their priority; but yet this measure reduces by \$4.7 billion the level of troop funding that we had in the bipartisan bill passed just last month and transfers it to the IMF. So, in fact, this measure does cut troop funding.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 3 minutes to the new ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the very distinguished gentleman from Santa Clarita, California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding the time.

As the ranking member on Armed Services, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the war supplemental conference report for one simple reason. It will endanger our troops in harm's way. Compared with the clean troop funding bill that passed the House with bipartisan support in May, this package cuts \$4.7 billion from defense that we passed at that time to create room for a \$105 billion global bailout loan program.

What should be a clean military funding bill has become a means for the President's promise to provide more foreign aid to the International Monetary Fund. Those funds will eventually make their way to countries that are less than friendly to the United States at the expense of programs to support our troops. And even more disturbing is the decision by conferees to reject the motion offered by Republicans to prohibit the release of detainee photos that could exacerbate tensions in the very regions our troops are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let me read to you a statement about those photos by General Petraeus, commander of U.S. Armed Forces throughout the Middle East:

"The release of images depicting U.S. servicemen mistreating detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan, or that could be construed as depicting mistreatment, would likely deal a particularly hard blow to U.S. CENTCOM and U.S. inter-agency counterinsurgency efforts in these key nations, as well as further endanger the lives of U.S. soldiers, marines, airmen, sailors, civilians and contractors presently serving there."

General Petraeus is correct, and we should stand with our troops in the field and prohibit the release of these photos. We should not leave it in the hands of ACLU lawyers or at the mercy of activist judges.

I urge my colleagues to reject this package and insist that it be brought back immediately with Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator GRAHAM's lan-

guage to prohibit release of these photos.

Finally, the Senate-passed troop bill included language prohibiting release or transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to U.S. soil. Unfortunately this conference report does not prohibit the transfer or release of detainees after October 1 of this year. This is a huge mistake. I fear we're already beginning to open Pandora's box. We've already begun importing terrorists. These Guantanamo detainees are trained to foment dissent among Americans, and we should do everything possible to keep them away from our local military bases and our prisons.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and the conference report so we can quickly make these necessary changes to protect our troops in the field and bring back a clean troop funding bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. I want to talk about a clearly necessary provision in this bill, the fleet modernization provision; but I do want to say just two things briefly to comment on what has been said here by the minority.

I really think they are looking for reasons to vote "no" no matter how illegitimate they are.

□ 1500

Regarding this issue of the release of photos, the President has said, "I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure the DOD detainee photographs are not released."

Secondly, on the IMF, a commitment was made at the G-20, and this carries out the U.S. commitment. It is not a believable position to vote "no" on this bill for that reason.

But I want to say a few words about the fleet modernization proposal that Representative SUTTON, who is here, has worked so hard on with a large number of people.

There is clearly a crisis in the automotive industry. The administration has stepped up to the plate with a plan. That plan is being implemented. It's very difficult. There is a lot of pain involved. It's being carried out.

What hasn't happened effectively is work on the demand side. That's what's lagging here. Sales were down very substantially these last several years. There was an uptick in May, but still the annualized level is far below even a few years ago. And the sales are down not only for the domestic industry but also for the transplants: for Toyota, down 41 percent from last May; Honda, 42 percent; Nissan, 33 percent. So there is an effort to make sure there is effective restructuring for the domestic industry.

We have to work on the demand side, and this today answers that need: a

voucher for consumers worth \$3,500 to \$4,500 to help them pay for more fuel-efficient cars and trucks. It will incentivize approximately 1 million new car and truck purchases. So anybody who votes "no" on this supplemental is voting "no" on this provision, and that would be a serious mistake.

It is critical that this Nation retain a strong domestic auto industry, and this effort on the demand side is a critical piece of that effort.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. This has not been an easy effort. There have been disagreements in different ways to go about it. And I simply want to say to those who have been in the lead, and especially to Representative SUTTON, this would not have happened without the dedication of herself and others who have been determined that there be continued, in this country, a strong domestic auto industry. It's that clear. Other countries have stepped up to the plate. They have provided support. This is now a necessary implementation of this effort.

