

According to the United States Geological Survey, Concepcion, Chile's second largest city, was 70 miles from the earthquake's epicenter and suffered some of the worst damage. Thousands of its residents initially remained cut-off from the remainder of the country without any basic necessities, such as running water and electricity. The coastal town of Dichato and its 4,000 residents were among the hardest hit and is 80 percent destroyed. 80 percent of Talcahuano's 180,000 residents living on the Chilean coast were left homeless by the earthquake. Initial estimates of damages range from \$15,000,000,000 to \$30,000,000,000, and basic necessities across the country, including electricity, clean water access, telephone access, and communication systems continue to be restored on a progressive basis in many zones.

Chile's stringent building codes, which one local architect called 'our proud building standards,' as well as the Government of Chile's ability to implement them greatly mitigated the impact of this catastrophic natural event both in terms of casualties and physical damage to the infrastructure of this country. The Government of Chile has taken significant measures to maintain order and public security in the streets in order to prevent more widespread panic and chaos as damage assessments are made and relief is delivered.

America is again responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Chile as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Chile's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Chile recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been highly involved in strengthening the relationship between the U.S. and countries abroad. I have worked to establish positive and productive partnerships with local development officials, nonprofit organizations, and various leaders to establish a strong web of support for countries abroad. In collaboration with the Congressional Black Caucus, I have been a continual advocate of providing assistance to various countries to strengthen their fragile democratic processes, continue to improve security, and promote economic development among other concerns such as the protection of human rights, combating narcotics, arms, and human trafficking, addressing migration, and alleviating poverty.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Chile. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Chile in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods.

America is responding to the earthquakes in Chile and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of Chile rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Chile as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Chile's friend, it is the United States' responsibility to help Chile recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter

budgets than usual. This legislation will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Chile to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. Additionally, these same benefits were extended to people who donated to Haiti. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, and January's earthquake in Haiti will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Chile. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Once again, I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4783.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 248, AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1146 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1146

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 248) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, if called up by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for three hours, with 90 minutes controlled by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee and 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1146.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1146 provides for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 248, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan. The rule provides 3 hours of general debate in the House, with 90 minutes controlled by Representative KUCINICH and 90 minutes controlled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution and provides that the concurrent resolution shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important day, and an important debate, in the House of representatives. Last summer, I had the privilege of traveling to Afghanistan and meeting with our brave troops. They are an incredible group of people, proud of their accomplishments, thoughtful and candid about the challenges that confront them. They deserve to know that we are thinking about them and do not take their lives or their fate for granted. It has been far too long since Congress had a full and open debate on the issue of U.S. policy in Afghanistan.

In 2001, I voted, along with the vast majority of my colleagues, to go after the terrorists who attacked us on September 11th. I believe we must have a comprehensive strategy to counter the global threat posed by al Qaeda and its affiliates, no matter where they are in the world—Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, North Africa, and elsewhere. But I also believe that we have serious challenges right here at home. Millions of Americans are out of work. Our economy is just now beginning to emerge from the worst recession in decades. Our schools, our health care, our tax code, our infrastructure—all must be updated for the 21st century if we are to create a better America.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Afghanistan has cost U.S. taxpayers well over \$200 billion—none of it paid for. None of it paid for. All of that money has been added on to our debt. And those costs will continue to rise as we fund increasing troop levels and provide the necessary care to our veterans when they return home. Our policy has drastically changed in those 8 years. We are no longer just going after the bad guys. We are engaged in a massive "nation-building" effort in Afghanistan.

Now, I certainly don't believe we should abandon the Afghan people. But instead of nation-building in Afghanistan, I'd like to do some more nation-building here at home.

Our allies in Afghanistan, the Karzai government, do not inspire confidence.

The recent election there was characterized by widespread fraud and corruption. Just 10 days ago, Mr. Karzai unilaterally rewrote the election law to ensure that he can handpick the members of the election monitoring commission that oversees voting irregularities. Talk about the fox guarding the chicken coop.

Over 1,000 U.S. servicemen and women have sacrificed their lives in Afghanistan. Over 670 more lives have been lost by our NATO military allies. Thousands more have been wounded, many severely, in ways that will affect the rest of their lives. Suicide and post-traumatic stress among our troops and veterans continue to increase at alarming rates.

