

Boyd (FL)
 Boyda (KS)
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Campbell (CA)
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carter
 Castle
 Castor
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Lincoln
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Fallin
 Farr
 Fattah
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Flake
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fossella
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach

Giffords
 Gilchrest
 Gillibrand
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Hall (TX)
 Hare
 Harman
 Hastert
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hookey
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Inglis (SC)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Jordan
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Lamborn
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Regula
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebach
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui

McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McRoney
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Murtha
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peterson (MN)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sali
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Saxton

Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder

Solis
 Souder
 Space
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg

Walden (OR)
 Walsh (NY)
 Walz (MN)
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Weldon (FL)
 Westmoreland
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Wu
 Wynn
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Eshoo

Turner

NOT VOTING—25

Alexander
 Boozman
 Carson
 Cubin
 Davis (AL)
 Emanuel
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Hastings (FL)

Heller
 Hirono
 Inslee
 Jindal
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Peterson (PA)
 Rehberg
 Ros-Lehtinen

Sires
 Sullivan
 Tancredo
 Taylor
 Weller
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1346

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 968, I mistakenly voted "nay." I intended to vote "yea."

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 968, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with Governor Blanco and Mayor Nagin discussing Hurricane Katrina Relief. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 968, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with Governor Blanco and Mayor Nagin discussing Hurricane Katrina Relief. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 968, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 968, H.R. 3678, the Internet Tax Freedom Act Amendments Act of 2007, I was not present due to an emergency situation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately today, October 16, 2007, I was unable to cast my votes on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 741, H. Res. 741; ordering the previous question on H. Res. 742, H. Res. 742; and on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3678 and wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 964 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 741, providing for the consideration of H. Res. 734, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the withholding of information relating to corruption in Iraq, I would have voted "nay."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 965 on passing H. Res. 741, providing for the consideration of H. Res. 734, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the withholding of information relating to corruption in Iraq, I would have voted "nay."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 966 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 742, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2102, the Free Flow of Information Act, I would have voted "nay."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 967 on passing H. Res. 742, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2102, the Free Flow of Information Act, I would have voted "nay."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 968 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3678, the Internet Tax Freedom Act Amendments Act of 2007, I would have voted "yea."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 106.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor to House Resolution 106.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING WITH- HOLDING OF INFORMATION RE- LATING TO CORRUPTION IN IRAQ

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to H. Res. 741, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 734) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the withholding of information relating to corruption in Iraq, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 734

Whereas Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, testified before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on October 4, 2007, that the "rising tide of corruption in Iraq" is "a second insurgency" that "stymies the construction and maintenance of Iraq's infrastructure, deprives people of goods and services,

reduces confidence in public institutions, and potentially aids insurgent groups reportedly funded by graft derived from oil smuggling or embezzlement”;

Whereas David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States, testified at the hearing that “widespread corruption undermines efforts to develop the government’s capacity by robbing it of needed resources, some of which are used to fund the insurgency”;

Whereas Judge Radhi Hamza al-Radhi, the former Commissioner of the Iraqi Commission on Public Integrity, testified at the hearing that “corruption in Iraq today is rampant across the government, costing tens of billions of dollars, and has infected virtually every agency and ministry, including some of the most powerful officials in Iraq”, that “the Ministry of Oil [is] effectively financing terrorism”, and that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki “has protected some of his relatives that were involved in corruption”;

Whereas the Independent Commission on the Security Forces of Iraq, chaired by General James L. Jones, U.S.M.C. (Ret.), reported on September 6, 2007, that “sectarianism and corruption are pervasive in the MOI [Ministry of Interior] and cripple the ministry’s ability to accomplish its mission to provide internal security of Iraqi citizens” and that “the National Police should be disbanded and reorganized”;

Whereas on September 25, 2007, the State Department instructed officials not to answer questions in an open setting that ask for “Broad statements/assessments which judge or characterize the quality of Iraqi governance or the ability/determination of the Iraqi government to deal with corruption, including allegations that investigations were thwarted/stifled for political reasons”;

Whereas Members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform asked Ambassador Lawrence Butler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, at the hearing whether “the Government of Iraq currently has the political will or the capability to root out corruption within its Government”, whether “the Maliki Government is working hard to improve the corruption situation so that he can unite his country”, and whether Prime Minister Maliki “obstructed any anticorruption investigations in Iraq to protect his political allies”;

Whereas Ambassador Butler refused to answer these questions at the hearing because “questions which go to the broad nature of our bilateral relationship with Iraq are best answered in a classified setting”, although he did answer questions at the hearing that portrayed the Iraqi Government in a positive light;

Whereas the State Department retroactively classified portions of the report titled “Stabilizing and Rebuilding Iraq: U.S. Ministry Capacity Development Efforts Need an Overall Integrated Strategy to Guide Efforts and Manage Risk”, which was released at the hearing by Comptroller General Walker and which addressed the commitment of the Iraqi government to enforce anticorruption laws;

Whereas the State Department also retroactively classified two reports on corruption in Iraq prepared by the Office of Accountability and Transparency in the United States Embassy in Iraq;

Whereas the United States has spent over \$450,000,000,000 on the war in Iraq and the President is seeking over \$150,000,000,000 more; and

Whereas more than 3,800 members of the United States Armed Forces have been killed in Iraq and more than 28,000 have been wounded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) as Congress considers the President’s request for over \$150,000,000,000 more for the war in Iraq, it is essential that Congress and the people of the United States know the extent of corruption in the Iraqi government and whether corruption is fueling the insurgency and endangering members of the United States Armed Forces;

(2) it was wrong to retroactively classify portions of the report titled “Stabilizing and Rebuilding Iraq: U.S. Ministry Capacity Development Efforts Need an Overall Integrated Strategy to Guide Efforts and Manage Risk”, which was released by the Comptroller General of the United States at the hearing of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on October 4, 2007, and other statements that are embarrassing but do not meet the criteria for classification;

(3) it is an abuse of the classification process to withhold from Congress and the people of the United States broad assessments of the extent of corruption in the Iraqi Government; and

(4) the directive that prohibits Federal Government officials from providing Congress and the people of the United States with “broad statements/assessments which judge or characterize the quality of Iraqi governance or the ability/determination of the Iraqi government to deal with corruption, including allegations that investigations were thwarted/stifled for political reasons” should be rescinded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today we mark an ominous anniversary. It was 5 years ago today that President Bush signed the congressional authorization to use military force in Iraq. As we have learned since, that authorization was based on fatally flawed information. Congress and the American people were told that we needed to go to war against Saddam Hussein because he had weapons of mass destruction. But there were no nuclear bombs or biological weapons.

Now, 5 years later, more than 3,800 U.S. servicemembers have been killed, more than 28,000 have been injured, and the U.S. taxpayers have spent more than \$450 billion; and Iraq is in shambles.

Today we are considering a different resolution. The purpose of today’s resolution is simple: to end the abuse of the classification process and to demand the truth about corruption in Iraq.

We must stop the pattern of dissembling and the misuse of classified information. President Bush is now asking taxpayers for an additional \$150 billion to support the war and to support Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki. But . . . is not being honest about the level of corruption in the Maliki government.

