

Ryan (WI)	Smith (NE)	Walsh (NY)
Sali	Souder	Wamp
Scalise	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Schmidt	Sullivan	Weller
Sensenbrenner	Tancredo	Westmoreland
Sessions	Terry	Whitfield (KY)
Shadegg	Thornberry	Wilson (NM)
Shimkus	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Shuster	Walden (OR)	

tempore (Mr. TIERNEY) at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.

motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except that the Chair shall divide the question between the dispositions of the two Senate amendments.

NOT VOTING—10

Edwards (TX)	Loeb sack	Tiahrt
Gilchrest	Meeks (NY)	Wolf
Honda	Rush	
Hulshof	Stark	

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-720) on the resolution (H. Res. 1284) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SEC. 2. During consideration of the motion to concur pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the motion to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the daily issue of the Congressional Record dated June 19, 2008, such material as he may deem explanatory of the motion.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1439

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. DRAKE changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So 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. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was on an official leave of absence to attend the commencement ceremony for Potomac Falls High School, a high school in my congressional district, at which I was the main commencement speaker. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 5781, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2008.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall 428 today. It was my intention to vote "yea" on that vote.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6304, FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-721) on the resolution (H. Res. 1285) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6304) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

I yield myself such time as I may consume and also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1284.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1284 provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642, Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2008. The rule makes in order a motion by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that the House, one, concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment numbered 1, and two, concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment numbered 2, with the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report.

The motion is debatable for 1 hour and controlled by the Committee on Appropriations, and the Chair shall divide the question between the dispositions of the two Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the issue to be debated today could not be of greater consequence to the future of our Nation or the citizens of this body and all of this country. For that reason, the Rules Committee has reported out a rule that gives each Member the opportunity to vote his/her conscience on the most pressing issue of our day: funding for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as critical domestic spending to bring relief to the American people and provide our veterans with access to higher education.

This legislation meets the spending requirements made by President Bush

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 6041

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 6041.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 6041 AND H. RES. 356

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of both H.R. 6041 and H. Res. 356.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1708

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1284 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1284

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments to the House amendments to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a single motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment numbered 1 and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment numbered 2 with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendments and the

with the exception of the \$2.65 billion in disaster relief for the aftermath of the tornadoes and floods that hit the Midwest which was added at the President's request.

In addition, the bill includes the \$5.8 billion that President Bush asked for to strengthen the levees in New Orleans and does not include a single earmark except those explicitly requested by his administration.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring the legislation forward today, the Democrat majority had to make very difficult decisions. However, making difficult choices is appropriate when deciding issues of great importance such as the war in Iraq, a war that has placed unprecedented strain on this Nation.

□ 1715

At no time in our history has America fought a war of this magnitude, or one that is this difficult, with an entirely voluntary military force composed of only 1 percent of the general population. And no one in this country has been asked to sacrifice as our troops and their families have.

Our soldiers are well aware of what the current situation means for them, two, three, four, sometimes five deployments of duty, while their political leaders casually use words like "political progress" to justify their redeployment.

However, these extraordinary individuals know full well that they return again and again to a conflict that has taken the lives of over 4,000, almost 5,000 now, of their fellow soldiers and 28 from my district alone.

They know that tens of thousands of American men and women are returning home wounded and physically disabled, many suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and a host of other mental health issues.

They know full well that they are redeployed to a civil war that has left millions of Iraqi men, women and children dead and millions more in refugee camps or fleeing to other countries that will accept them.

Our soldiers already know quite a lot, and by that I mean, they've come to learn that terms like "political progress" are little more than political posturing and empty rhetoric, and that is not how a Nation shows respect for its military.

Unfortunately, such disrespect is what our brave men and women in uniform are accustomed to. Our troops were repeatedly promised that they would have the equipment they needed to do their jobs. Yet we all saw the reports of desperate searches through junk heaps to refit ill-equipped armored vehicles. We all heard the stories of struggling families frantically emptying their savings accounts to purchase adequate body armor for their children going off to war.

Our troops were repeatedly promised that they would be taken care of when they came home from combat. Yet

once again this administration's promises turned out to be nothing more than rhetoric. Remember the disgraceful images of Walter Reed Hospital, and that is not how a grateful Nation shows respect for its troops.

Mr. Speaker, it is with this in mind that we proceed today with this legislation. While some pieces of this bill required difficult decisions before it could be brought to the floor, others were easy to make.

The bill provides immediate resources to our troops currently in the field, and nothing is more important than their safety and security. And in addition, the bill keeps our promises to our veterans.

Part of the cost of waging war is ensuring that those who fight receive the resources that they need to resume their lives when they return home. Given all the sacrifices that our troops have made for this Nation, it is simply unconscionable to nickel and dime them when it comes time for us to keep up our end of the bargain.

The underlying legislation includes a dramatic expansion of the education benefits provided to our veterans. Not only do our troops deserve this benefit, the same one provided to veterans of World War II, but for every dollar we spend on education today, we will see a return that will bolster our economy tomorrow. And frankly, our economy needs bolstering.

Far too many hardworking Americans are feeling enormous pressure with skyrocketing gas and food prices, unaffordable health care costs, rising college tuition rates, home foreclosures that are far too commonplace, and a terrible job market.

Last month's atrocious unemployment numbers highlight the urgent need for assistance to millions of struggling families calling out for relief. In fact, the number of Americans looking for work has grown by 800,000 over the last year, and the number of American jobs has declined by 260,000 since the beginning of 2008.

This bill takes immediate action to extend unemployment insurance for workers who have exhausted their benefits by up to 13 weeks in every State.

Furthermore, the American people are feeling the pain as their hard-earned tax dollars finance the rebuilding of a foreign Nation while their country's own economy and infrastructure are falling apart at the seams. To that end, this legislation removes the unfair burden placed on the American taxpayer by requiring the Iraqi government to pull its own weight and match U.S. reconstruction money dollar-for-dollar.

In addition, it prohibits, once again—and we have to look out for those signing statements—but it prohibits once more the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq, blocking this administration from saddling the American people with a costly occupation long after their soldiers are home.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation deals with some of the most im-

portant issues of the day, our fellow citizens who have been sent to fight in a conflict far away from home, as well as critical domestic spending that will give relief to the millions of Americans struggling just to survive.

The structure of the rule we consider today provides each Member the opportunity to cast his or her vote according to their values and their priorities. I am proud to support the rule, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

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. I want to begin for the second time today by expressing my great appreciation to my very good friend and colleague, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it was interestingly enough on February 5 of 2007, February 5 of 2007, which is exactly 500 days ago—500 days ago President Bush made a request of this Congress to provide supplemental funding for our troops to ensure that they have all the tools necessary to prosecute these struggles going on in both Iraq and Afghanistan, 500 days, a long period of time. But Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that I believe that we've finally gotten there.

As I listened carefully to the statement of my good friend from Rochester, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, I have to say that I completely concurred with the first third of her statement in which she went through a very accurate description of exactly what this supplemental appropriations bill consists of. I could not disagree with her more on the second third of her presentation, and on the last part, I have sort of a mixed view.

When it comes to the first third, I will say that, again, I completely concur. This measure is designed to ensure that we get to our men and women in uniform the tools that they need, the resources that they need to continue this struggle. It ensures that the request and the directive by Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, raising very serious concern about the prospect of not being able to have the resources necessary is addressed.

She also in her remarks talked about the need to deal with the economic challenges that we face, and I completely concur. When we saw the largest increase in the unemployment rate in 22 years, a half a percent increase in the unemployment rate, it's clear that we want to ensure that those Americans who are very much in need are going to be able to have their concerns addressed by providing with that 20-week requirement, which we've gone back to and which we supported in the early part of this decade in 2001 and 2002, that that requirement will

continue to be in place. So I wholeheartedly support that effort for the 13-week extension.

