

Upton	Weiner	Wolf
Van Hollen	Welch	Woolsey
Walden	Westmoreland	Wu
Walz	Wilson (OH)	Yarmuth
Watt	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Waxman	Wittman	

NAYS—41

Becerra	Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)
Berry	Kilpatrick (MI)	Payne
Clarke	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Luján	T.
Farr	Markey (MA)	Schakowsky
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Skelton
Fudge	McDermott	Speier
Grijalva	McGovern	Tsongas
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Velázquez
Honda	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hoyer	Obey	Waters
Johnson, E. B.	Oliver	Watson

NOT VOTING—32

Abercrombie	Jackson-Lee	Sutton
Baca	(TX)	Taylor
Barrett (SC)	Maloney	Teague
Butterfield	Miller, George	Tierney
Capuano	Moran (VA)	Wamp
Conyers	Neugebauer	Wasserman
Davis (IL)	Paul	Schultz
Gerlach	Pence	Wexler
Gohmert	Radanovich	Whitfield
Harman	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Higgins	Sestak	
Israel	Sires	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1909

Mr. DELAHUNT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SCHRADER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. FARR, BOYD, BISHOP of Georgia, DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. HINCHEY, JACKSON of Illinois, OBEY, KINGSTON, LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, Messrs. ALEXANDER and LEWIS of California.

There was no objection.

NO TROOP ESCALATION IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, President Obama will soon decide whether to significantly escalate the number of U.S. troops deployed to Afghanistan. I urge him to exercise extreme caution and not increase America’s military footprint in Afghanistan.

I was in Afghanistan right after the elections. Everyone admits there was massive fraud and that corruption is widespread in the government. Do we really expect to achieve long-term sustainable development in Afghanistan when the people have no confidence in

their leaders? Can we develop and train a credible Afghanistan security force when many of its leaders are allied with warlords and drug lords?

Last Friday, 57 bipartisan Members of Congress sent a letter to the President asking him not to increase the number of U.S. combat troops in Afghanistan in the absence of a well-defined military exit strategy. If we’re going to send our men and women to fight and die in Afghanistan for a corrupt and fraudulent government, then at least tell us when they will be able to come home.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2009.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States, The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you consider the latest assessment of U.S. military engagement in Afghanistan by General Stanley A. McChrystal, we urge you to reject any recommendation to increase the number of combat troops there, particularly in the absence of a well-defined military exit strategy.

We have enormous confidence in the ability of the U.S. military, but we question the effectiveness of committing our troops to a prolonged counterinsurgency war that could last ten years or more, involve hundreds of thousands of troops, and impose huge financial costs on taxpayers already saddled with trillions of dollars of government debt.

According to General Charles Krulak (retired), the 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps, the current strategy of protecting the people of Afghanistan with U.S. forces would require an escalation of several hundred thousand additional troops. He warns that our military has already been overburdened: “Not only are our troops being run ragged but, equally important and totally off most people’s radar screens, our equipment is being run ragged.” It is unlikely that our NATO allies will be able to sustain the political support necessary for continuing such a mission placing even more of a burden on American forces and the American people.

2009 is already the deadliest year for U.S. forces since the war began eight years ago. Fifty-one of the seven hundred and thirty-eight U.S. soldiers who have lost their lives in Afghanistan were killed last month alone.

The national Afghanistan election that U.S. Ambassador Karl Eikenberry hoped would lead to a “renewal of trust of the Afghan people for their government” was a disaster and will almost certainly have the opposite effect. The official Electoral Complaints Commission in Afghanistan has announced that is has found “clear and convincing evidence of fraud.” A government already mired in allegations of widespread fraud and incompetence is now facing serious charges and compelling evidence that it has attempted to steal the national election.

A February 2009 ABC/BBC/ARD poll found that only 18 percent of Afghans support increasing the number of U.S. troops in their country. This should come as no surprise. Historically, Afghans have always forcefully resisted the presence of foreign military forces, be they British, Soviet or American. The presence of our forces strengthens the hand of Taliban recruiters. Indeed, an independent analysis early this year by the Carnegie Institute concluded that the presence of foreign troops is probably the single most important factor in the resurgence of the Taliban.