Just as it did 5 years ago, the Bush administration is hiding the truth while seeking hundreds of billions of dollars and placing our troops in danger. We cannot allow this to happen.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that his words be taken down for disparagement of the Bush administration.

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

□ 1400

Mr. WAXMAN. I gather that the offensive word is that “he” is not being honest, and what I intended to say is that the Bush administration is not being honest. I think that removes the objection that would lie against a personal disparagement, so I would seek to make that clarification and ask unanimous consent to withdraw that spoken word.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection as long as the admonishment of the Chair would be that, in fact, there is a caution as to disparaging or appearing to disparage the office or the person of the President or the Vice President under our rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can affirm that with respect to the person, as a response to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman, and that is an acceptable UC.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration is hiding the truth while seeking hundreds of billions of dollars and placing our troops in danger, and we cannot allow this to happen.

We need answers to some very important questions: How corrupt is the Maliki government? Are top officials in Iraq stealing billions of dollars to fund insurgents who are attacking and killing our troops? Is corruption undermining the chances for political reconciliation?

Secretary of State Rice says she will answer these questions only on one condition: every Member of Congress who hears the answers has to keep the answers secret. Well, that’s an outrageous abuse of the classification system.

Earlier this month, the former head of the Iraqi Commission on Public Integrity, Judge Radhi, testified before the Oversight Committee. He told us that corrupt Iraqi officials had stolen a staggering \$18 billion and used part of that money to fund terrorists. He told us that when he tried to track down who was responsible, well, 31 of his investigators were brutally assassinated, and his own family living in the Green Zone was targeted twice with rocket attacks. And he gave us copies of secret orders that Prime Minister Maliki personally issued to protect his allies, including his own cousin, from corruption investigations and prosecutions.

Judge Radhi, Special Inspector General Stuart Bowen and Comptroller General David Walker all told us that

corruption is so entrenched in Iraq that it is jeopardizing our troops and our mission. But when we asked the State Department for unclassified documents about the extent of corruption in the Maliki government, Secretary Rice retroactively classified them. And when we asked the embassy officials when they knew about corruption, she ordered them not to respond.

Secretary Rice has made public statements praising the anticorruption efforts of the Maliki government, and he, himself, she praised; and she even praised the corrupt Interior Ministry. But when we asked embassy officials in Iraq whether her public statements were accurate, they said they were not allowed to respond unless we agreed to keep their answers secret.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, abusive classified information got us into this war. It's time for these abuses to end, and that's why we ask all Members to support this resolution.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to speak on H. Res. 734, a resolution about corruption in Iraq.

Corruption, the theft of public resources for private gain, saps the life out of everything it touches. The fact that official corruption has long undermined government effectiveness and public confidence in Iraq and throughout the Middle East should come as no news to anyone. But no one believes rampant corruption is inevitable or tolerable in Iraq. Republicans don't support corruption, Democrats don't support corruption, so the pace and reach of our efforts to help the Iraqis prevent, deter, investigate and punish corruption in their struggling democracy should be one thing, perhaps the only thing, about our policy in Iraq that we can agree on.

But we were never given the chance to agree. The language of this resolution has never been considered by any committee. Why not? Just last week, four House Committee chairmen wrote to the Secretary of State asking for her cooperation in "finding solutions" to corruption in Iraq. So those committees apparently have an interest in the issues raised by the resolution. But none of them ever considered this language. Why not? Because this resolution is just the latest find in the frantic search for proxy antiwar votes that the leadership has staged to feed an increasingly restive left wing of their party. Unable to prevail directly, they ignore regular order and nibble around the edges with symbols, surrogates, and sense of Congress resolutions.

In this political environment, it almost doesn't matter how we vote since the resolution means so little and accomplishes even less. But, fairly or not, as has been voiced by several Members on the other side, a "no" vote would be portrayed as "pro-corruption." That's unfortunate, and it didn't have to be that way.

Both the committee majority and the State Department have gone out of their way to politicize the discussion of corruption in Iraq. This resolution cherry-picks statements from our hearing testimony and tries to pick a fight with the Secretary of State over access to certain information. I offered a substitute to try to bring some balance and perspective to this resolution, but it was rejected by the majority in the Rules Committee. I will talk more about that substitute later.

For its part, the State Department's process for answering our inquiries about anticorruption assistance to Iraq has been sluggish and poorly thought out. When requested documents failed to show up, we didn't demand a committee vote on subpoenas the chairman decided to send to the Department. It's a separation of powers issue. The committee has a right to timely and meaningful access to information about executive branch programs and operations. The Department then classified information already, irretrievably, in the public domain. As a result of that decision, they felt compelled to limit open discussion on what everybody already knows about corruption in Iraq.

Had the State Department witness at our hearing said to the committee what Ambassador Satterfield said in today's Washington Post, broadly speaking about the Iraqi Government's political will to fight corruption, we might not have needed to consider this resolution at all.

Nevertheless, this is obviously not a resolution I'd bring to the floor to assert our constitutional rights. Both the process and the product tend to trivialize a serious and pernicious problem by reducing it to the terms of a spat over what State Department employees can say in an open forum and classification of a few sentences and two reports. It's a transparent attempt to draw the Secretary of State into a highly visible, but completely avoidable, conflict with the Oversight Committee.

What is the House being asked to "resolve" in this resolution? That we should know "the extent of corruption in Iraq"? That it was wrong to "retroactively classify" two draft State Department reports that had never been reviewed for sensitive information before? That it's an abuse of the classification process to "withhold" broad, unverified assessments of a foreign government by low-level State Department employees? And that a "directive" limiting discussion of potentially sensitive matters to a closed setting should be rescinded? Let me take them one by one.

The phrase "the extent of corruption in Iraq" is used several times. In truth, it's code for the unspoken conclusion that if we only knew the real level of corruption, we would all conclude Iraq could never stand on its own. But contrary to what this resolution implies, it's no secret there is widespread corruption in Iraq. We concede that. It's

sadly well documented, from the scandalous Oil-for-Food Program in the 1990s to present-day diversion of oil revenues. Corruption is a critical concern to the United States Government, to the Iraqi Government, and to the Iraqi people.

No amount of handwringing or feigned indignation can avoid the hard truth that the United States did not bring corruption to Iraq, and it won't stop when we leave. And no spreadsheet or corruption clock will ever give us the real-time cost of bribes and the real-time cost of graft there.

Focusing on the extent of corruption rather than the extent of anticorruption efforts betrays a desire to publicize corruption, not help fix it.

On the classification question, in all honesty, I have my doubts whether the State Department's reports should have been classified. A sloppy process in Baghdad leaked them; they're on the Internet right now. It's probably counterproductive to put that genie back in the bottle. The Department simply should have said, "The reports got out. Our mistake. But they represent only the collected anecdotes and flavor added by the authors and were not official policy statements of the United States." That could have avoided the whole fight over classification, but they didn't do it.

On the question of "withholding" information, there is a difference, and in my judgment an important difference, between hiding information and simply exercising appropriate caution and good management in deciding who makes official statements about U.S. relations with another sovereign state and where those statements are made.

More determined to be aggrieved than informed, the committee refused repeated efforts and offers to question witnesses in a setting that could permit us to discuss sensitive and classified information.