And she also talked about the need to ensure that we provide the resources for the veterans. For those men and women who have been engaged in this struggle and have come home, it is absolutely crucial that we do everything that we can to provide those very important resources for those brave and courageous men and women who have served in our Armed Forces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it came as I said to the second third of Ms. SLAUGHTER's presentation, I could not disagree more vigorously. She referred to the term "political progress" as being one of posturing. Well, I've got to say if we look at the independent assessments that have been provided by even some of the most harsh critics, some of the harshest critics of this war, there has been acknowledgment that this surge has worked.

All one needs to do is this week look at lead articles in both the Washington Post, hardly an entity that has been sympathetic with this effort, and the Associated Press. Both of those entities have strongly come forward and pointed to the tremendous progress that has been made not only, not only militarily but the political progress which has been made as well.

And so I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues who have worked in a bipartisan way. I see Mr. OBEY here. He just testified before the Committee on Rules and talked about his concerns, and he talked about the need to make sure that we move forward.

Our Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, has also worked very, very diligently on this, and I have to say it's interesting as we mark today the 500th day since the President made this request for supplemental funding for our troops, it's fascinating that this all came together within what is just about a maybe 28-, 29-, 30-hour period of time.

So I think that it's important for us to get this done. It's important for us to address these concerns which include the much-needed relief to those victims of the floods in the Midwest and the strengthening of the levees following Hurricane Katrina, and I believe that we have a wonderful indication of bipartisanship at its best here.

I am very pleased to finally take up a Rule for a Supplemental Appropriations bill that is based on bipartisan compromise that gets our troops the funding they need. And most important, it is a bill that the President can actually sign. I just wish we could have done this months ago.

Mr. Speaker, the request for supplemental funding for our troops came to us on February 5th of 2007—exactly 500 days ago. Since that time, we have heard hours of testimony from our military commanders, warning us in clear terms of the strains on our troops from the failure to fund them. For months, we have heard of impending layoffs of military contract employees. Of vital programs getting cut off or

put on hold. The message was very clear: our armed forces in harm's way needed emergency funding in order to effectively continue their jobs.

But what did they get from the Democratic Leadership? Endless political posturing. Funding bills that were purely political documents, with no hope of being enacted. I find it very troubling that this partisan process could drag on for so long.

I find it very troubling that it took so long before there was an attempt at bipartisan negotiation to craft a good bill that provides for our troops and will be enacted into law.

After months of posturing, once the Democratic Majority finally reached across the aisle so that real progress could be made—how long did it take to reach a workable compromise? Mere hours. Once the dialogue began, Republicans and Democrats quickly came to a solution—a bill that funds our troops, while also addressing other priorities in a responsible way.

Today's underlying bill fully funds our armed forces. It will provide a new education benefit to veterans, without raising taxes. And it will extend unemployment insurance in these uncertain economic times, without eliminating key provisions to prevent fraud and abuse. This is a compromise that Republicans and Democrats can support, fulfilling our duty to the men and women who are in harm's way. This is a duty that we as a body must take far more seriously than the last few months have demonstrated.

When we are bogged down by the Democratic Majority's political gamesmanship, there are real-world consequences to these actions—or lack of action.

As we have heard from our military commanders over the past weeks and months exactly what these consequences are, one of the most troubling revelations came just last week. Adm. Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that our commanders had run out of funds to pay for development projects in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is perhaps the most perverse outcome of the Democratic Leadership's failure to fund our troops.

Regardless of where you stand on the war, we all know and agree that the fight against extremism demands more than a purely military solution. Our armed forces are working to provide a security environment that allows for development to take place—and they are succeeding. But if we squander this opportunity, we will never succeed in the long term. We will fail to win hearts and minds, and we will fail to provide an alternative to terror and extremism.

The people of Iraq and Afghanistan need to see that our fight is not against them. They need to see that we support democratic institutions and the good governance that ensures peace, liberty and opportunity. Without our development efforts, our military efforts can have no hope for sustainable success. By stonewalling the troops' funding, the Democratic Leadership not only shortchanges our troops, they are blocking our efforts to assist in the development of the foundation for lasting peace.

This is an unconscionable policy. Especially at the very time that the seeds of reconciliation are starting to take root. For months we have known that the surge has succeeded in reducing violence. Even the war's harshest critics have begrudgingly conceded that vio-

lence has been significantly reduced. But they called it an empty victory, saying that the improved security situation has failed to bring about political progress.

But today, that is changing. Monday's lead AP story was "Iraqi violence down, confidence in government up."

Tuesday's Washington Post announced "Calm in Iraq Spurs Debate; Decline in Violence, Focus on Politics May Signal Turning Point." These are stories not just of reduced violence. They tell of the political reconciliation and progress that is now being made possible by the increased security. Iraqis are gaining faith in the Maliki government. And minority Sunni parliamentarians are heartened that a Shiite government would go after Shiite terrorists with the same zeal they go after Sunni terrorists.

Of course, this progress is fragile. Tuesday's terrible attack in Baghdad reminded us that while violence is diminishing overall, the danger of large-scale attacks remains very real. Furthermore, the political progress is still in its infancy. The Post story goes on to say "analysts question whether the limited political accommodation among Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds can be sustained if the U.S. withdraws its forces quickly." It points out that Iran would love to fill any void that we create, and that Iraqis fear today's calm is simply the calm before the storm. Clearly, our mission is not complete.

But demonstrable progress is being made. After years of terrible violence, setbacks and enormous challenges, many of us have become desensitized to any signs of progress and improvement. But they are there. The tragic part is that any delay in providing critical funding puts this fragile progress in jeopardy. Today's underlying bill is urgently needed. While I am deeply sorry it has taken this long, I am truly pleased to finally have a bipartisan bill that will deliver our troops the vital resources they need.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the chairwoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the rule allows for the supplemental to be considered in two parts. Part 1 is funding for the war and Iraq, and part 2 includes expanded benefits for GI education, expanded unemployment compensation, disaster relief, food aid, and other measures.

I want to begin also, Mr. Speaker, by thanking Chairman OBEY for his incredible leadership in trying to forge a decent and fair compromise. He has more patience than I.

Mr. Speaker, let me start with talking about amendment No. 2. I strongly support the measures contained in this amendment. It expands the GI benefits for the education of our veterans, including those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, and extends them more equitably for all of our service branches, including the Guard and Reserves.

The amendment also extends unemployment benefits by up to 13 weeks in every State for workers who have exhausted their benefits.

It places a moratorium on six Medicaid regulations, the costs of which are fully offset.

It provides emergency funding to meet critical needs, especially in addressing the global food crisis and disaster and refugee assistance.

It includes many other measures, Mr. Speaker, that are worth supporting, that are important, that are vital, and so I urge all my colleagues to support amendment No. 2.

Let me now just say a few words about funding for the war in Iraq, Mr. Speaker.

Under amendment No. 1, funding for the Iraq war is provided without conditions, a blank check, with no requirements about how or when we might begin removing our military forces from Iraq or prohibiting the Bush administration from moving forward with a Status of Forces Agreement that could tie the hands of the next administration to design a new policy and a new future with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, how can anyone in this Chamber give this President another blank check for the war in Iraq? This is the same President who rushed us into war under false pretenses. There were no weapons of mass destruction and no ties to al Qaeda. Everything he and his administration have told us has been wrong. Where is the accountability?

For me, this is one compromise too many. It represents one cave-in too many. It asks Congress to roll over and be blind to the consequences of the war for the next 9 months or so.

Five years after the invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration continues the occupation of Iraq with no end in sight. More than 4,500 American soldiers and tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been killed, and over 30,000 Americans wounded.

It is long past time for a change in course, and this bill does absolutely nothing to bring that about.

This is George Bush's war, and he should end it while he is still President.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to oppose this amendment, amendment No. 1, and demand that this President and his administration begin the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

□ 1730

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'm very happy to yield 3 minutes to my thoughtful and diligent colleague from Irvine, California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you for that kind introduction, my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. Speaker, we learned this week that 8 months into this fiscal year we now have a deficit of \$317 billion. If you project that out for the rest of the fiscal year, we are looking at having a deficit of \$476 billion. That would be the largest deficit of any year in the history of the country, and today we are making it worse yet again.