We support your administration’s declared goals of defeating Al Qaeda and reducing the

global terrorist threat. But, we believe that adding even more U.S. troops to the military escalation that your administration ordered in March would be counterproductive. We urge you to consider and pursue the full range of alternative options including applying the lessons of the Cold War where we isolate and contain those who pose a threat to our national security.

Mr. President, the last thing that our nation needs as it struggles with the pain of a severe economic crisis and a mountain of debt is another military quagmire. We believe that this is why recent polls consistently show that a majority of Americans are opposed to a military escalation in Afghanistan. We urge you to reject any recommendation for a further escalation of U.S. military forces there.

Sincerely,
James P. McGovern, Walter Jones, Ron Paul, Ed Whitfield, Neil Abercrombie, Jim McDermott, Pete Stark, Bruce Braley, Phil Hare, Raúl Grijalva, Lynn Woolsey, Lloyd Doggett, Bob Filner, John Olver, José Serrano, Barbara Lee, Jerry Costello, Ben Ray Lujan, Alan Grayson, Peter Welch.

Kurt Schrader, Tammy Baldwin, Ed Pastor, Yvette Clarke, Sheila Jackson Lee, John Lewis, Carolyn B. Maloney, Richard Neal, Diane Watson, John Conyers, Jr., Dennis Kucinich, Tim Johnson (IL), Steve Cohen, Keith Ellison, Donna Edwards, Laura Richardson, Michael Honda, Jan Schakowsky, Daniel Maffei, Steve Kagen.

Michael Capuano, Sam Farr, Chellie Pingree, Luis Guterrez, Maurice Hinchey, Maxine Waters, Mazie Hirono, Jared Polis, Roscoe Bartlett, John J. Duncan, Jr., Dana Rohrabacher, Mike Michaud, Earl Blumenauer, Rush Holt, Mike Quigley, Peter DeFazio, Jerrold Nadler.

MIAMI-DADE HEART ASSOCIATION LEADS THE WAY IN NATIONWIDE HEART WALK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, the Miami-Dade Heart Association will hold its Miami-Dade Start! Heart Walk this Saturday, October 2, at the beautiful Tropical Park. Miami’s walk is just one of nearly 400 similar events across our great country that will help the tremendous lifesaving activities of the American Heart Association. This major undertaking is designed to promote physical activity and heart-healthy living in a fun-loving atmosphere for the whole family. More than 1 million walkers from around the Nation are expected to participate in this massive effort to help those afflicted by the Nation’s number one and the Nation’s number three killers, heart disease and stroke.

The main reason behind the walk is to raise awareness that physical inactivity significantly increases the risk of heart disease and stroke. Seventy percent of Americans don’t get enough exercise; and as a result, our waistbands have expanded and so have the number of preventable illnesses and health care costs.

Madam Speaker, both locally and nationally, the Heart Association is

showing the way to help improve our Nation's health care through this momentous endeavor. Let's all start walking this Saturday.

WALSH UNIVERSITY 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, this academic year represents a most momentous occasion for the 16th Congressional District of Ohio. We celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of Walsh University. On November 17, 1960, the six founding brothers of Walsh University brought their dream to life when Walsh College enrolled 67 male students united under the mission of creating leaders in public service and educating the working class.

Walsh's 50-year history is full of many highlights, but some stand out from the rest. In 1967 Walsh opened its doors to women and officially became coed. In 1981, Walsh established its first graduate program, offering a master of arts in counseling. In 1993, Walsh College became Walsh University, paving the way for further growth and expansion. Under the leadership of President Richard Jusseume, the university has experienced unprecedented growth not only in enrollment but also in physical growth with the addition of several academic buildings, residence halls and athletic facilities.