If anything constructive comes out of passage of this resolution, I hope it's to refocus and reenergize State Department anticorruption efforts in Iraq. They need it. That might not be the goal of all those that are voting for this resolution, but it's my goal in voting for it, and it's the only positive outcome that I can see.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with international relations of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issue before us on this resolution is whether or not this institution, the Congress, is going to absolutely carry out its oversight responsibilities and demand that the executive branch provide to us materials we need to make reasonable determinations as to whether or not there is an extent of corruption in Iraq with respect to what is going on there, but also whether or

not our State Department and other agencies are doing all they should do to build up the capacity of the Iraqi Government to be able to combat corruption.

In December 2006, and again in July of 2007, the United States Embassy in Iraq produced two reports that weighed on those issues, corruption in the Iraqi Government, and would have shown us some capacity of whether or not the United States was doing enough about it. They were marked "sensitive but unclassified." And they were widely distributed within the United States Government and they were even posted on the Internet.

In September, the Oversight Committee requested copies of those two documents. But rather than provide them in their unclassified form, the State Department decided to retroactively classify them, in essence, keeping them from public view or from public debate.

The State Department classified these documents only after the committee requested that they be produced. And they gave this task to an official who told the committee he had never in his life been requested to review for classification before.

Incredibly, the State Department then retroactively also classified key portions of a Government Accountability Office report that was issued to the Oversight Committee at a public hearing on October 4. Now, David Walker, the Comptroller General, testified in open session that this Government Accountability Office report addressed corruption in Iraq and the failure of the United States agencies to properly support capacity-building efforts in Iraqi ministries. This is not about just deciding how much corruption there was in playing that. It's about deciding whether or not there had been sufficient capacity-building efforts in Iraq ministries to prevent corruption.

Mr. Walker issued the report, copies were handed out to the press, and it was posted on the Internet. But after the hearing, the State Department classified those portions of the report that addressed Iraq's commitment or a lack of commitment to fighting corruption. And yesterday, the State Department claimed in a letter to Congress that they classified the Government Accountability Office report prior to official publication, but, in fact, when we checked with the Government Accountability Office, they said that was not true. The State Department reviewed this report before it was released. They confirmed that it contained no classified information. It was not until after the report was released at the public hearing that the State Department retroactively classified it.

Secretary Rice may not want the public to know what the Government Accountability Office found when it investigated whether the Maliki government is committed to fighting corrup-

tion, or they may not want the public to know whether or not the government is actually working hard enough to build the necessary capacity to stop and check corruption in Iraq. But it's a gross abuse of the administration's powers to retroactively classify these findings and the findings of the State Department's own embassy officials and to do it retroactively.

Classification cannot be allowed to happen primarily because people think they're going to be embarrassed, whatever government may be embarrassed. Congress has to exercise its prerogative here and do the proper oversight for the protection of our troops and of the public's interests.

Testimony was that some \$18 billion in corruption was occurring in Iraq, and that was without going into the oil ministry, where significant further corruption was believed to happen. Testimony was that monies from that corruption were going to fund militias, who in turn were placing their focus on targeting United States troops.

It is imperative that this Congress investigate whether or not, through review of these documents and other sources, we are making enough efforts to build the capacity in Iraq to make sure that that corruption stops and that our troops, our men and women in service, are not being targeted through corruption.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter. This is the prerogative of this House. This should not be about partisan politics or protecting the home team. This should be about making sure that we protect our troops and the public interest.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, the former chairman of the committee (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for yielding the time.

You know, I get such a kick out of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in particular the chairman of the committee. He was my ranking Democrat for 6 years. And during those 6 years we investigated the illegalities of the Clinton administration that took place, and he blocked and defended the administration, as I would expect him to do because he is a Democrat, every single time. But the thing that interests me is he's talking about corruption in our State Department. We sent out over 1,000 subpoenas, and he and his side tried to stop us at every turn in the road to get to the bottom of corruption during the Clinton years. We had over 100 people in the administration and associated with the administration either take the fifth amendment or flee the country. We have pictures of them up on the wall, people that would not testify, that had memory loss. We said there was an epidemic of memory loss at the White House. People were leaving the country. People were taking the fifth amendment. They wouldn't give us any information.

They blocked us time after time after time for 4 years.

And so today, here they are on the floor talking about corruption and being blocked by the State Department when they are the authors of this process. They're the ones who did it for 4 straight years to protect Bill Clinton and his administration when there was no question about corruption in that administration.

We sent five criminal referrals to the Justice Department during the time I was chairman, and they and their colleagues in the Justice Department, the head of the Justice Department blocked us at every step of the way, every turn in the road. And here they are today complaining about our State Department, during a time of war, trying to deal with the problems over there, and they're alleging a cover-up, blockage and everything else. You know, there is nothing so righteous as a lady of the evening who is reformed. And so I just want to say to my colleagues tonight that this is another example of you coming to this floor complaining about the administration blocking you when you did it for 4 straight years. You did it every day, you did it every night, and now you're complaining because we're trying to do something about the war in Iraq and we're stopping you from getting some information that you think is absolutely essential. Where were you when we were investigating Clinton? Why didn't you want that stuff to come out?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to please direct their remarks through the Chair.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I will direct this to you, Mr. Speaker.

For 4 years, they did exactly what they're accusing this administration of doing, and they did it in spades. When people wouldn't testify, they stuck up for them. When people took the fifth amendment, they stuck up for them.

□ 1415

When people from the administration came down here to testify and couldn't remember anything, they helped block the testimony coming before the committee. So today, they are complaining about the very things that they did for four straight years and during a time of war.

Mr. WAXMAN, I just want to say to you one more time I appreciate your reformation. I appreciate your changing. I am happy you are seeing the light. But I don't know why you didn't do it when I was chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that Mr. BURTON, who was chairman of our committee, issued thousands of subpoenas. He received millions of pages of documents. He had hundreds of hours of depositions. He conducted an investigation that has been widely regarded as irresponsible and reckless.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland to speak on this resolution.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very much, Chairman WAXMAN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 734, a resolution expressing our dismay at the withholding of information relating to Iraqi corruption, which I have cosponsored.

By all accounts, Iraq was a corrupt state at the time of the U.S. invasion. Unfortunately, it remains so today. The nonpartisan group, Transparency International, finds that the Iraqi Government is the world's third most corrupt country more than 4 years after Saddam Hussein was ousted.

In an October 4 hearing of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, we listened to the heart-wrenching testimony of Judge al-Radhi, the former Commissioner of the Iraqi Commission on Public Integrity. During his tenure, the judge uncovered up to \$18 billion in funds that were lost as a result of corruption. Rather than receive the accolades for his efforts, however, Judge Radhi faced severe retaliation instead. He told us of the horrible atrocities that he and his family and that of his staff suffered at the hands of those who aimed to stifle his investigations.

In total, 31 people from his office and 12 of their family members were killed. Many endured unspeakable torture, their bodies hung from meat hooks. Judge Radhi's own home was struck by rockets. Harassment eventually reached the point that he was forced to flee his own country. This is not the sort of environment that leads to the free and democratic Iraqi society that President Bush is so fond of invoking.