I understand that much of the spending, as you've just heard in this bill, are priorities for Members of this House, for citizens—frankly, many of them for this Member, but not every one of the well over \$3 trillion that we're spending now in the Federal Government can be a priority that we cannot do without. We are going to have to start, when we add more spending, take some spending out of something else, offset it with reduced spending.

What we're talking about here are priorities. And if we look at what's happening ahead of us, the appropriations bill that we now see for the coming year increases spending by another 7.7 percent, while revenues are essentially flat. And that's \$72 billion that would add to this deficit next year. And that doesn't include the entitlement programs, which increase at a dramatic rate every single year and which were actuarially bankrupt.

Where are we headed, Mr. Speaker? Are we headed for a \$600 billion, \$700 billion deficit? Do we care? Are we going to do anything about it?

Now, there are some on the other side of the aisle who would say, well, we'll raise taxes, and that's how we'll cover it. Well, I'm not even sure you can raise taxes enough. Taking aside the arguments of what that would do to a now struggling economy, what that would do to many people out there struggling either in their business, with the cost of energy, or personally with the cost of energy, but you, frankly, can't raise taxes enough to cover the massive deficits that we're having this year and that look to be getting even greater next year.

So I would say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to both the Democrat and Republican leadership, we need to stop spending without offsetting it by reducing spending somewhere else. And I hope that we'll start that now.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you for yielding.

Thank you to the Rules Committee, and to you, Mr. OBEY, who has been more than a stalwart central figure in this whole effort. And as I'm going to say, there are hundreds of thousands of people who will say to you, thank you, because today the voices of over one million people who have not been heard enough on this floor are finally being listened to with a much-needed extension of unemployment benefits.

Some have written us the most persuasive letters about being unemployed, often for the first time, sending out hundreds of resumes, losing their health care, and having difficulty making ends meet. They have not marched on Washington. They have individually been in their communities looking for work. But if they did form a line, these million plus and those who've exhausted their benefits, by estimation,

it would extend from this Capitol to Denver, Colorado.

I asked the State of Michigan to provide me information on individuals who have exhausted their benefits just yesterday, and we have the figures now. They come from the broadest range of occupations—sales, health care, production, management, financial operations. I would suggest that each Member do the same, because once you look at the data, you will have no doubt that we are doing the right thing today.

Today is a victory for more than one million of our citizens and an additional 2.5 million estimated to exhaust their benefits. This is a vital first step, and we will be ready to fight to sustain this program for people who continue to be unemployed through no fault of their own in a truly difficult job market.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Monticello, Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank my friend, the ranking member on Rules, for yielding.

It is with very mixed emotions that I come to the floor today to oppose the rule that we are debating at the moment.

As you heard the other speaker say, the underlying substantive legislation is legislation that really needs to be passed by this Congress and signed into law.

You've got a very unpopular war, but as the debate about the policy goes on in Washington, the men and women in the field wearing the uniform need to be provided the funds and the resources they need to carry out that policy until such time as it is changed. And I think many of us feel very strongly about that, so we have to do the war funding piece.

Secondly, you have a significant domestic policy piece, and part of it is the GI Webb Bill, the education benefits package. That needs to be updated, and it's an appropriate thing to do. We are doing it, though, probably in a, if not an unprecedented way, certainly a very unusual way in that we are creating a new mandatory spending program in an emergency supplemental bill. I know that's never been done since I've been here, but nevertheless, it is a piece that needs to be done. I wish it could be debated and funded separately.

We have the unemployment insurance benefits package. Obviously, in today's economy, with a 5.5 percent unemployment rate, is something that I think everybody on this floor supports, and most of us have already voted on it and supported it earlier in the previous week.

As has been stated before, you've got true emergencies in the Midwest with the floods, you've got the Katrina levee piece, which continues to be a problem. And all of these things are items that the government of the richest Nation

in the world ought to be doing, and we ought to be paying for it. But here is the reason I stand here to oppose this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And, Mr. Speaker, let me add an additional minute to that.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank Madam Chairman, my friend.

I would say that the richest Nation on the face of the Earth, we ought to be willing to find a way to pay for these things which are so important for the continuation of this great democracy that we have, the strongest economy in the world. But what we've chosen to do is to borrow the money, not pay the bill, and send the bill to the generations of the future. And I think that's morally wrong. It's a mistake. It's economically a mistake because our children and grandchildren will live in an economy that's much different than the one that our fathers and grandfathers and grandparents built for us.

So I feel very strongly about this. We're making a serious mistake by not paying for these things. I know we have another body on the other side of the Capitol here that doesn't understand this concept. We have a White House which doesn't understand the concept of pay-for, but this House has stood pretty strong on this issue until today.

This bill is \$257 billion, over a quarter of \$1 trillion. As my friend from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) said earlier, it adds to the already \$319 billion existing deficit that we're running in this fiscal year.

I feel strongly about this. I think it's a mistake. And I think it's one that our children and grandchildren will pay for.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a young President, a veteran of the Greatest Generation, once reminded the world that Americans would pay any price, bear any burden in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty. His, the generation of John F. Kennedy, understood that all Americans had a moral obligation to support those who have paid the greatest price and borne the heaviest burdens of war—our troops, our veterans, and their families. That's why the original GI Bill was passed in 1944. Today, 64 years later, with the strong leadership of Speaker PELOSI and Chairman OBEY, Congress is renewing its moral commitment to those who have served our Nation in uniform.

Amendment No. 2 in this bill includes a 21st century bill of rights, a GI Bill of

Rights that will open the doors of our colleges and universities to our troops, our veterans, and their families. We also commit \$396 million to improve VA polytrauma centers, which are providing critical care to the most severely wounded troops.

With respect to health care needs of our troops and their families, we fund \$863 million in amendment No. 2 to begin a desperately needed modernization of outdated military hospitals. No service man or woman, not one, Mr. Speaker, should ever have to face the degrading conditions our soldiers saw last year at Walter Reed Annex 18.

Amendment No. 2 also respects the unsung heroes in our Nation's defense, our military spouses and children, by providing funding for 20 new military child care centers with a focus on those bases bearing the burden of multiple tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan. For our youngest heroes, the 18, 19, and 20-year-olds who have just signed up to serve our country, we provide \$75 million, again, improving woefully inadequate training barracks. Those who choose to serve deserve decent housing.

Supporting our troops, our veterans, and their families is what we Americans do, it is who we are. Since our Nation's founding, shared sacrifice during time of war has been a quintessential American value, a promise to keep. I thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman OBEY for seeing that we keep that promise. It is the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to vote "yes" on amendment No. 2.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to our very thoughtful and hardworking colleague from Columbus, Indiana, an area that has been victimized by the floods and will be assisted in this package that is coming forward, Mr. PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of most of this bill, and certainly appreciate the spirit with which it has come together.

I certainly strongly support the military funding portion of the Iraq/Afghanistan supplemental appropriations bill. It will speed roughly \$165 billion in emergency funds to our men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it will do so without imposing artificial timelines and timetables for withdrawal.

Far away from Washington D.C., our brave troops are focused on doing the job we've asked them to do, continuing our progress in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Earlier this week, the headline of the Indianapolis Star, the leading newspaper in my home State, simply read, "Iraq May Have Reached Turning Point." In a national Associated Press story the following words were written, "Signs are emerging that Iraq has reached a turning point. Violence is

down, armed extremists are in disarray, government confidence is rising, and sectarian communities are gearing up for a battle at the polls rather than slaughter in the streets."

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that these headlines would not be possible if most Democrats in Congress had had their way, if they had passed any of the measures over the last year and a half that are brought to this floor again and again which would have cut off funding to our troops and facilitated a retreat and defeat from Iraq. And these headlines would not be possible if Republicans in Congress had not stood with our soldiers in the field, stood with our Commander in Chief, supported the new strategy and the new tactics that have brought about what the Associated Press describes as "a turning point in Iraq."