Today, Walsh University offers more than 50 majors, six graduate programs, a doctorate program in physical therapy, and boasts four campuses throughout northeast Ohio, one just outside of Rome, Italy, and welcomes more than 3,000 students to our great district. We can only imagine what the next 50 years will bring, but I am certain a bright future lies ahead for Walsh University.

□ 1915

NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize September as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

This deadly disease hits 1 in every 72 women in the United States and is the fifth leading cause of cancer deaths among women.

As a husband, brother, and father, I believe it's of the utmost importance to call attention to this disease that hits 20,000 American women every year. In just 2008 alone, over 15,000 women died of ovarian cancer.

Cases of this deadly cancer can be very difficult to diagnose because of subtle symptoms that are sometimes

confused with many other conditions. When it's detected, however, 9 out of 10 women will survive. However, only 19 percent of ovarian cancer cases in the United States are diagnosed at an early stage.

Let's not only remember those that we have lost to this deadly disease, but as this month ends, let's work together towards creating and improving treatments to save the lives of mothers, sisters, daughters, and all those around us that we love each day.

FCC WILL STIFLE INVESTMENT WITH NEW REGULATIONS

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, yesterday The Washington Post published an editorial about recent rumblings at the Federal Communications Commission. It seems that the FCC Chairman is concerned about "breaks and cracks" in the Internet that pose a threat to openness. His prescription for these apparent fissures: the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

As a result, the FCC appears ready to hand down new regulations that will hinder Internet Service Providers' ability to manage their own networks. The rules would essentially regulate how ISPs manage network traffic. But this seems more like a solution in search of a problem. Or rather it's a solution that will create a problem by hamstringing network operators' ability to manage network congestion.

The Post is right to question the FCC's proposal. Such overregulation will only hamper additional investment by Internet providers, which could negatively affect rural areas like much of the district I represent.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, because I was unavoidably detained with constituents, I would like to acknowledge that my vote would have been "aye" in roll call vote No. 737, the Medicare Premium Fairness Act, on Thursday, September 24, 2009.

Likewise, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with the Vice President, and I would like to indicate that my votes today on passage of H.R. 905, Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve Boundary Modification Act, roll call vote No. 740, would have been "aye"; H. Res. 16, supporting the goals and ideals of the National Life Insurance Awareness Month, roll call vote 741, would have been "aye"; and adoption of motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2997, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, roll call vote 742, would have been "no."

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WALL STREET BAILOUT: "HEADS, WE WIN; TAILS, THE TAXPAYERS LOSE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, a year ago we heard that the world financial system was on the verge of collapse. Congress was given a \$700 billion Wall Street bailout plan that we were told was needed to avert catastrophe. After studying the legislation, I decided it contained too many loopholes and provided no guarantee that middle class Americans would be helped by this huge expenditure of their hard-earned money.

One year ago today, I stood here and voted against the bailout bill, and it failed. Unfortunately, later that week the Senate passed it, and it then passed the House on the second try. The bill had gotten no better; so I reluctantly voted against that bill again.

I believed it was the right thing to do then, and I am even more convinced of that today. Much of what I feared would happen if we passed the bailout has come to pass.

We still don't know what the banks have done with the billions they were given. Executives at firms the taxpayers propped up have taken home huge paychecks. Foreign banks wound up receiving taxpayer money. And, most importantly, unemployment has skyrocketed and is expected to go higher.

Last week I joined 28 of my colleagues in calling on the Treasury Department to end the bailout program and stop more taxpayer money from being misspent. A year after Wall Street's recklessness brought the economy to its knees, little has been done to reform the financial system and prevent another such crisis. That must change. We cannot permit the financial industry to continue to live by the slogan "heads, we win; tails, the taxpayers lose."

For the time being, the markets appear to have stabilized, but that is little comfort to the millions of Americans who are out of work or have seen their wages and hours cut, or are wondering if their next day on the job will be their last. They are among the innocent victims of this recession.

There is still great anger about what happened with the bailout and the