We cannot achieve a victory in Iraq as long as we allow corruption to continue unchecked. Unfortunately, officials of the U.S. Department of State do not appear to agree. Following our hearing, the Department retroactively classified reports and portions of reports that detailed problems with Iraqi corruption. These actions represent a blatant attempt to manipulate the classification process to stave off bad publicity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad reality indeed. I find it ironic that our own government is engaging in obstructive practices in an attempt to cover up the truth about corruption in Iraq. I urge all of my colleagues to join us in sending a very strong message to the administration that these practices will not be tolerated by voting in favor of H. Res. 734.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I appreciate what the chairman of the committee has done in holding the hearings and the investigations. I think this is something the American people should know. There is no question about that. But there are particular concerns that go to the particular content of the resolution. The chairman and I have discussed this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of this committee cannot have it both ways. And the Speaker of the House cannot have it both ways. In their blind hatred for this administration and the President, they would have you believe on Tuesday of last week that you must believe the Ministry of Interior in Iraq and you must believe that the veterans, now serving for Blackwater, murdered in cold blood 17 Iraqis who were unarmed, defenseless, simply for the sport of it. On Tuesday, that is what Erik Prince had to deal with on the orders of Speaker PELOSI and dealt out by Chairman WAXMAN.

That was Tuesday. By Thursday, we were looking at what we see here today, that the administration was covering up so much corruption, particularly the corruption of the Ministry of Interior. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this resolution not because it is flawless. It has its understandable flaws. But I am going to vote for it because in the whereas it says, whereas, the independent commission on security forces of Iraq chaired by General James L. Jones (Retired) reported on September 6, 2007 that "sectarianism and corruption are pervasive in the Ministry of Interior and cripple the ministry's ability to accomplish its mission."

It goes on and on to make the point I am making, just as the majority has already made, Mr. Speaker, and that is that in order to believe that combat veterans, special forces veterans, Green Berets and special forces SEALs now out of the military and out of harm's way in Iraq working for Blackwater, in order to believe that they murdered in cold blood defenseless civilians at an intersection just for sport just after a bomb went off, you would have had to believe the Minister of Interior. And Mr. WAXMAN would have had the committee believe that on Tuesday. But by Thursday, of course, we have the cover-up of such rampant corruption. Yet in the very, very resolution, we have an independent commission headed by a distinguished former general say, in no uncertain terms, there is rampant and widespread corruption. That has not been taken back by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, what I would say is Mr. WAXMAN and the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, cannot have it both ways. They cannot go after our troops in harm's way, our contractors serving in those capacities similar, most of them, if not all of them veterans, they cannot denounce every aspect of this war, how we got there and when we go there and then say, but this group is so corrupt we must leave.

The previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, went out of his way to say the third from the bottom in corruption is Iraq, never mentioning that Burma was below that. Burma managed to be one of the two at the very bottom. Mr. Speaker, would the majority have us pull out our representation and support in Burma and leave to those who are already the victims of corruption an

even more corrupt government? Or would they, given that this administration in their view is not doing enough, say, We should do more, we should engage, we should spend the money insisting on transparency and reform?

Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this resolution because, in fact, I believe the majority and the minority should agree that there is corruption, corruption so widespread in Iraq for the Minister of Interior to frame men and women in harm's way in order to get them out of the way. I do not want this body and this Congress to be a party to framing Americans who are putting their lives on the line as patriots in Iraq.

I ask that people support it on both sides, not because Mr. WAXMAN isn't trying to have it both ways, but because, in fact, there is corruption in Iraq, and hopefully, at some point, he will begin to believe loyal Americans over those very corrupt entities that he denounces in other parts of his resolution.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the argument the gentleman made. But I like his conclusion. So we welcome his support for our resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), a very esteemed member of our committee.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. One must put this debate in perspective. The administration certainly helped to create the war. Iraq didn't have weapons of mass destruction, but Iraq did have one thing that is very valuable, and that is oil. The administration helped create the war. They created the Coalition Provisional Authority, and they helped to create the Maliki government. Now they are withholding information and classifying previously unclassified information. Again, no WMDs in Iraq, but oil.

I maintain that has all been about oil. The administration looks the other way on corruption, putting great pressure on the Maliki government at this very moment to privatize 20 to \$30 trillion worth of Iraqi oil assets. Now, they can classify all they want over at the White House. But this is still about oil. It can't classify nearly 3,800 deaths of our soldiers. They can't classify 1 million deaths of innocent Iraqis. They can't classify that the war will cost up to \$2 trillion. They can't classify that they are borrowing money from China to fight a war against Iraq. This war has been based on lies. We agree we should all abide by the rules of the House. We should also abide by the United States Constitution. That is why I support this bill. It is also why I support accountability, and I support impeachment.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I would like to inquire as to how much time I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHIFF). The gentleman from Virginia

has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of our committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the American people understand what exactly is going on here. This is not about the Clinton administration. It is not about Blackwater.

I just want to touch on a few facts here. Number one, \$450 billion has already been committed by this President and his administration toward the war in Iraq. Recently, the President has come back to us with a request for an additional \$150 billion also to be spent in Iraq on, among other things, schools, roads, bridges, power plants, water treatment facilities, not in the United States, but in Iraq.

Now, Congress, our responsibility here, we have the power of the purse. The power of the purse is not simply the power to open the purse, but it also includes the duty and the obligation to inspect appropriations and to inquire whether or not this country, this government, who has had the benefit of, if the bill goes through, it will be \$600 billion, we have the duty to inquire whether that government is corrupt.

We received several reports, one from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, Mr. Stuart Bowen, who indicates there is widespread corruption. There is a commission headed by General James Jones, United States Marine Corps, indicating there is widespread corruption in Iraq among the government, and again by Comptroller General David Walker, who indicated, again, there is widespread corruption in Iraq.

We have requested, in response to these reports, testimony and documents from the State Department. They have said "no." They have said, no, they would not testify; they would not give us documents. Chairman WAXMAN had to join with the committee and we issued four subpoenas. They were joined in by my respected colleague from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) who agreed that he would support the subpoenas, as well. However, they did not give us all the documents. The witnesses came forward, but refused to testify as to the level of corruption in Iraq. They have denied Congress the access to the information we need.

There's a strong irony here; it is inescapable to me. The State Department has retroactively classified two reports by its own officials regarding Iraqi corruption. Do you know, it is ironic, the name of the office inside the U.S. Embassy that wrote those reports? It is the Office of Accountability and Transparency. They have refused to give us information. They are the ones who are

supposed to be teaching the Iraqi Government how to be more transparent, how to be more accountable to their own government.

What about the other report the State Department classified, basically has hidden from the American people? Who issued that one? The Government Accountability Office. The statement retroactively classified that one, too. If this were not so serious, it would be laughable. These offices were set up with the express mission of calling the government to account, not only the Government of Iraq but also the Government of the United States. This effort to classify this information has been done for the express purpose of saving the Maliki government from embarrassment because of the allegations of corruption regarding their officials.

So here we are supposed to be exporting democracy, but what we are doing here now is covering up for a corrupt government at the expense of the American people. And the irony runs deep. The Bush administration says we are in Iraq to spread democracy and the rule of law; but, instead, it appears that we are, indeed, complicit with the corruption that is going on in the Maliki government.

I question how it makes America look not only to Iraqis but to our own citizens. I believe it does render us complicit. It harms our core mission. It does not win the hearts and minds of the Iraqis. It loses them. America must lead by action and by example, not by suppressing public discussing of corruption in government.