And so I strongly support the military supplemental funding in this bill. And I commend the leadership, most especially my colleagues who have stood with our soldiers and our Commander in Chief, for bringing this clean bill to the floor.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I was heartened, as the gentleman from California just alluded, the ranking member, that after weeks of some of the most devastating weather in Indiana history, that this legislation will include \$2.65 billion in disaster relief funding to ensure that critical resources are available to respond to the tornados and flooding across the Midwest.

□ 1745

I've spent a great deal of my time with Hoosiers that are hurting. And my heart goes out to families across the Midwest and to those government agencies that are responding with such effectiveness. But I must say that in this emergency military spending bill, when we fund these emergencies, be they at home or abroad, we still need to do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

I've said before and will say again that we must ensure that a catastrophe of nature does not become a catastrophe of debt for our children and grandchildren. I support this funding for true emergencies. But I still believe, as others have said before, that it should be offset by reductions in other government spending.

And let me say emphatically, military emergency funding bills ought to be about military funding and emergencies. Our war funding is emergency military spending. The GI Bill improvements in this bill are meritorious and military. Flooding in the Midwest is an emergency. But I say with respect, what does \$178 million for the Bureau of Prisons have to do with military or emergencies? What is \$210 million for the Census or \$400 million for scientific research doing in an emergency military funding bill?

I support this expansion of the GI Bill. I support funding FEMA during a

time of crisis. And I certainly support our troops.

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

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. PENCE. I believe, as we go forward with the spending bill, the American people deserve to know where credit is deserved, to those who have stood in this body for a clean war funding bill, stood by our troops, stood by the surge, and they also deserve to know that despite all the promises to the contrary about putting our fiscal house in order that here we are again with a massive amount of increased domestic spending, with nary a thought of how we're going to pay for it, passing the burden along to future generations of Americans.

So I will not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I will support this bill, because on balance I believe it funds urgent national needs in various respects. But I rise, as others have before, to say that emergency funding bills for the military ought to be about military funding and emergencies. And supporting those aspects of this bill will bring me to the floor and to an "aye" vote today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

(Mr. BRALEY of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule because of the flood relief provisions included in the supplemental funding bill. I'm pleased that this amendment includes \$2.65 billion for flood relief in my State and others. And I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule because of this important funding.

Iowa is currently experiencing record flooding which is having a widespread and unprecedented impact on people, property and agriculture in the State. Governor Culver has issued an emergency proclamation for 83 of Iowa's 99 counties, all experiencing significant damage due to the combination of severe rainfall, tornadoes, high winds and flooding. Fifty-five Iowa counties have been declared Presidential disaster areas. Seventeen citizens have lost their lives, and many more have been injured. Over 38,000 Iowans have been displaced from their homes already, and thousands more have been disrupted because of the closure, through evacuation, of Iowa hospitals, nursing homes, businesses and schools. More than 18 shelters have been in operation in more than a dozen counties. And it is estimated that 20 percent of the State's cropland has been destroyed. And the flooding still continues.

This flooding has impacted everyone in Iowa. And the scope of damages to Iowans' homes, lives and livelihoods is almost beyond description. Some are

calling this disaster "the Katrina of the Midwest." If you were to travel around Iowa, you would understand what they are talking about.

This unprecedented destruction needs and deserves a swift and special response from Congress. That's why this \$2.65 billion flood relief package is so important. Iowans and people across the Midwest impacted by this flooding need immediate help to restart their businesses, salvage their farms and rebuild their lives after this devastating flood.

When things get tough in Iowa, Iowans come together to help one another. I would look to thank the Appropriations Committee and the House leadership for coming together and working with me and my colleagues from Iowa to provide this urgently needed flood relief funding. This disaster relief funding is a crucial first step on the road to Iowa's full recovery. And I urge all of my colleagues to support it by voting for this rule.

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Brooksville, Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the emergency supplemental appropriations rule and bill that is currently before the House.

I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. MITCHELL from Arizona, for his very hard work on the veteran and the veterans service organizations like the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America for their tireless effort in support of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act. I am the lead Republican on that portion of the bill. And it will boost educational assistance to our veterans.

The current veterans' education assistance program covers only a portion of the ever-rising costs associated with a college degree. The education benefits for our veterans have not kept pace with today's rising college costs. Congress must act to correct this. And that is exactly what this portion of the bill does.

I also support the bill because it recognizes the tremendous contributions and sacrifices made by members of the National Guard and Reserves. The United States has relied heavily on the efforts of the National Guard in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since September 11, 2001, over 250,000 National Guard personnel have served in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Currently, members of the National Guard may only receive educational benefits for the longest amount of time that they're activated. The Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act included in the supplemental recognizes these deserving men and women by allowing for the accumulation of educational benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the emergency

supplemental bill containing the veterans' education benefit to provide for a brighter future for all those who have served our country honorably, and also because it does contain the funding necessary for our troops currently fighting the war to protect our freedom.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 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. I thank the gentlewoman from New York. I rise today to thank Chairman OBEY and thank the leadership, Speaker PELOSI, for addressing the question that confronts us in the most strategic way possible. But it is important to note that many of us have opposed consistently a war that continues to go on unbridled and misdirected.

We thank our soldiers. But it's important to note that now some \$600 billion has gone to Iraq. We've lost 4,100 soldiers. Instead of having a military surge, we should have a diplomatic surge. We now give \$165 million unrestricted to this White House. But I do rise in support of amendment 2 that provides for the GI Bill that acts as a good Samaritan to those who have been unemployed for 13 extra weeks of unemployment, that provides for elimination of six Medicaid provisions that will help restore partially the health care that Americans need. But I believe we should have had provisions in this particular appropriation that would indicate that the dollars should be used to redeploy our troops, thank them and grant them the success that they have had because they are successful.

But we need to bring our troops home. And we need to indicate that the authority for military force has expired. The GI Bill is a "thank you" to our soldiers. Let's bring them home safely. And let's provide the investment that it needs. I am grateful that we had the disaster relief for all of those suffering in the Midwest, but that we've not forgotten the Katrina victims and survivors that now are still homeless. It is important, as we move forward, to begin to look at domestic funding.

This is a first start. But we need to have legislation that acknowledges the honor of those who have fallen, declare a military success and allow Iraq to invest. And I am grateful for the two amendments that require Iraq to invest in its own domestic development. This is the time to redeploy our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to Amendment #1, and in strong support of Amendment #2 of the bill H.R. 2642, Making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. While I am supportive of the portions that contain provisions beneficial to the American people designed to improve our economy and protect

our young men and women, I remain adamantly opposed to this legislation because it continues a disastrous policy of providing unrestricted funding to continue the Bush Administration's war in Iraq.

AMENDMENT #1—IRAQ WAR FUNDING

Mr. Speaker, I oppose Amendment #1 because I stand with the American taxpayers, who have paid over \$600 billion to finance the misadventure in Iraq. I stand with the 4100 fallen heroes who stand even taller in death because they gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. In May, I was proud to vote against amendment #1 to the previous version of the supplemental spending bill that would have provided funds for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, which included a timetable for the redeployment of U.S. troops. I was extremely pleased that the House did not pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this legislation as it provides a total of \$165.4 billion for the Department of Defense for FY 2008 and FY 2009, funds that are handed over without any strings. This legislation does not withhold funding for the Iraq war, a war that so many of my colleagues in Congress oppose, and which only 32 percent of Americans now support. The bill we are considering today does not require that war funds can only be used for the responsible redeployment of American troops home from Iraq. Instead, it hands the President nearly \$163 billion of virtually unrestricted funding, allowing him to continue a war that the American people do not support.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the 2002 Iraq War Resolution. I am proud of that vote. I have consistently voted against the Administration's practice of submitting a request for war funding through an emergency supplemental rather than the regular appropriations process which would subject the funding request to more rigorous scrutiny and require it to be balanced against other pressing national priorities. I cannot support legislation that provides the President with the resources to prolong his ill-advised war effort unrestrained. As a Member of both the Out of Iraq and the Progressive Caucuses, I am proud to vote for legislation that, like other measures passed by this Congress, begins the process of withdrawing U.S. men and women from Iraq.