Mr. Speaker, last summer I authored an amendment to require the administration to develop an exit strategy for our military involvement in Afghanistan. While my amendment did not carry the day, I believe it demonstrated to the administration that an open-ended commitment was not sustainable. As we know, President Obama outlined such a strategy in his speech at West Point. And I believe it is essential that we in the Congress work to keep the administration to its word. We must fulfill our constitutional responsibilities by making sure that taxpayer funds are spent wisely and with complete accountability and transparency for every dime and every dollar. No more Halliburton and Blackwater scandals. No more projects where fat-cat middlemen walk off with all the money while the Afghan people go without hospitals, schools, roads, or food.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is just the first—not the last—debate that we have on the House floor this year over our policy in Afghanistan. The issue is simply too important. The future at stake is too grave. We have sacrificed too much—in the lives and well-being of our soldiers, in the cost to our economy—to wait another year or 2 or 3 for Congress to do its job. We must continue to ask the hard questions and demand straight answers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the Iraqi people went to the polls to vote in their latest national parliamentary elections. Millions of Iraqis voted at thousands of voting stations throughout the country. The democratic process is succeeding in Iraq. The people there, despite extraordinarily difficult challenges, are able to express themselves in free elections.

Sunday was a good day for the future of Iraq. Those elections would not have taken place but for the decision of President Bush in 2007 to send over 20,000 surge troops to Iraq in order to establish "a unified democratic federal Iraq that can govern itself, defend

itself, and sustain itself." Those elections would not have been possible but for the sacrifices of our troops and their families. Just 4 months ago, Mr. Speaker, President Obama announced a surge strategy for Afghanistan. He committed 30,000 additional forces to a counterinsurgency strategy that I believe will help to strengthen the government in Afghanistan's security forces, as the surge did in Iraq.

Since President Obama's announcement, we've seen considerable results. For example, last month, our troops began what is known as the Marjah offensive. The joint offensive with the Afghan National Army and coalition partners has pushed the Taliban out of Marjah and has allowed the Afghan government to take control of significant areas that were previously controlled by the Taliban. This offensive is what General David Petraeus, the commander of the United States Central Command, has described as the "initial salvo" in a 12- to 18-month campaign to defeat the Taliban.

Now I have had and I continue to have, Mr. Speaker, disagreements with policies of President Obama, but I have said privately, I have said publicly, and I reiterate here today, that in the case of Afghanistan, President Obama has demonstrated great responsibility and a sense of the national security interest of the United States. He deserves our support.

Just as our military is making tangible progress, like the Marjah offensive demonstrates, just as this is occurring, many of our colleagues in the majority party now feel that it is time to withdraw from Afghanistan. The resolution that we are set to debate today would require the President to withdraw our troops in 30 days. I believe that that would be precipitous. I believe that precipitously withdrawing our troops would be reckless. I believe it would allow the Taliban to regain control of Afghanistan and thereby provide criminal groups such as al Qaeda with carte blanche to run terrorist training camps and plan terrorist attacks against the United States and our allies. I would remind my colleagues that it was the safe harbor and support that the Taliban gave bin Laden which allowed him to plan the September 11, 2001, attacks from Afghanistan against this country. A reconstituted Taliban will undoubtedly do the same and will pose a significant and grave risk to the national security of the United States.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must never allow Afghanistan to once again fall into the hands of terrorists whose sole purpose is to destroy the United States and to kill innocent civilians. Precipitous withdrawal would not only be dangerous, I believe, to our national security, but would constitute a mortal blow to the Afghan people, who are relying on our support.

Although they have far to go, Afghanistan has made demonstrable progress. But if this resolution were to

become U.S. policy, all the improvements made by the Afghan people would disappear. Afghans would no longer be given the chance to vote in elections. The Taliban would rule by the edict of terror. It would mean the return of a nightmarish tyranny to Afghanistan. Women would see the rights they have gained disappear as the Taliban once again made women non-citizens and banned young girls, who for the first time are learning to read, from schools.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that now is not the time to turn our backs on the Afghan people. It is not the time to counter the mission of our troops, especially when they are engaged in the first major offensive of President Obama's reaffirmed counterinsurgency strategy. Let us send a message to the terrorists that the United States is committed to our mission to prevent the return to power of the Taliban. Let us soundly defeat this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

I appreciated the gentleman from Florida's comments. He spent a great deal of time trying to compare Iraq to Afghanistan. I would remind my colleagues that Iraq and Afghanistan are very, very different countries, different cultures, different levels of education and a different history of centralized government. In Afghanistan, there is no tradition, there is no history of a centralized government. Comparing Iraq to Afghanistan is not comparing apples to oranges. It's like comparing apples to Volkswagens. There is no comparison. And we could have a debate about Iraq, but that should be on a separate day, and we could talk about whether there were any weapons of mass destruction; but today we're here talking about Afghanistan.