□ 1430

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Just to put it in perspective, the report was, I think, something like 60 pages. It was called back for five sentences.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, now the ranking member.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. Let me just speak to the point that is made by the resolution that talks about the need to disclose in open session facts which would deal with corruption, and I am quoting, "including allegations that investigations were thwarted, stifled for political reasons, and that that classification should be rescinded."

I have looked at Mr. Butler's testimony to the committee. I have read it. I have got it in front of me. He talks a great deal, acknowledging that there is corruption in the Iraqi Government, as there is in practically every government in the Middle East, to some degree. He talks about that.

Mr. Speaker, he also said that he would be happy to talk about details concerning any political moves to avert investigations into corruption. He would be happy to talk about those

details in a classified session. So he gave that opportunity, as I understand it, to the committee, and the committee didn't take him up on it.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that sources and methods are important. If there was a secret conversation that went on in the Iraqi Government and that secret conversation was listened to by somebody who then relayed that to the U.S. Government, or U.S. officials, laying that out for the public without going into classified session would not be good for American intelligence operations. This committee could have gone into classified session and had all the details that they needed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this particular resolution.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand what the gentleman is saying about sources and methods, and we understand that under some circumstances talking about it in public session might be harmful. But we asked the representative from the State Department questions, such as whether the Government of Iraq currently has the political will or the capability to root out corruption within its government. We were told he couldn't answer that in a public session. That is the problem that we are complaining about in this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, what I have in front of me is the actual testimony of Mr. Butler, who says this: "The Department of State has devoted considerable effort and resources helping courageous Iraqis establish mechanisms and procedures to investigate and prosecute corruption." He says, "It's fair to say we probably do not have a program in the ministerial capacity development area that does not seek to build an environment in which corruption is less prevalent." He goes on to talk about what has been done. So he does engage you on this issue of corruption.

I think you could have gone to a classified session, as was invited by Mr. Butler, you could have gone to a classified session, he invited you to do that, and he would give you the details on that particular conversation. Incidentally, the particular conversation that you're talking about is the one that is manifested in your resolution. It's not this statement that you have just given me. It's the one that is in your resolution. You could have had him do that in private.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Let me say that who speaks for the State Department at certain times and how nuanced the statement is going to be is very important in diplomatic jargon in terms of what its meaning is. I think

that was one of the difficulties they had at that time.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that we asked Mr. Butler from the State Department questions such as whether the Maliki government is working hard to improve the corruption situation so that he can unite his country. We were told he could not answer that question unless we went into closed session, which would mean that if he answered it in closed session, it would be a national security violation for any of us to report his response. That was what was so offensive. They did not want to even discuss a broad kind of questions which go to the nature of our bilateral relations with Iraq how they are doing and what our efforts are doing and whether we are succeeding in stopping the corruption in Iraq, which is jeopardizing our mission and endangering our troops.

I would like to now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, last week Lieutenant General Ricardo Sanchez, who led our forces in Iraq when the vast majority of the American public had yet to turn against the war, emphatically agreed with those of us who criticized the invasion and occupation from the start. In calling the situation a "nightmare," Lieutenant General Sanchez referred to the "unfortunate display of incompetent strategic leadership."

But from what I have seen from my seat on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, with all due respect to the Lieutenant General, he is wrong. The administration isn't failing to implement the strategic leadership needed to bring peace to the region and protect our young men and women risking their lives in Iraq; they are refusing.

David Walker, U.S. Comptroller General, said that widespread corruption is robbing Iraq of the resources to develop the government and is funding the very insurgency we are fighting. Rather than working to end or mend this catastrophe, the State Department has instructed its officials not to cooperate. Instead of using the "Stabilizing and Rebuilding Iraq" report to rectify the problem, they classified it retroactively, giving the impression that honest information is seen by this administration as politically embarrassing rather than constructive.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of how they see it, they owe it to the American people not to ignore factors that endanger our soldiers, jeopardize Iraqi stability, and squander upwards of \$18 billion due to corruption. In today's terms, that is 2½ years of health care for 4 million children through SCHIP. But this isn't merely a case of ignoring crucial information. Our government is actually covering up the rampant corruption, which Inspector General Bowen has referred to as "a second insurgency."

With article I of the Constitution, our Nation's Founders protected us against this abuse by calling for a representative government with all legislative powers vested in the hands of a Congress. By defying that mandate, the Bush administration is defying the American people. So I call on the President to return to those Constitutional principles by dropping the veil of secrecy and restoring the open, honest government envisioned by the Framers, demanded by the people, and depended upon by our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, saying "supporting the troops" is one thing, but following through with actions is something entirely different. That means admitting our deficiencies so that we can correct them. For the 3,820 warriors we lost in Iraq, and for the more than 165,000 serving there today on the ground, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 734, and call on the administration to level with us and support our troops abroad.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me just add that official diplomatic statements, even under oath in congressional testimony, critical of foreign governments, have consequences. Criticizing foreign governments through official statements of our government, when you are trying to get them to comply with other things, have consequences. Criticizing specific ministries, which were some of the questions asked, have consequences within a fragile political framework of the Iraqi current coalitions, and, for one reason or another, the State Department felt that, at least in an open forum, they felt constrained to make appropriate statements.

However, I think it is clear from the amount of testimony and the volume of testimony and the substance of the testimony that we have heard that there has been corruption in Iraq for a long time. It continues, it will probably continue after we leave, and it is something that this Congress and the American people need to know about, and we can address it here on the House floor.

This resolution was introduced dealing with corruption in Iraq and the State Department's attempts to cover up the extent of the corruption, or, I should say, the alleged attempts. This quotes various witnesses that have appeared before our committee over the last several years to discuss the affairs of Iraq.

Along with the chairman, I participated in those hearings, too, and I listened to what the witnesses had to say, and I share his concern about the extent of corruption in Iraq, and I hope every Member does. But I am concerned about the way that the statements are being portrayed, the statements by the panels of expert witnesses who appeared before our committee, because in this resolution, it only paints half the picture.

I offered to work with the chairman to come up with a resolution that in my judgment paints a more complete

picture of the extent of corruption in Iraq, but the offer wasn't accepted. I then, in good faith, filed an amendment with the Rules Committee that accepted basically the resolution that was presented by the chairman but added some additional whereas and resolved clauses that I thought provided a more accurate, bipartisan perspective on the extent of corruption in Iraq.

For example, the chairman's resolution quotes Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraqi Reconstruction, as stating before the committee on October 4 that the "rising tide of corruption in Iraq stymies the construction and maintenance of Iraq's infrastructure, deprives people of goods and services, reduces confidence in public institutions, and potentially aides insurgent groups reportedly funded by graft derived from oil smuggling or embezzlement."

I concur with the chairman's concerns about this particular statement by Mr. Bowen and included the same statement in the amendments that we proposed. But I also added an additional quote made by Mr. Bowen at the hearing that says, "Iraq has a history of corruption" and "the United States did not bring corruption to Iraq, and it will not be gone whenever we leave."

He said that, but apparently that proposed addition didn't fit the theme of what the majority is trying to do this week.