So I plead with people on the minority side to listen, to step up to the plate, to not look for arguments or excuses to duck. There is no ducking the need for a strong domestic automotive industry, not only for Ohio, not only for Michigan, not only for Illinois, not only for Indiana, but for the entire United States of America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I don't have any further requests for time. I would inquire of my friend whether he has any further speakers?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, I have an additional speaker.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman for his leadership and really thoughtful conversation on what is a challenging time for America.

I rise to support the rule and want to express both my support and concerns for aspects of this legislation. But I will speak to the seeming overall opposition of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and I would hope that in their deliberation they have given a thoughtful assessment of the analysis of opposition.

We are dealing with some very difficult times. I opposed the war in Iraq and remain opposed. I do, however, want the opportunity to be able to stand down in order to safely have our soldiers redeploy. I want to see the standing up of the Iraqis and resources to allow them to proceed in their own

defense and to bring our soldiers home as heroes.

I also want us to make good on the promise we made to Afghanistan. America is good at keeping her promise. Her soldiers have never stepped away from promoting the ideals of democracy and liberty and freedom, and the Afghan people are in need. They need the collaboration of the NATO forces and the United States. They also need to have reconstruction and the empowerment of women and the protection of their children.

And so the part of this legislation addresses that question. It is a recognition that many of us opposed the Iraq war and are asking, as we have been asking for so long since the horrific tragedy of 9/11 when we found that those terrorists, horrific terrorists came from the inner parts of Afghanistan, and we abandoned Afghanistan. We did not pay attention to them. And so it is important now to ensure that we do it in the right way, that we don't maintain an extended force in Afghanistan but we help in a collaborative way for the Afghan people to stand up and to fight the terrorists and to reestablish institutions that will help them build their society, both with respect to education and social services. And so part of this legislation does include that funding.

Our eyes have been on Pakistan. There is a regional effort. Secretary of State Clinton and the President have worked to appoint Ambassador Holbrooke to be an envoy, and he has been in those camps where you have seen 2½ million people be displaced. We cannot abandon them now. We must provide the opportunity for them to return to a rebuilt region. These are individuals who have fought for their freedom, who left the Swat area because they did not want to be overtaken by insurgents, the Taliban, who want to undermine a system of democracy and, yes, terrorists.

One man fled with 13 of his children, living in a tent. He said now his home is occupied by Pakistan soldiers. He's willing to sacrifice and live homeless because he wants freedom. The resources that we now have will allow that to happen, and that is vital.

We also realize that there are areas like Chad, the Congo, and places that are near collapse that we are providing for peace-keeping dollars that are so very important in helping the U.N. Chad is near collapse because it is near Sudan, and many of those who have fled the persecution are there.

From the gulf coast region we have fought consistently to provide reimbursement for Galveston and Houston and the regions that have still been struck and still sacrificing and still living under the shadow of Hurricane Ike. We have the resources to put people in housing and to be able to correct the wrong of that terrible storm but yet the inability to move as fast as we like pursuant to the work that was not done in the last administration.

I think it is important that we are supporting the International Monetary Fund because we cannot stand by while we speak the language of reconstruction and rebuilding and not provide that for particular support. So there is a value in the hard work of our colleagues.

But I do believe it is important to revisit an issue that impacts many States: the sidestepping of the President's mission on stimulus dollars. And the State of Texas is a poster child for that. \$3.2 billion was taken from the moneys that should have been utilized for the education of our children. One of my school districts alone has lost \$155 million because it has been replaced or reordered or snuck under or left somewhere in what we call a "rainy day fund." We need to fix this. We have an opportunity going forward to be able to fix it, but I would like to fix it now.

So I hope that we will be in the midst of discussion, the congressional delegation of Texans who believe that our children must come first. And we must follow the vision of President Obama, who said, Save a job and create a job. And so we are saving teachers' jobs and helping them if we fight to get that \$3.2 billion from Texas where it needs to be.