I think this is important, and it's an important discussion because this Congress, with the exception of a few amendments that got very little time, has not had a debate or a discussion in this Chamber on Afghanistan since after September 11, 2001. And our policy has changed in a number of different ways over those years, and we still have not had a debate or a discussion on Afghanistan.

So today, hopefully, we will. And my hope is that in this Chamber, where lots of Members talk all the time and very few Members listen, that this may be a day for Members to listen. It is important that we get this right, especially for the men and women who we have deployed over there.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you very much to my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the time, for his excellent opening statement, and for his response to

our colleague from the Rules Committee as well. And I thank him for being here today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution. It is a rare occurrence that Members of this body have the opportunity to devote 3 hours of debate to such an important issue, and it is even more unusual that Members are given a chance for a clean up-or-down vote on ending the war in Afghanistan. Each time an emergency war supplemental, a Defense appropriations bill or a Defense authorization bill has come to the floor, continued funding for the war in Afghanistan is hidden behind spending to create jobs, to provide humanitarian relief or to increase medical benefits to our troops, all of which I support. And privileged resolutions like this, which exercise the constitutional right of the United States Congress to decide whether or not to continue the use of the military force, rarely sees the light of day.

This country has spent over \$250 billion, Mr. Speaker, on the war in Afghanistan. The share of my home State of Maine is almost \$700 million. And in the next few months, the administration will likely ask this Congress to spend another \$30 billion to fund a surge of troops in Afghanistan. At a time when we cannot find \$30 billion to create jobs, continue unemployment benefits or help small businesses, we need to ask ourselves, Is the cost of this war worth it? Is it right to spend more money and lose more lives on a strategy that isn't working? Can we afford to turn our backs on the challenges we face at home and to pursue failed policies abroad?

I am an original cosponsor of this concurrent resolution because I firmly believe this war needs to end. We have asked our men and women in uniform to return to combat again and again. They have fought with bravery and helped the people of Afghanistan with compassion. They have risen to meet every challenge and paid every price to defend this country. But the cost of this war is too high. The economic situation in the country is too dire, and the lives of our brave men and women in uniform are too precious for this war to go on and for this issue to be muddled and tucked away in large spending bills.

It is time to end the war in Afghanistan and bring our troops home. It is time for this Congress to demand an open debate on Afghanistan and a clean vote on any future bills that fund this war. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation does face a very real and immediate terrorist threat. The terrorist threat stems from al Qaeda, which is a stateless menace, a menace that is not rooted in any one location or has any dominion in any one particular area.

In fact, the two countries that our Nation continues to occupy, namely Iraq and Afghanistan, are not significant bases of operations for al Qaeda. It's been recently reported that there are, in fact, only around 50 al Qaeda operatives in the entire nation of Afghanistan, and there could very well be 10 times that number in nations like Yemen and Pakistan.

Yes, there is a very real threat, but the answer is not to continue to indefinitely occupy countries where we only breed more sympathy with those who would do us harm. The correct and more important way to leverage American military might to combat this menace is to have targeted and aggressive intelligence-gathering and targeted special operations against the terrorists no matter where they are.

Some have expressed concerns that if we leave Afghanistan precipitously, al Qaeda could reassert itself there. The answer to that is to go after al Qaeda in a targeted way in Afghanistan if the need arises again. It is not to engage in an indefinite occupation of one or two particular countries. How many more countries would we need to occupy? If they're in Yemen, do we occupy Yemen? If they're in Pakistan, do we occupy Pakistan? If we weren't already in and occupying Afghanistan, would we choose to go in there today? I would submit that the answer is no.

We need to continue our effort to battle terrorists wherever they are and focus on this stateless menace through intelligence-gathering, targeted special operations and a refocused emphasis on homeland security, all of which a very costly and expensive effort in Afghanistan continues to reduce our ability to do by soaking up our national time and resources as well as costing the lives of American soldiers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Today, so very late, represents the first real House debate on Afghanistan since President Obama announced that the path to peace could only be found through wider war. I have continually challenged that policy. But because our security, I believe, will not be found in either the false choice of "more troops in" or "all out now," I cannot support the resolution, as I do not support our current strategy in Afghanistan.

This December escalation announcement by the President was counterproductive and somewhat misleading. He tried to have it both ways. He pledged to begin withdrawing troops in July 2011, but his plan continues send-

ing troops through near the end of this year. Defense Secretary Gates was more candid. He says that any withdrawal next year will be a "handful," that there is no real Afghanistan exit strategy, and that a large military presence is planned there for "a very long time."