Additionally, the chairman's resolution quotes David Walker, the well-respected Comptroller General of the United States, as stating before our committee that "widespread corruption undermines efforts to develop the government's capacity by robbing it of needed resources, some of which are used to fund the insurgency."

I concur with the chairman's concerns about that statement made by Mr. Walker, something we want the world to know, Congress should be aware of. I included the same statement in the amendments that I proposed. But I also added an additional quote by General Walker at the hearing that says, "none of us should underestimate the challenges of establishing strong and transparent government institutions in the wake of a dictatorship where corruption was woven into the very fabric of governing. And none of us should underestimate the challenge of rooting out corruption in a combat zone, even one where violence is diminishing as we have seen over the past 6 months."

Apparently this proposed addition also failed to fit the majority's tidy little box for discussion this week.

Another example, the resolution highlights the fact that the State Department instructed officials not to answer certain questions. My amendment included the same language as the chairman's but added an additional whereas to acknowledge the fact that the State Department counsel, concerned about the specific assessments regarding the government's capacities

of Iraq Ministries and Ministers made in an open setting, and that these statements could affect the United States' bilateral relationship with the Government of Iraq and could put in danger the lives of Americans, of our allies, repeatedly offered to make United States Government officials and employees available to respond to questions regarding potentially sensitive or classified information, including foreign government information, in an appropriate secure setting where we wouldn't be endangering lives.

But that truthful statement went too far as well to include in this resolution.

The resolution also states that the State Department retroactively classified two reports on corruption in Iraq prepared by the Office of Accountability and Transparency in the United States Embassy in Iraq. I included the same whereas clause, but simply added an additional whereas, to explain that the original leaked report was an internal, unpublished, unedited and unapproved draft report on corruption in Iraq that, as described by one U.S. Embassy Baghdad employee has been embellished with anecdotes for flavor. The report had not been properly reviewed and vetted for classification purposes before.

The majority was not interested in including that explanation for why the State Department chose to classify the report.

Finally, my amendment would have included all but one of the chairman's resolved clauses and then added a handful of additional clauses to paint a more accurate picture of the extent and cause of corruption in Iraq.

For example, I proposed to add a resolved clause that stated it is not an abuse of the classification process to protect from unauthorized disclosure information contained in draft internal, unpublished, unedited and unapproved reports that reasonably may be expected to cause harm to the national defense or foreign relations of the United States.

Like all the previously discussed additions I proposed, apparently this assessment went too far, which leads me to the unfortunate conclusion that the resolution we are considering today is not a substantive resolution intended to achieve a bipartisan consensus on the important issue of corruption in Iraq, which we all agree on. It is intended to politicize and is a political measure, put forth by the majority, with no intention of trying to reach constructive steps to improve U.S. anticorruption efforts.

Is that enough for Members to oppose this press release masquerading as serious legislation? That is for each Member to decide. As for me, I am going to support the resolution, with those reservations.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to say it today that the conversation about corruption in Iraq, this isn't theoretical. It is not hypothetical. It is not just about numbers or statistics. Corruption in Iraq is real. It has a face. And, frankly, it is no secret to those Iraqis who are picking up their newspapers and their media outlets every day and finding out the corruption that is rampant there. So I think it is worthwhile just for a second to talk about the face of corruption in Iraq.

This is Salam al-Maliki, the former Iraqi Minister of Transportation. He is also the Prime Minister's cousin. He was accused of abusing his official position to purchase real estate at a fraction of its value. But the Prime Minister issued an order barring, barring, his case from being referred to court.

I want to now introduce you to Aiham Alsammarae. He was the Iraqi Minister of Electricity who was convicted in Iraq of the abuse of national funds; yet he escaped from the Green Zone with the help of U.S. contractors. He is now living, if you can believe it, in Chicago, running his own business and traveling around the world.

Finally, this is Hazem Shaalan. He was the Iraqi Minister of Defense, accused of embezzling almost \$1 billion that should have been spent on weapons and vehicles for the Iraqi Army. Iraqi courts reportedly have audiotapes of his deputy discussing payoffs to various officials. After his conviction, he also fled the country, and he is now living in Europe or the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the tip of the iceberg. But this administration doesn't think that the American people should be concerned or even know about this. By refusing to answer questions and retroactively classifying corruption reports, this administration has proved once again that they either don't trust the American people, or they know that their case for continuing this war is so weak that they have to obfuscate the facts on the ground.

Now government contractors are getting into the game. Two weeks ago, Erik Prince, the CEO of Blackwater Security, refused to disclose to this committee his salary or the profit margins of his company, despite the fact that Blackwater makes 90 percent of its money off of U.S. taxpayers.

This cannot stand, Mr. Speaker. I, for one, will never support another war funding authorization that doesn't provide for the redeployment of forces out of Iraq.

But for those on this floor who do support this war, I plead with you to at least demand accountability for the billions of wasted dollars that we have thrown at the Iraqis. Do not stand here on the House floor telling us that we cannot afford to heal children throughout the United States of America if we aren't even asking questions and getting the appropriate documentation

that we require on the billions of wasted dollars in Iraq.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1445

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and also for his leadership as Chair of the committee for insisting that Congress exercise its constitutional responsibility of oversight of the executive branch.

The classification process is meant to protect State's secrets, not to cover administration's failed policies. The American people and Congress deserve honest answers about the extent of corruption in the Iraqi Government, and to what extent corruption is fueling the insurgency and endangering our troops. We deserve to know if our troops are dying to support a corrupt regime propped up with United States tax dollars.

But when the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform started to ask those questions, the State Department turned around and classified key sections of the report and testimony.

In a democracy, we do not run away from facts. We do not classify information just because it is embarrassing. Unfortunately, this administration has shown an alarming lack of interest in the facts. This incident looks more like the same kind of stuff we have seen coming from this administration that really wants to continue to keep our young men and women in harm's way knowing full well this is a civil war that cannot be won militarily. I urge my colleagues to support transparency and accountability and condemn this abuse of the classification process and to support this resolution.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time to close.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to a very important member of our committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), for 3 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the chairman of the committee (Mr. WAXMAN) for his important work in this area and moving the committee to take a look at this.

Look, the question is why does the Bush administration not want us to see this information about corruption in the Iraqi Government. One thing is clear, it is not that we are hiding something from the Iraqis that they don't already know. They know about the problem. In fact, we had Judge Radhi from the Iraqi Government who had been thrown out of his job because he was uncovering corruption testify.

So if it is not the Iraqis we are trying to shield this information from, why is it? It is pretty clear that the administration doesn't want the American people to hear it. I think they are finally

understanding that their position is untenable.

Just yesterday the State Department sent a letter saying: "There is no Department 'directive' prohibiting officials from providing Congress any information relating to corruption in Iraq." That is just flatly false. In fact, we have a copy of the directive right here.

Before the committee began its hearings, we asked for some State Department officials to come before the committee and talk about corruption issues. Well, the night before they came before the Oversight Committee, they were given this directive. Here is what it says. These are the areas which are red lined. That means these are the topics that they are not allowed to talk about in public: "Broad statements/assessments which judge or characterize the quality of Iraqi governance or the ability/determination of the Iraqi Government to deal with corruption, including allegations that investigations were thwarted/stifled for political purposes," and it goes on.