The congressional authorization providing for the use of military force in Iraq has expired. The 2002 Resolution authorized the President to:

- (1) Defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and
- (2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions regarding Iraq.

Specifically, the resolution called for the disarming of any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, removal of the rogue Iraqi regime, the capture of any al-Qaeda operatives in Iraq, as well as the promotion of democracy in Iraq. All of these objectives have been met.

Mr. Speaker, our troops have achieved extraordinary military success in Iraq, toppling the regime of Saddam Hussein in only 21 days, assuring the world that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction, assisting the Iraqis in holding free elections, and setting the nation on a path toward democracy. However, while our troops have achieved the objectives for which they were sent to Iraq, they are now caught in the midst of a sectarian conflict. Unfortunately, there is

no military solution to Iraq's ongoing political and sectarian conflicts. This is a war without end. Though President Bush continues to rely on a strategy that seeks to stabilize and reconcile Iraq by force, only the Iraqi government can secure a lasting peace. Thus far, the Iraqi government has demonstrated an inability or an unwillingness to deliver on the political benchmarks that they themselves agreed were essential to achieving national reconciliation, which was the rationale and stated objective of the surge.

AMENDMENT #2—IRAQ POLICY PROVISIONS

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Amendment #2 contains two important Iraq policy provisions. This amendment requires that funds spent by the State Department and USAID for Iraqi reconstruction be matched, dollar-for-dollar, by the Iraqi government. In addition, this legislation prohibits military construction funds from being used to establish permanent bases in Iraq.

Like many of my colleagues, I am also concerned that the United States has paid and continues to pay a disproportionate amount for Iraq reconstruction, especially when the Iraqi government reportedly has a \$25–30 billion budget surplus this year. I am pleased that this legislation calls on the Iraqi government to share equally in the cost of rebuilding the country. To date the United States has appropriated more than \$45 billion for Iraq reconstruction. American-funded reconstruction programs have included the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces.

Iraq is a resource-rich nation. Though still facing problems including a lack of technology, damage from previous mismanagement, the effects of looting, and water intrusion, Iraqi oil production is currently at around 2 million barrels per day. The price of oil has skyrocketed to over \$100 a barrel and Iraqi oil exports are generating an estimated \$56.4 billion this year alone, according to the GAO, yet it is U.S. taxpayers who continue to foot the bill for Iraqi reconstruction. The government of Iraq is stashing its money in global banks, including a reported \$30 billion in the United States, instead of investing this money in the development of crucial Iraqi infrastructure.

I am also extremely concerned about the direction of U.S. policy in Iraq, and the future of U.S. commitments. I am also very worried about the Administration's apparent desire to circumvent congressional approval and oversight in the process of negotiating a long-term agreement with the Iraqi government, as well as the still-open question of the establishment of permanent U.S. bases in Iraq, to which I am strongly opposed. Today's legislation, crucially, continues a prohibition on permanent American military bases in Iraq.

EXPANDED GI BILL

Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 of this legislation provides funding for much needed domestic programs and foreign aid. By extending unemployment benefits, expanding veterans' education benefits, and placing a moratorium on the Bush Administrations' six Medicaid regulations, this legislation gets us closer to where the Economic Stimulus package should have taken us. I am particularly pleased that this legislation expands the education benefits that veterans receive under the GI, providing \$50 billion over the next 10 years for veterans' college funding. This legislation restores the promise of a full, four-year college education, and will entitle veterans who en-

listed after the Sept. 11 attacks and served three years or more to what amounts to four years of college education at a state university. By passing these provisions, we are making the veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan an integral part of an American economy recovery, much in the same way World War II veterans were incorporated under the original GI bill. I would like to see us go even farther to make an affordable college education a possibility for all those brave men and women who selflessly served our nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today's legislation does allow service members to transfer educational benefits to their spouses and dependents.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this legislation includes a 13-week extension of jobless benefits for long-term unemployed. The number of Americans looking for work has grown by 800,000 over the last year, and the number of American jobs has declined by 260,000 since the beginning of 2008. The extension of unemployment benefits will provide a crucial safety net to American workers who are feeling the strain of the sagging economy.

EMERGENCY FUNDING FOR THE MIDWEST

This legislation also includes \$2.65 billion in much-needed aid for the storm-ravaged American Midwest. Violent storms, bringing tornadoes and flooding, have been blamed for at least 24 deaths since late May. With damage still not fully assessed, what has been called the worst flooding in the Midwest in 15 years has ruined an estimated 5 million acres of farmland. According to the Army Corps of Engineers, 23 levees along the Mississippi have failed this week alone, and 48 more, which protect over 285,000 acres of cropland, are either overflowing or at high flood risk. Today's legislation provides critical resources to respond to these disasters, which are affecting millions of Americans.

MEDICAID

In addition, this legislation also delays most of the destructive Medicaid cuts proposed by this President. The Bush Administration sought to cut services and payments to American families by adding seven different Medicaid regulations to the stimulus. This legislation places a much needed moratorium on six of these regulations, giving back to our seniors, families, and those with disabilities as well as cut payments to safety net providers.

Because I believe that fixing our health care system is one of the most important issues we currently face, I recently introduced the "Medicare Efficiency and Development of Improvement of Care and Services Act of 2008" (MEDICS Act), which provides a solution to the Medicare reimbursement problem as well as grows beneficiary access.

My bill increases the number of primary care physicians. It specifically requires that within one year of enactment, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Association of American Medical Colleges shall submit to Congress an effective plan to increase the number of primary care physicians particularly those practicing in counties, cities, or towns "underserved" or with a disproportionate number of Medicare-eligible and/or Medicare recipients. In addition, my legislation forces an examination of the disparities in our health system, particularly those based on race, ethnicity, and gender,

and begins the process of eliminating these discrepancies, and making health care an affordable reality for all Americans.

FOOD AID AND DISASTER ASSISTANCE

I am also pleased that this legislation provides increased funding for international affairs. This includes \$1.865 billion for food aid and disaster assistance, which is \$745 million above the President's request. This sum includes \$500 million above the President's request for PL480 Food Assistance and \$245 million above his request for development assistance and disaster assistance programs meant to alleviate world hunger.

This additional funding comes at a crucial time. As my colleagues are aware, we are facing an international food crisis. According to the International Monetary Fund, IMF, global food prices have increased an average of 43 percent. In fact since March 2007, wheat has increased by 146 percent, soybean has increased by 71 percent, corn by 41 percent, and rice prices have increased by 29 percent, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Sadly, approximately 1 billion people—or one-sixth of the world's population—subsist on less than \$1 per day. Of this population, 162 million survive on less than \$0.50 per day. Overall, increased food prices particularly affect developing countries, and the poorest people within those countries, where populations spend a larger proportional share of income on basic food commodities. It is simply unacceptable in this day and age that so many children are going hungry. We have millions of dollars to bailout Bear Stearns, let's find that same money to help our families and our children.

REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

I am also extremely supportive of the provisions in this legislation that increase funding for refugee assistance. This legislation provides \$696 million, a total \$475 million above the President's request, to address the ongoing refugee crises in Iraq and elsewhere. This funding comes in the midst of a worldwide surge in the number of refugees, with Iraq and Darfur facing particularly severe crises. Having recently spent time on the ground with refugees living in camps in Darfur and Chad, I am pleased that the figures in this legislation represent the reality of the global refugee situation, and will make important strides toward meeting the needs of the growing number of people displaced by conflict, poverty, disaster, or other extreme circumstances, particularly those in Darfur and in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support amendment #2 to this legislation because it contains vital provisions that will directly benefit the American people. I must oppose amendment #1 because I refuse to support the continuation of a disastrous policy of providing unrestricted funding to continue the Bush administration's war in Iraq. It is pure fantasy to imagine that President Bush's military surge has created the necessary safety and security to meet economic, legislative, and security benchmarks. It is time for a new strategy, a new plan that will encourage Iraqis to take charge of their own destiny, seek constructive and sustained regional engagement, and substitute the ill-advised military surge for a thoughtful diplomatic one. It is time to be realistic and pragmatic, to recognize that our troops achieved what they were initially sent in for and that continued U.S. military engagement is not bringing about the desired results.