With our unceasing commitment to American blood and treasure being poured into Afghanistan, there is no meaningful pressure on President Karzai and his drug dealer and warlord cohorts. They have been much less interested in undertaking the steps necessary to secure peace than in clinging to power and wealth, such as by stealing one-third of the votes in the last election. I believe that the calls for reform have been greeted since that time by Mr. Karzai only by taking over the independent election commission that questioned that election and by the appointment of multiple drug warlord types to the cabinet who are part of the problem. In Afghanistan, reform is a slogan, it is not a reality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. We have exercised minimal leverage over Karzai and his cronies, who view our continuing presence there as an invitation to steal all they can get when they get it. The better exit strategy is having fewer troops who need to exit. I agree with General Eikenberry, our former commander and now ambassador, who last November questioned an escalation that would only "bring vastly increased costs and an indefinite, large-scale U.S. military role." He wisely concluded that further increases would "dig us in more deeply."

In 2001, I voted for the use of force against the enemies that attacked us, and I continue to support that effort. But unless we pursue a different approach with a more narrow military footprint and a pragmatic exit strategy, we will remain embroiled in a land that has entrapped so many foreign powers throughout the centuries. Afghanistan can consume as many lives and as many dollars as we are willing to expend there. As in Iraq, we are on a course for a trillion-dollar war waged on borrowed money. That must be changed to save American lives and America's future.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the author of the resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. We're either in or we're out. Unless this Congress acts to claim its constitutional responsibility, we will stay in Afghanistan for a very, very long time at great cost to our troops and to our national priorities. Or we can set a date, December 31, 2010, by which we must leave. And this is exactly what the resolution seeks to do.

Congress has to be mindful of our responsibilities under this Constitution, article I, section 8, to claim responsibility for the true casualties, which are now close to 1,000, to claim responsibility for the cost, which is approaching \$250 billion and together with the Iraq war close to \$1 trillion. And this at a great cost to our priorities here at home for housing, for job creation, for health care, for education; to claim responsibility for the casualties to innocent civilians, the human costs of the war.

Congress must claim responsibility one way or another for challenging the corruption that my colleagues have talked about that has engulfed the Afghanistan administration. We must claim responsibility and understand exactly the role the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India pipeline has in all of this. We must claim responsibility for debating the wisdom of the counterinsurgency strategies which apparently have failed and claim responsibility for the logistics of withdrawal.

I brought this resolution to the floor of the House with the help of the Rules Committee and the support of the leadership, which believes the debate is merited, because after 8½ years it is time that this Congress be heard from. It is time that we claim our constitutional responsibility under article I, section 8.

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 was enacted to ensure that Congress has a role in the decision to send the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or the continued use of such forces and hostilities. And my legislation, if enacted, would require the President to bring the Armed Forces out of Afghanistan by December 31, 2010.

As the U.S. Armed Forces and our allies begin the first in a series of large military operations in Afghanistan, it is up to us to have our voice and our vote felt at this important moment.

Regardless of your support or opposition to the war, this resolution is about ensuring meaningful and open debate. And in the 3 hours ahead, I'm confident that this House will have the opportunity to do that so that people, no matter what their position is, can finally be heard from with respect to our constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his courtesy in permitting me to speak on this. I continue to have profound reservations about our troop commitments, first in Iraq and more recently with President Obama's decision to escalate our presence in Afghanistan.

History suggests we will not be successful in stabilizing Afghanistan with military force. No one has. I don't

think anyone ever will. Afghanistan today is perhaps the most corrupt country in the world, ranked next to last out of 180, according to Transparency International. If you have a culture of corruption, it's hard to plant seeds. It's hard to rent allies and have them remain loyal. Global economic development through roads and water are not esoteric, abstract issues. These are things that make a difference between people being thugs and, in some cases, feeding their families in any way they can, having little sympathy for infidels and drug problems.

The magnitude of spending that we're involved with here needs to be put in perspective. Each one of these additional troops that we are sending over costs \$1 million a year to support. We are going to be spending as a Nation \$7,000 for each of the 14.5 million Afghans in the workforce.

□ 1315

Our military spending per Afghan worker is 20 times what that worker will earn in an entire year in Afghanistan. At the same time, there is a dire need for the most basic of services. In rural Afghanistan, 80 percent drink polluted water and only 10 percent have adequate sanitation.

I have profound reservations about the course we are on and the ability to generate positive long-term, fundamental changes that will persist over time. I think it is absolutely essential that we have this debate. While I don't agree with the resolution that somehow we are going to be able to pull the plug and be able to end this in 30 days or 30 weeks, I do think it is important for Congress to focus on what is here, what is possible.