It is very clear that the State Department did not want their representatives coming before the committee to tell the truth about Iraqi corruption. And since then, when their officials actually came before the committee during the hearings, they refused to answer questions, the broadest kind of questions.

Let me give you an example of questions that Ambassador Lawrence Butler, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, said he couldn't answer: whether "the Government of Iraq currently has the political will or capability to root out corruption within its government."

That's an important question for the American people.

Also: "whether the Maliki government is working hard to improve the corruption situation so that he can unite his country."

Another question that was put to the State Department representative by the committee: whether Prime Minister Maliki "obstructed any anticorruption investigations in Iraq to protect his political allies." These are important questions to answer for the American people. These are questions that go to the heart of whether or not the policy in Iraq is succeeding or failing. They go to the heart of the question about whether the billions of dollars that taxpayers in this country have put into Iraq are being put to good use or whether they are squandered through waste, abuse, and corruption.

This resolution simply says let's not play games here. Let's not play games with the truth. Let's not try to hide the facts from the American people. The people of Iraq know well the problems they have with respect to corruption. In fact, some of their leaders have put their lives on the line and have had to flee Iraq when the government said they were getting too close to the truth.

But the people here need to know the truth, and the State Department and the Bush administration should not be using games to try and hide the facts and hide the truth from the American people on a very important issue.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying, Look, I think the State Department when this draft was leaked made a mistake in trying to reclassify this and put the genie back in the bottle. They should have just said this is unofficial, this has some problems, and gone ahead. I think that would have made it a lot easier for everybody.

Secondly, let's get real. For the State Department to make official pronouncements about another government and particular ministries can have its diplomatic challenges, and I respect the right of the administration in some of these instances to refrain from saying what the majority would like them to say.

Having said that, I think the State Department, when they go tell The Washington Post things that they wouldn't tell this committee, gives me some problems and puts me on the side of voting for this resolution rather than defending the State Department.

I want to thank the chairman for his oversight hearings on corruption in Iraq. I think it is entirely appropriate. I think he is certainly within his bounds in the right to get the information from the Department of State, and I hope in the future they will be more cooperative in terms of turning over information to the committee instead of just turning it over to the newspapers with their own slant. That is not the way this works. We have a separation of powers. We are a separate branch of government, the legislative branch, and we want to be part of these discussions.

Now, this resolution could have been about a strong bipartisan consensus calling attention to the corruption in Iraq and urging the State Department to step up its efforts to ferret out official corruption, but it is not.

The resolution is just the latest, as I said before, it is the latest find in a search for proxy anti-war votes that the leadership on the other side has staged to feed an increasingly restive left wing of their party.

Unable to prevail directly, they ignore regular order; they nibble around the edges with symbolic surrogates and sense of Congress resolutions.

Having said that, I am going to vote for this resolution. It is not the resolution I would have put forward. We would like to have had more input. I hope as we move down the road on a number of war issues, we can work across the aisle to try to bring some consensus and real change regarding what is going on in Iraq, instead of putting up a document such as this, drafted by one party. But I urge support for the resolution. I thank the chairman for his oversight hearings.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish we had everyone sign off on every word in this resolution, but I think the Members ought to understand what this resolution does. It says to the State Department: don't go with a double standard. You can say publicly positive things about the Iraqi Government, but you can't say things that are honest that may be negative about them, and we are not talking about specific statements, but general statements as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a war in Iraq. Not everybody in this country is making a sacrifice for that war. But those who are being called to make a sacrifice are called to make the maximum sacrifice. They are giving up their lives potentially. The rest of us are paying through deficit spending billions and hundreds of billions of dollars.

But if we are going to ask people to give up their lives in this war, what we owe them is to know the truth, not propaganda, but the truth about what this Iraqi Government is doing that may enable them to accomplish the goal that we have said we wanted to accomplish in Iraq, and that is to reach out, to bring about reconciliation in Iraq and a government that has credibility for its own people.

If this Government in Iraq is so corrupt that our State Department won't even tell us about it, I have to wonder whether we can ask our brave men and women to risk and to give their lives to support that Iraqi Government.

I urge passage of this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 734, expressing the sense of House of Representatives regarding the withholding of information relating to corruption in Iraq, introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, Representative HENRY WAXMAN. This important legislation recognizes the incongruities amongst reporting on the situation in Iraq and seeks to hold the Government accountable for the provision of and access to accurate and consistent information.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House that the State Department is misusing the national security classification process to withhold from the American people information about widespread and increasing corruption within the Government of Iraq. This misuse includes the retroactive classification of documents and directions to employees not to answer questions in an open forum that calls for "broad statements/assessments which judge or characterize the quality of Iraqi governance or the ability/determination of the Iraqi government to deal with corruption, including allegations that investigations were thwarted/stifled for political reasons."

Mr. Speaker, the American people have poured vast amounts of resources and treasure into the misguided war in Iraq. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, the U.S. is spending an estimated \$10 billion per month in Iraq. This \$10 billion a month translates into \$329,670,330 per day, \$13,736,264 per hour, \$228,938 per minute, and \$3,816 per second. For this huge sum of money, we could have repaired the more than

70,000 bridges across America rated structurally deficient (\$188 billion), potentially averting the tragedy that occurred August 1st in Minneapolis, MN. We could have rebuilt the levees in New Orleans (\$50 billion), protecting that City from future hurricanes that could bring Katrina-like destruction upon the City. We could have provided all U.S. public safety officials with interoperable communication equipment (\$10 billion), allowing them to effectively communicate in the event of an emergency, and we could have paid for screening all air cargo on passenger planes for the next 10 years (\$3.6 billion). And, we could have enrolled 1.4 million additional children in Head Start programs (\$10 billion). Instead of funding increased death and destruction in Iraq, we could have spent hard-earned taxpayer dollars on important progress here at home.

Given the enormous amount of resources involved, coupled with the catastrophic costs in human lives, we would certainly expect adequate oversight and management of U.S. funds and military supplies. We would expect clear records of exactly where those \$10 billion a month is going, and to whom it is being given. And yet, the GAO reports that the Pentagon has lost track of over 190,000 weapons, given to Iraqis, particularly in 2004 and 2005. The report's author stated that the U.S. military does not know what happened to 30 percent of the weapons the United States distributed to Iraqi forces from 2004 through early this year as part of an effort to train and equip the troops. These weapons could be used to kill our American troops.

Americans who are footing this enormous bill deserve real answers about where their money is going. Recent indications have suggested that it is not being well spent. The recently released Government Accountability Office report on Iraqi progress toward the 18 legislative, economic, and security benchmarks indicated that only three of these benchmarks have been met by the Maliki government. Despite the surge, despite increasing U.S. military involvement, the Iraqi Government has not made substantial progress toward stabilizing their country. The over 3,750 U.S. casualties and the \$3,816 per second we are spending in Iraq have not bought peace or security. Mr. Speaker, the time has long passed for the Iraqi Government to step up to take control of their own nation.