The underlying bill is an important bill, but the Texas children are important as well.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just plan to close debate if the gentleman has concluded debate.

Mr. ARCURI. I have one more speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on the Rules Committee and for the time.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill. But as we prepare to send the war supplemental to President Obama, I would be remiss not to express the deep concerns I have about the bill not including an exit strategy for military operations in Afghanistan.

And while I support the supplemental, I am also strongly supporting Representative MCGOVERN's bill to require an exit strategy from Afghanistan. Fairness requires it. Our brave soldiers need to know that we have a plan and that we're looking out for them. And out of fairness to the 185,000 soldiers who have been subject to the stop-loss policy since September 11, 2001, the supplemental that we're about to pass today will provide \$500 per month in monthly payments.

And the use of stop-loss has prevented mothers and fathers from returning home to their children, from families and friends from gathering for the momentous occasions that mark their lives. They have gone above and beyond the expectations of their country. So I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues to create the Stop Loss

Compensation program and to ensure its funding in this bill.

And I am pleased that we are also funding the bipartisan CARS Act program which Representative LEVIN spoke of a moment ago. That bill was passed overwhelmingly by this House just last week. And while it's called the CARS Act, it's about far more than just cars. It's about the environment and it's about people. It's about consumers, and it's about the millions of families in this great Nation who depend on the strength of our auto and related industries for their livelihood, to put food on the table, to get health care for their children. It's about our friends and our neighbors, and it's about our communities that depend on auto jobs for their tax base, to support schools and police, firefighters and other city services.

And I'm also proud to say that we have worked on language in the bill to allow that SAFER grants that are used to hire firefighters can be used now to rehire and retain much-needed firefighters.

This bill provides stop-loss payments for those who protect us bravely overseas. It funds the consumer-environmental beneficial CARS Act to help shore up the 3 to 5 million jobs in our auto industry that Americans depend upon for a living, and it provides for more adequate staffing for firefighters who bravely protect us at home.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that deserves support. And with that, I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been a fascinating debate that has taken place. It began with some very thoughtful comments from my friend from Utica talking about the need for funding for our troops, and I laude him for referring to the fact that that is the priority of this measure.

We then listened to, on our side, the distinguished new ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, my friend from Santa Clarita (Mr. McKEON), talk about the priority of funding for our troops.

And then we listened to speeches made by our colleagues, and there was barely a mention of the issue of troop funding.

We just heard our colleague talk about firefighters. Hey, I'm from southern California where we have fires, and we have horrible fires. Loss of life and property is something that regularly takes place there. It's a very, very important issue. It's an issue that should be considered under the regular appropriations process under the leadership of my California colleagues, Mr. LEWIS and Mr. OBEY, not in a troop funding bill.

Then we listened to our very good friend from Detroit talk about the automobile industry, a serious challenge that we, as a Nation, are trying to address. I personally believe that the notion of continuing to see the government more and more involved in

this area is not the right thing to do, but it's a debate that will go on. And yet our friend, Mr. LEVIN, was talking about the issue of the automobile industry in this troop funding bill.

□ 1515

Then I listened to our friend from Houston, Texas, talk about Darfur, one of the most troubled spots on the face of the Earth, an issue that does need to be addressed, and the challenges of meeting the needs of children in Texas, a very, very important issue, but not as part of a troop funding measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, through the very thoughtful work of the Appropriations Committee last month, we came to this floor with what President Obama and I believe a majority of Republicans and Democrats in this House would like to see us achieve, and I know the American people would like to see us achieve, and that is bipartisanship.

Bipartisanship is a word that is used all the time around here, all the time. Everyone talks about the need for bipartisanship, how important it is. The Speaker in her opening address here to the Congress as we began the 111th Congress talked about how she wanted to work in a bipartisan way. We Republicans say we want to work in a bipartisan way.

But this bill that emerged from the House Appropriations Committee was the first time, the very first time in this 111th Congress that we were able to see a bipartisan work product emerge from the Democratic leadership, and I congratulated them on that, and I have done that when we considered the bill, and I would like to be able to do it today.