Mr. DREIER. At this time, I am very happy to yield to one of our top experts on Veterans Affairs, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations subcommittee that deals with this issue, my friend from Chattanooga (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to say as I begin that the gentlelady from Texas said that this money goes to the White House. Thankfully, this money goes to the men and women in the uniform of our Armed Forces who volunteered to stand between a threat and our civilian population.

And I want to commend everyone in the House for bringing us to this moment, because the traditions of this great country and this Congress are to meet at the water's edge at a time of war. And we have learned the lessons of history. And we know that it's important to fund the men and women who are in harm's way with the resources they need.

The particular piece that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and I have worked together on are the issues of quality of life. And let me tell you that this supplemental appropriations bill meets those quality of life needs on military housing, the child development centers for the families that are so critical, the medical treatment at places like Walter Reed that we have read and heard so much about and polytrauma rehabilitation centers.

We know that asymmetrical warfare has caused critical problems that must be addressed. People ask me and Mr. EDWARDS often, are we doing what's right for our men and women in uniform? This bill helps us to do that in a significant way and meet the needs of our veteran population. It meets the needs of barracks that we know and have heard about. And it fully funds what we need to on the Base Realignment and Closure Commission so they can meet their schedule which we were not meeting. This is so important.

And then this issue of GI benefits for education. Of course the men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan deserve this benefit. For weeks we've all been writing about how this is so appropriate. And today we come together. So I applaud everyone, most of all those volunteers in our military, who have agreed to answer our country's call and stand in harm's way. My nephew, who just got back from Iraq, and my other nephew who is a marine on his way to Afghanistan, and all of the other brave Americans, we're answering their call today. They answered our call.

We meet together to do what is right for our country thanks to the leadership in the majority and the minority for finally coming together and doing what is right. This is a good bill. Let's move it forward. And let's honor our commitment to our men and women in uniform.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I regret that I'm going to have to oppose this bill. And let's look at the numbers: \$161.8 billion for the war it keeps going, a war that we all know now was based on untruths. It keeps going a war that has cost the lives of over 4,000 of our brave men and women, tens of thousands of injuries to our troops and over 1 million innocent Iraqis killed as a result of the war. The costs of the war will run to \$3 trillion. And here instead of keeping a commitment that we made back in 2006 to end the war, we're continuing it into the term of the next President, and \$161.8 billion of this bill will go for the war.

That's actually, of the total bill, 86 percent is going to go for the war, \$24.7 billion in domestic spending. How much of this is going for unemployment? Well, \$12.5 billion or about half of it over a period of 2 years. How much is going to the veterans? Less than \$1 billion over 2 years. So we're using the veterans here and unemployed persons to put forth a war bill that is going to cost \$161.8 billion.

We have to establish what our priorities should be in this country. Yes. Getting people back to work should be a priority. Imagine if we put \$100 billion into that. Yes. Giving veterans better benefits ought to be a priority. Imagine if we put \$100 billion into that. But no. We're putting \$161 billion into a war that we know is based on untruths.

It's time that Congress take back its real authority here. And its real authority under article 1, section 8 is to declare war. This administration led us into a war based on lies. It is time for us to regain our ability to create an effective checks and balances, to reclaim our position as a coequal branch of government. You do not do that by continuing to fund this war. You do it by funding education, health care and job creation. That's what the people in Cleveland, Ohio, want. That is what people want all over this country. I'm voting against this.

□ 1800

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 3 minutes to a hardworking member of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend from Ames, Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for the time, and I rise today in strong support of both the rule and the bill itself, this emergency supplemental.

I want to take this time to speak briefly about the devastating flood situation in our Midwestern States, and particularly in my home State of Iowa.



I also want to thank Chairman OBEY very much and Mr. LEWIS from California for their efforts in producing the \$2.65 billion of disaster relief in this package that is part of the supplemental agreement. I think the six funding components of the package will be of significant help to the residents of Iowa and other Midwestern States as they continue to cope with this disaster. I hope that we can continue to work together through the process to provide this needed assistance.

This past Monday, after several days of touring affected areas in and near my district in Iowa, I talked with the committee about the devastation in Iowa and what I thought we would need initially to help us get through this.

It is difficult to fully grasp the magnitude of the devastation and loss unless you see it firsthand. City blocks, town squares, neighborhoods, businesses and homes are underwater. The damage and the extent of the flooding will exceed that of 1993. Illustrating the magnitude of these floods is the fact that Iowa Governor Chet Culver has issued an emergency proclamation for 83 of Iowa's 99 counties, all of which have experienced significant damage. Forty-two of the 83 designated counties have thus far been declared presidential disaster areas, and the flooding has not yet stopped.

This great flood of 2008 has displaced nearly 40,000 Iowans from their homes, and countless others have been displaced from hospitals and nursing homes. The damage in Iowa and to her people is staggering and will not be fully known for some time yet. In the agricultural sector, there are projections of losses in the range of \$2 billion to \$2.7 billion by themselves. When combined with the damage and losses of homes, businesses, hospitals, community facilities, roads, bridges and levees, the impact obviously will be staggering. Every sector of Iowa's economy has been touched, and the range of damage is endless.

I look forward to continuing to work with the members of the Appropriations Committee and others in the House in a bipartisan effort. We must pledge to continue to produce needed resources in a timely manner to help facilitate a quick recovery for Iowa and other Midwestern States.

I thank the committee and its leadership again, Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS, for their help.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LATHAM. The committee and its leadership and this institution have a long history of working together to find consensus solutions for the tragedies that befall Americans. The people of Iowa and the Midwest are watching us and waiting for a helping hand to recover from this horrific tragedy. I sincerely appreciate the great help that the House of Representatives is giving

the State and throughout the Midwest, and look forward to working on an ongoing basis to make this happen.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Chairman OBEY, Speaker PELOSI and Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for their countless hours and their leadership on this very difficult task.

I am opposed to giving this President over \$160 billion with no strings attached to continue the disastrous war and occupation in Iraq. This is the biggest blank check ever. Ever.

The war and occupation in Iraq has put our country and economy in a hole, and when you are in a hole, you have got to stop digging in deeper and climb your way out. You don't dig yourself deeper in. Today that means funding the safe and responsible redeployment of our American troops and contractors out of Iraq.

The Lee amendment that I offered would have accomplished that. There is no way, no way, I will vote to continue funding any combat operations in Iraq. This funding needs to end. What the Lee amendment proposed was not to cut off funding for our troops, but to provide for their safe and responsible redeployment out of Iraq.

Although the supplemental retains one restriction that I have long championed, the prohibition against the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq, it does not include the other indispensable condition, prohibiting the President from unilaterally binding the United States to an agreement with the government of Iraq that includes security assistance for mutual defenses without coming to Congress.

While I supported the amendment providing modest funding for urgent domestic priorities and for our GI educational benefits, I hope to see more of our economic needs addressed in a more fully and more comprehensive economic stimulus funding package.

The sad fact is that over the last 5 years, this administration has spent nearly half a trillion dollars on the Iraq war and occupation, and we have now a destabilized Iraq. We have tarnished our national image, and we have diverted national attention and resources from the real urgent challenges facing the American people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. LEE. Let me just remind you that nearly 5,000 American troops and countless Iraqi civilians have died, more than 30,000 Americans are wounded, and more than 4 million Iraqis are displaced.

As the proud daughter of a career military officer, my dad died last September, and, let me tell you, he wanted us out of Iraq, I salute and I honor our troops. I believe the best way to support and honor our troops is by bring-

ing them home, and we should provide funds to bring them home, to provide for their economic security, their health and their mental health needs when they come home.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk to you for a second about Specialist Sean Walsh. Sean served for two tours of duty in Iraq in the 933rd Military Police Company in the 16th Airborne Brigade of the United States Army. He protected main supply routes. He and his unit were inundated with sniper fire and IEDs.

Today, Sean Walsh is a plumber in the City of Chicago. He wants to go to college. Sean cannot afford to go to college. His dream is to become an engineer.