However, as long as corruption remains endemic in Iraq, the government will find it difficult, if not impossible, to address the ongoing insurgency and to successfully achieve stability in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, leading experts have testified to the widespread corruption of the Iraqi Government, and that this problem continues to threaten our mission in Iraq as long as it's not effectively addressed. According to Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, corruption in Iraq is "a second insurgency" that "stymies the construction and maintenance of Iraq's infrastructure, deprives people of goods and services, reduces confidence in public institutions, and potentially aids insurgent groups reportedly funded by graft derived from oil smuggling or embezzlement." The Comptroller General of the United States, David Walker, agreed, testifying that "widespread corruption undermines efforts to develop the government's capacity by robbing it of needed resources, some of which are used to fund the insurgency."

The State Department must answer questions about the extent of corruption in the government of Iraq, and how this corruption is undermining both our governments' abilities to successfully end the insurgency. Instead, however, on September 25, 2007, the State Department instructed officials not to answer questions in an open setting that asks for "broad statements/assessments which judge or characterize the quality of Iraqi governance or the ability/determination of the Iraqi government to deal with corruption, including allegations that investigations were thwarted/stifled for political reasons." On top of this, the State Department retroactively classified portions of a report on Iraqi corruption previously released by Comptroller General Walker.

In order to emerge successfully from our war in Iraq, we must be able to understand the situation on the ground and have access to documents and information that will allow our troops and fund to go where they are most needed. While the administration has put forward in a myriad of reports a sunny picture of the situation in Iraq emphasizing the progress of a few over the majority.

This legislation is so significant because it addresses the corruption, within both the Iraqi and the United States Government, which have allowed for such a skewed perception of the reality in Iraq. This legislation illuminates the active work of the State Department in masking information on Iraq from public view. In order for this Congress to do its duty and protect its citizens, both at home and serving in our military overseas, it must be able to see what it is that its funds and soldiers are supporting overseas. Voices of dissent and honesty must be heard. We cannot continue to provide open-ended funding and protection for a government which has failed in its mission to be transparent and based in integrity.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve more. The men and women who have fallen in this war due to this endemic lack of information deserve more. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 734, a resolution that discloses the corruptive withholding of information in Iraq. The Administration cannot continue to hide corruption in the Iraqi Government. We cannot allow this abuse of the classification process. Americans have the right to know the truth about the situation in Iraq. The fact of the matter is, our military presence in Iraq is not making our country any safer. Instead, in my district alone, we have lost 13 brave young men to this war.

The Iraq War is costing the American taxpayers ten billion dollars a month. With the money we have spent in Iraq, we could have hired an additional 7.8 million teachers. Americans should be outraged by this abuse of the system. Americans are paying for the war with their money and more importantly, the lives of their loved ones. I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for honesty and accountability by supporting this resolution.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 adoption of House Resolution 734 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2295, as amended, and the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 182.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 21, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 969]

YEAS—395

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

Larsen (WA) Nunes
Larson (CT) Oberstar
Latham Obey
LaTourette Oliver
Lee Ortiz
Levin Pallone
Lewis (GA) Pascarell
Lewis (KY) Pastor
Lipinski Paul
LoBiondo Payne
Loeb sack Pearce
Lofgren, Zoe Perlmutter
Lowey Peterson (MN)
Lucas Petri
Lungren, Daniel Pickering
E. Pitts
Lynch Platts
Mack Poe
Mahoney (FL) Pomeroy
Maloney (NY) Porter
Manzullo Price (GA)
Marchant Price (NC)
Markey Pryce (OH)
Marshall Putnam
Matheson Radanovich
Matsui Rahall
McCarthy (CA) Ramstad
McCarthy (NY) Rangel
McCaul (TX) Regula
McCollum (MN) Rehberg
McCotter Reichert
McCrery Renzi
McDermott Reyes
McGovern Reynolds
McHenry Richardson
McHugh Rodriguez
McIntyre Rogers (KY)
McKeon Rohrabacher
McMorris Ros-Lehtinen
Rodgers Roskam
McNerney Ross
McNulty Rothman
Meek (FL) Roybal-Allard
Meeks (NY) Royce
Melancon Ruppertsberger
Mica Rush
Michaud Ryan (OH)
Miller (FL) Ryan (WI)
Miller (MI) Salazar
Miller (NC) Sanchez, Linda
Miller, George T.
Mitchell Sanchez, Loretta
Mollohan Sarbanes
Moore (KS) Saxton
Moore (WI) Schakowsky
Moran (KS) Schiff
Moran (VA) Schmidt
Murphy (CT) Schwartz
Murphy, Patrick Scott (GA)
Murphy, Tim Scott (VA)
Murtha Sensenbrenner
Musgrave Serrano
Myrick Sessions
Nadler Sestak
Napolitano Shadegg
Neal (MA) Shays

NAYS—21

Broun (GA) Gingrey
Cannon Hall (TX)
Cantor Hunter
Carter Jordan
Conaway King (IA)
Doolittle Lewis (CA)
Dreier Linder

NOT VOTING—15

Blunt Cubin
Boehner Jindal
Carson Johnson (IL)
Clyburn Johnson, E. B.
Costa Peterson (PA)

□ 1520

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FRANKS of Arizona, KLINE of Minnesota, BARRETT of South Carolina, SULLIVAN, BILBRAY, HASTER, SHADEGG, and Mrs. BLACKBURN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 969, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ALS REGISTRY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2295, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2295, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 970]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie Cleaver
Ackerman Coble
Aderholt Cohen
Akin Cole (OK)
Alexander Conaway
Allen Conyers
Altmire Cooper
Andrews Costa
Arcuri Costello
Baca Courtney
Bachmann Cramer
Bachus Crenshaw
Baird Crowley
Baker Cuellar
Baldwin Culberson
Barrett (SC) Cummings
Barrow Davis (AL)
Bartlett (MD) Davis (CA)
Barton (TX) Davis (IL)
Bean Davis (KY)
Becerra Davis, David
Berkley Davis, Lincoln
Berman Davis, Tom
Berry Deal (GA)
Biggart DeFazio
Bilbray DeGette
Bilirakis Delahunt
Bishop (GA) DeLauro
Bishop (NY) Dent
Bishop (UT) Diaz-Balart, L.
Blackburn Diaz-Balart, M.
Blumenauer Dicks
Bonner Dingell
Bono Doggett
Boozman Donnelly
Boren Doolittle
Boswell Doyle
Boucher Drake
Boustany Dreier
Boyd (FL) Duncan
Boyd (KS) Edwards
Brady (PA) Ehlers
Brady (TX) Ellison
Braley (IA) Ellsworth
Brown (SC) Emanuel
Brown, Corrine Emerson
Brown-Waite, Engel
Ginny English (PA)
Buchanan Eshoo
Burgess Etheridge
Butterfield Everett
Buyer Fallon
Calvert Farr
Camp (MI) Fattah
Campbell (CA) Feeney
Cannon Ferguson
Cantor Filner
Capito Forbes
Capps Fortenberry
Capuano Fossella
Cardoza Foxx
Carnahan Frank (MA)
Carney Franks (AZ)
Carter Frelinghuysen
Castle Gallegly
Castor Garrett (NJ)
Chabot Gerlach
Chandler Giffords
Clarke Gilchrest
Clay Gillibrand

Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppertsberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

NAYS—3

Broun (GA) Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Blunt Green, Gene
Boehner Jindal
Burton (IN) Johnson (IL)
Carson Johnson, E. B.
Clyburn Peterson (PA)
Cubin Tancredo

□ 1529

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.