But, unfortunately, this bill has crumbled from what it was intended to be, a bill to support funding for our troops. It in fact included a reduction by transferring money that was intended in the House-passed bill to be funding for our troops to the International Monetary Fund.

Now, I will say that that may be a worthwhile cause as we deal with the economic challenges that exist here in the United States and around the world. But, again, Mr. Speaker, that is something that should not be considered as an emergency funding measure. It is something that should be considered under the normal appropriations process, so that we can make a determination whether increasing by \$5 billion the funding for the International Monetary Fund is more important than transportation priorities here in the United States or other priorities that we have.

So, some might like to say that this bill is just a continuation of what we considered last month. But, Mr. Speaker, it unfortunately has gone a long way down from where we were, creating the potential, the potential for us to not be able to prevent with absolute certainty the terrorists from Gitmo ending up in the United States. There is no guarantee that that will happen.

On the IMF, on the IMF, there is no guarantee, no guarantee in this measure that funding requests could not be made for countries like Iran or Venezuela.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that this troop funding bill has ended up addressing, and it was made very clear by an overwhelming majority of the remarks that came from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, so that we can come back and pass in this House what 267 Members last Friday said that they wanted to have passed, and that is a clean bill that funds our troops and ensures that we won't have terrorists in the United States, that ensures that we will not be dramatically expanding a wide range of other programs.

So vote "no" on this rule, and, if by chance it passes, I urge a "no" vote on the conference report itself, because we can do better.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee for his management of this rule and also for talking about what I think is ultimately the most important thing with respect to this bill, and that is, of course, our troops.

There are many of us who opposed the war in Iraq. I was one of them. I continue to oppose it. There are many of us who believe that the funding that this bill contains should be greater. I think on both sides of the aisle there is agreement that we should do as much as we possibly can. And there are things about this bill that clearly are not perfect. But we can't allow the perfect to get in the way of the good.

This bill is a good bill. Let's not deprive our brave sons and our daughters, their husbands and their wives, of what they need to return to their families safely. This is not about what is right or what is wrong. This is about what we as a country, what we as a Congress, need to do, and that is to make sure that our troops, our sons and our daughters, the people who put their lives on the line each and every day, have all and each and every thing they need.

Some people may argue it is not enough, but we need to give them everything that we possibly can. Voting "no" simply because you think it is not enough is not a solution. That absolutely is not a solution. We need to do everything we can to ensure that our soldiers have what they need.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is much good in this conference report on the FY09 supplemental. I support the IMF monies and I certainly support the funding to respond to the H1N1 flu virus.

But I will vote "no" today on the final bill for the same reason I voted "no" on the original supplemental. This supplemental is primarily a war funding bill. It includes a huge escalation

of our military involvement in Afghanistan: an escalation without benchmarks, conditions, or most importantly, without an exit strategy.

I hope all my concerns about Afghanistan are wrong. There is a different team in the White House now—who I believe are trying very hard not to repeat the mistakes of the previous Administration.

President Obama and others have said there is no military solution in Afghanistan, only a political solution. I believe this, too. So I am very concerned when we put billions of dollars building up the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan without a clear mission and without an exit strategy.

Just as I insisted that the Bush Administration provide Congress with clear benchmarks and an exit strategy for Iraq, then we should the same with this Administration for Afghanistan.

I am not advocating an immediate withdrawal of our military forces in Afghanistan. I understand that our humanitarian mission may have to be protected in the near term. All I am asking for is a plan. If there's no military solution for Afghanistan, then please, tell me how we will know when our military contribution to the political solution has concluded.

I suspect that the votes are in place to pass this supplemental conference report. But I am deeply concerned. I'm concerned that we are moving ahead with a significant military escalation in Afghanistan without any real debate or any sense for how we will eventually bring our troops home.

Some have suggested that we have that debate at some point in the future. I respectfully disagree. I am not and never will be an advocate for "cutting and running" from Afghanistan. But we need to provide the American people and the people of Afghanistan a clearly defined mission, which includes a clearly defined plan for departure.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the