This GI Bill, this GI Bill is for Sean Walsh and his unit, so Sean Walsh can do for Sean Walsh what Sean Walsh did for Iraq. He gave them a chance. He gave them a chance to build a better country. That is what we said when we sent Sean there. And now it is time America invests in Sean Walsh. We have spent \$50 billion of U.S. taxpayer money rebuilding roads and bridges and streets and schools in Iraq, and this is about \$50 billion to rebuild Sean Walsh and his unit.

The American people are the most generous people in the world, but they will not continue to be generous if you foreclose their future. I think this is what we owe Sean Walsh, because we asked him to do something, not once, but twice.

Sean wants to be an engineer, and I am for Sean being an engineer. I want to make sure Sean can get to college, and this is going to invest in his future. He earned it the old-fashioned way; he gave something for his country. And when America was asked to help rebuild Iraq, we did it. It is time we do that for Sean.

In addition, one of the things I am most proud about in this legislation is that from now on, in all the rebuilding of Iraq, the Iraqis must put in 50 percent of the dollars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. EMANUEL. In addition, this legislation requires that for all future rebuilding of Iraq, the Iraqis must put in 50 percent of the dollars. For too long we have asked the American people to foot the bill for Iraq's future. Finally we have turned the page and require the Iraqis to stand up for Iraq. This is the first step in that process.

So for Sean Walsh and for the future of this country, at the height of the GI Bill we were once spending 2 percent of our GDP on our GI Bill, this is the first real investment in America for our kids.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, and I do so to simply congratulate my friend on his very thoughtful statement. The fact that we have been able to come together in a bipartisan way to ensure that the Sean Walshes and the other men and women in uniform who have sacrificed for this country are going to have what they are due is, I believe, a great testament to what we are doing in this House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, the chairperson of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today with a very heavy heart. Today this Congress will vote to spend \$165 billion more on war. War is bloody. War is messy. It tends not just to hide the truth, but to sacrifice the truth. It destroys the hopes, the dreams and the aspirations of a people.

When the citizens of this Nation are begging for aid, struggling to make ends meet, it doesn't make sense to spend our precious resources on an unnecessary war. Sometime, somehow, some way, somebody must say enough is enough.

The rest of you may do what you may, but, as for me and my house, I will not vote for another dollar, another dime, another nickel, another penny, for this war. I will vote "no" on funding for war.

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

Mr. Speaker, it was February 5, 2007, February 5, 2007, exactly 500 days ago, that President Bush made a request for supplemental funding for our men and women in uniform to ensure that they have the resources necessary to successfully prosecute this war. That is what we are here doing this evening now.

We are here because we have actually seen, based on reports that have come from some of the harshest critics of this war, that we are making progress. All one needs to do is look at the Washington Post the day before yesterday, the Associated Press story that has been referred to by a number of my colleagues. Time and time again we hear of the success that is being made in our effort to ensure that we are able to continue to enjoy our freedoms and that we have a world that has a greater degree of stability. Only the United States of America, only the United States of America, is in a position to do this.

□ 1815

Sacrifice has been made. Time and time again our colleagues have talked about the number of lives that have been lost.

As I listened to my friend from Chicago (Mr. EMANUEL), he was referring to one of his constituents, I was immediately reminded of one of my constituents whom I refer to on a pretty regular basis here.

It was in the battle of Fallujah in November of 2004 that J.P. Blecksmith tragically was killed. His father, who was a former Marine from San Marino, California, has, on repeated occasions, to me said if we don't complete our mission, my son, J.P., will have died in vain.

War is an ugly thing, but it's not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks nothing worth a war is worse. Those were the words of a very, very famous writer who wrote them following the Civil War. We are in the midst of a painful struggle.

But on this issue, I am very happy that we have been able to come together in a bipartisan way to deal with this. I congratulate my colleagues, Messrs. OBEY and LEWIS, for working together on this, and Mr. BOEHNER, who has provided great leadership in this effort.

We need to ensure that our men and women in uniform not only have everything that they need to successfully prosecute this war, but we also need to make sure that they have the tools necessary as they come back into our society. We have for years seen great warriors come back to the United States of America and work to make their country an even better place, and I believe that the provisions that we provide in here with these GI benefits will go a long way towards doing that.

The American people are hurting. We saw, as has been repeatedly said, the largest increase in 22 years in the unemployment rate, going up a half a percent. That's why, again, we have come in a bipartisan way to ensure that those who are truly in need, those who through no fault of their own, have lost their jobs, are able to see an extension in their unemployment benefits.

Again, I think that what we are going to be doing here in the next few minutes is we are going to be casting a bipartisan vote which will be done in the spirit of what the American people want us to do, and that is to get things done, deal with very, very important issues and problems that we face.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition not to the rule but to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, today will go down in history as a failed opportunity. For \$165 billion we could begin funding a safe and responsible re-deployment of our troops and military contractors from Iraq. Instead, we are giving the President a blank check . . . actually, more than he asked for.

Our Nation—whether through blood or treasure—cannot afford to continue this endless occupation of Iraq.

This bill will appropriate \$165.4 billion for the Department of Defense. That could be a down payment on real change for Iraq—for reconciliation, reconstruction, and refugee resettlement.

We have spent half a trillion dollars . . . and we have lost 4,101 troops and over 30,000 have been injured or maimed. Four million Iraqis have been displaced and unknown thousands have been killed.

The cost is unsustainable and we must put an immediate stop to this madness.

We must not cave to the demands of the White House. I urge my colleagues to vote against funding for the occupation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one brief remark and that is in answer to what my dear friend and colleague Mr. DREIER said about only the United States of America could afford this war. I'm not sure what kind of bookkeeping allows him to say that. Obviously the fact we are in such extraordinary debt, as one speaker on your side already pointed out today, this is an unprecedented debt. In the history of the Republic we have never been so far in debt and to say that we can afford to continue to do this, not just in money, not just in treasure, but what we are losing in lives and young people whose lives will never be the same because of the life-threatening wounds that they are bringing home.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I will say that I never said anything about "affording." I said that only the United States of America can do this job of ensuring this struggle for freedom around the world.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If I may reclaim my time, I think doing this job probably says we can give enough soldiers to die or to be maimed and that we have the money to pay for it. At least that would be my interpretation of what you had said.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and for this bill and I hope a "no" vote when we get to final passage on amendment 1.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Enough is enough.

I will always support our troops; but not President Bush's losing policies.

We've done our job in Iraq. Our brave soldiers took out Saddam, and Iraq has held several free elections.

They now have a budget surplus, while we suffer with a budget busting deficit. It is time to move our troops away from Iraq, and back after our real enemies—Osama bin Laden and his followers.

With three trillion dollars down the drain, President Bush's never ending occupation of Iraq will soon be known as the greatest theft in human history, driving the United States of America into bankruptcy.

We must put an end to the losing policy of wasteful government spending in Iraq, and invest our hard earned tax dollars right here at home, as we work together to build a better nation for all of us.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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. BOYD of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1284 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1230.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 83, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—342

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hodes
Ackerman	Cubin	Hoekstra
Aderholt	Cummings	Holden
Akin	Davis (AL)	Honda
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Hooley
Allen	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Altmire	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Andrews	Davis, David	Inslie
Arcuri	DeGette	Israel
Bachus	Delahunt	Issa
Baldwin	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Barrow	Dent	Jackson-Lee
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jefferson
Becerra	Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Berkley	Dingell	Johnson (IL)
Berman	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Biggert	Drake	Jones (NC)
Bilbray	Dreier	Jones (OH)
Bilirakis	Edwards (MD)	Jordan
Bishop (GA)	Edwards (TX)	Kagen
Bishop (NY)	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Ellison	Kaptur
Blackburn	Emanuel	Keller
Blumenauer	Emerson	Kennedy
Blunt	Engel	Kildee
Boehner	English (PA)	Kilpatrick
Bonner	Eshoo	Kind
Bono Mack	Etheridge	King (NY)
Boozman	Everett	Kirk
Boswell	Fallin	Klein (FL)
Boucher	Farr	Kline (MN)
Boustany	Fattah	Knollenberg
Brady (PA)	Feeney	Kuhl (NY)
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	LaHood
Bralley (IA)	Forbes	Lampson
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Langevin
Brown, Corrine	Fossella	Larsen (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Foster	Larsen (CT)
Ginny	Fox	Latham
Buchanan	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Butterfield	Gallegly	Lee
Calvert	Gerlach	Levin
Camp (MI)	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Cantor	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Capito	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Capps	Gordon	Lipinski
Capuano	Granger	LoBiondo
Cardoza	Graves	Loebsack
Carnahan	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Carson	Green, Gene	Lowe
Carter	Grijalva	Lucas
Castle	Gutierrez	Lungren, Daniel
Castor	Hall (NY)	E.
Cazayoux	Hall (TX)	Lynch
Chabot	Hare	Mack
Childers	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	Manzullo
Clyburn	Hayes	Marchant
Cohen	Heller	Markey
Cole (OK)	Herger	Matsui
Conyers	Higgins	McCarthy (CA)
Costello	Hinchee	McCarthy (NY)
Courtney	Hinojosa	McCauley (TX)
Cramer	Hirono	McCullum (MN)
Crenshaw	Hobson	McCotter

McDermott	Rahall
McGovern	Ramstad
McHugh	Rangel
McKeon	Regula
McMorris	Rehberg
Rodgers	Reichert
McNerney	Renzi
McNulty	Reyes
Meek (FL)	Reynolds
Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Melancon	Rodriguez
Mica	Rogers (AL)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Miller (NC)	Rogers (MI)
Miller, George	Ros-Lehtinen
Mitchell	Roskam
Mollohan	Rothman
Moore (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Moran (VA)	Ruppersberger
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Murphy, Patrick	Salazar
Murphy, Tim	Sanchez, Linda
Murtha	T.
Musgrave	Sarbanes
Myrick	Scalise
Nadler	Schakowsky
Napolitano	Schiff
Neal (MA)	Schmidt
Nunes	Schwartz
Oberstar	Scott (VA)
Obey	Serrano
Oliver	Sessions
Ortiz	Sestak
Pallone	Shays
Pascrell	Shea-Porter
Pastor	Sherman
Payne	Shimkus
Pearce	Shuster
Perlmutter	Simpson
Peterson (PA)	Sires
Pickering	Slaughter
Platts	Smith (NE)
Pomroy	Smith (NJ)
Porter	Smith (TX)
Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
Pryce (OH)	Snyder
Putnam	Solis
Radanovich	Souder

NAYS—83

Baca	Duncan
Bachmann	Ellsworth
Baird	Filner
Barrett (SC)	Flake
Bean	Franks (AZ)
Boren	Garrett (NJ)
Boyd (FL)	Giffords
Boyd (KS)	Gillibrand
Broun (GA)	Gingrey
Burton (IN)	Goode
Buyer	Harman
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling
Carney	Herseth Sandlin
Chandler	Hill
Clarke	Holt
Clay	Inglis (SC)
Coble	King (IA)
Conaway	Kingston
Cooper	Kucinich
Costa	Lamborn
Cuellar	Linder
Culberson	Mahoney (FL)
Davis, Lincoln	Marshall
Davis, Tom	Matheson
Deal (GA)	McHenry
DeFazio	McIntyre
Doggett	Michaud
Donnelly	Miller (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Cannon	McCrery
Gilchrest	Rush
Hulshof	Saxton

Speier	Thompson (CA)
Spratt	Thompson (MS)
Stearns	Thornberry
Stupak	Tiberi
Sutton	Tierney
Tancredo	Towns
Tauscher	Tsongas
Taylor	Turner
Terry	Udall (CO)
Thompson (CA)	Udall (NM)
Thompson (MS)	Upton
Thornberry	Van Hollen
Tiberi	Velazquez
Tierney	Visclosky
Towns	Walberg
Tsongas	Walden (OR)
Turner	Walsh (NY)
Udall (CO)	Walz (MN)
Udall (NM)	Wamp
Upton	Wasserman
Van Hollen	Schultz
Velazquez	Waters
Visclosky	Watson
Walberg	Watt
Walden (OR)	Waxman
Walsh (NY)	Weiner
Walz (MN)	Welch (VT)
Wamp	Weldon (FL)
Wasserman	Wexler
Schultz	Whitfield (KY)
Waters	Wilson (NM)
Watson	Wilson (SC)
Watt	Wittman (VA)
Waxman	Wolf
Weiner	Woolsey
Welch (VT)	Wu
Weldon (FL)	Yarmuth
Wexler	Young (AK)
Whitfield (KY)	Young (FL)
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman (VA)	
Wolf	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Yarmuth	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Miller, Gary	Moore (KS)
Moore (KS)	Moran (KS)
Moran (KS)	Neugebauer
Neugebauer	Paul
Paul	Pence
Pence	Peterson (MN)
Peterson (MN)	Petri
Petri	Pitts
Pitts	Poe
Poe	Price (GA)
Price (GA)	Rohrabacher
Rohrabacher	Ross
Ross	Royce
Royce	Ryan (WI)
Ryan (WI)	Sali
Sali	Sanchez, Loretta
Sanchez, Loretta	Scott (GA)
Scott (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Sensenbrenner	Shadegg
Shadegg	Shuler
Shuler	Space
Space	Sullivan
Sullivan	Tanner
Tanner	Weller
Weller	Westmoreland
Westmoreland	Wilson (OH)
Wilson (OH)	

Mr. BACHUS changed his 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.

CONDEMNING POSTELECTION VIOLENCE IN ZIMBABWE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1230, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1230, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Capito	Emanuel
Ackerman	Capps	Emanuel
Capps	Cardoza	Engel
Aderholt	Cardoza	English (PA)
Akin	Carnahan	Eshoo
Alexander	Carney	Etheridge
Allen	Carson	Everett
Altmire	Carter	Fallin
Andrews	Castle	Farr
Arcuri	Castor	Fattah
Baca	Cazayoux	Feeney
Bachmann	Chabot	Ferguson
Bachus	Chandler	Filner
Baird	Childers	Flake
Baldwin	Clarke	Forbes
Barrett (SC)	Clay	Fortenberry
Barrow	Cleaver	Fossella
Bartlett (MD)	Clyburn	Foster
Barton (TX)	Cohen	Fox
Becerra	Cole (OK)	Frank (MA)
Berkley	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Berman	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Berry	Costa	Gallegly
Biggert	Costello	Garrett (NJ)
Bilbray	Courtney	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Giffords
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Gillibrand
Bishop (NY)	Cubin	Gingrey
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Gohmert
Blackburn	Culberson	Gonzalez
Blumenauer	Cummings	Goode
Blunt	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte
Boehner	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Bonner	Davis (IL)	Granger
Bono Mack	Davis (KY)	Graves
Boozman	Davis, David	Green, Al
Boren	Davis, Lincoln	Green, Gene
Boswell	Davis, Tom	Grijalva
Boucher	Deal (GA)	Gutierrez
Boustany	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Boyda (KS)	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Brady (PA)	Delahunt	Hare
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Harman
Bralley (IA)	Dent	Hastings (FL)
Broun (GA)	Dicks	Hastings (WA)
Brown (SC)	Dingell	Hayes
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Heller
Brown-Waite,	Donnelly	Hensarling
Ginny	Doolittle	Herger
Buchanan	Doyle	Herseth Sandlin
Burgess	Drake	Higgins
Burton (IN)	Dreier	Hill
Butterfield	Duncan	Hinchee
Buyer	Edwards (MD)	Hinojosa
Calvert	Edwards (TX)	Hirono
Camp (MI)	Ehlers	Hobson
Campbell (CA)	Ellison	Hodes
Cantor	Ellsworth	Hoekstra

□ 1844

Messrs. GARY G. MILLER of California, MORAN of Kansas, LINDER, GINGREY, MCINTYRE, PENCE, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Messrs. WILSON of Ohio, LAMBORN, and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”