What we need to be doing is re-directing our effort. We need to start reversing the course that we are on there. We need to narrow our focus. We need to make more efforts to involve the Afghans themselves with water, with sanitation, with education. And we need to make sure that Congress has a voice and is pushing back as the elements come to us.

I don't agree that we are powerless on some of the defense appropriations, for instance. We can in fact push back. We can be heard. And we can start reversing what I think is an inappropriate course.

I welcome the debate today. While I am not going to support the particular resolution, I appreciate my colleagues bringing it forward. I think it is important to engage and for us to imagine how we can do a better job in that troubled country and in that troubled region. The time to begin the discussion is long overdue. I look forward to continued progress.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think this has been a good discussion today. And I think it is appropriate to have it. I certainly hope that the result is clear, and that this Congress today strongly and in a bipartisan way rejects the resolu-

tion that is being brought forth. It would be a grave mistake for us to allow the Taliban to regain power in Afghanistan.

Sometimes the lessons of history may be a little bit more difficult to explain. In this case, when the Taliban was in power they opened the country up to training camps for terrorists to attack the United States. That was in 2001. It is not ancient history. So I hope we don't forget the lessons of history.

In addition, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, our Armed Forces with our coalition allies and the Afghan armed forces are in the midst of the first major offensive in President Obama's new strategy. So I think it would be a grave mistake if this Congress does not clearly and emphatically reject the resolution today.

Having said that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with demanding our troops come home, including forcing that debate by using the privileges of the war powers resolution. There is nothing unpatriotic in demanding that our troops and their families, their neighbors and their communities be told when they are coming home. And Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to debate how we go after al Qaeda and how we create a flexible, mobile, global strategy able to track, find, counter, and strike al Qaeda cells wherever they might be. And there is no reason to run away from a debate over whether 100,000 boots on the ground in Afghanistan is the best strategy to eliminating al Qaeda once and for all.

I do not doubt that our brave military men and women can and will achieve military successes in battle after battle after battle. But are Afghanistan's tribal disputes going to be solved on the battlefield or at the political negotiating table? And if it is going to take a political solution to resolve centuries of grievances, then who is willing to stand at the front of this Chamber and declare how many American lives that is worth?

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has said he will begin to bring our troops home next July, but he didn't say when the job will be complete. Representative KUCINICH says let's bring them home by New Year's Eve, this year. We must continue to debate this issue, debate it today, debate it on the supplemental, debate it on defense bills.

Let's debate it when we are begging for resources so our kids can go to quality schools, when we are trying to find the money so every American has a decent job and affordable health care, so we can maintain our roads and our bridges and our waterways, so we can guard our ports and our borders, so we can keep our cops on the beat and our seniors safe in their homes. Let's debate the war in Afghanistan, how we will pay for it, how it will end, when it will end, and when our sons and daughters, husbands and wives, friends and neighbors will be able to come home.

Let us continue to ask the hard questions and demand straight answers until we get it right and all our troops are safely home.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and on the previous question.

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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. 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 1146 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1088 and H.R. 4621.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—225

Ackerman	Engel	Lowey
Adler (NJ)	Eshoo	Lujan
Andrews	Etheridge	Lynch
Baca	Farr	Maffei
Baird	Fattah	Maloney
Baldwin	Filner	Markey (CO)
Bean	Foster	Markey (MA)
Becerra	Frank (MA)	Marshall
Berkley	Fudge	Matheson
Berman	Garamendi	Matsui
Berry	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Bishop (NY)	Grayson	McDermott
Blumenauer	Green, Al	McGovern
Boswell	Green, Gene	McMahon
Boucher	Grijalva	McNerney
Boyd	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Brady (PA)	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)
Braley (IA)	Hare	Melancon
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Michaud
Butterfield	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Campbell	Heinrich	Miller, George
Capps	Herseth Sandlin	Minnick
Capuano	Higgins	Mollohan
Carnahan	Hill	Moore (KS)
Carney	Hinchey	Moore (WI)
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Castor (FL)	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Chandler	Hodes	Murphy (NY)
Chu	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Clarke	Holt	Nadler (NY)
Clay	Honda	Napolitano
Cleaver	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Clyburn	Israel	Oberstar
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Connolly (VA)	Jackson Lee	Olver
Cooper	(TX)	Ortiz
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Costello	Johnson (IL)	Pallone
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Crowley	Jones	Pastor (AZ)
Cuellar	Kagen	Paul
Cummings	Kanjorski	Payne
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Perriello
DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
DeGette	Kilroy	Peterson
Delahunt	Kind	Pingree (ME)
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)
Dicks	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Dingell	Langevin	Price (NC)
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Driehaus	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Duncan	Levin	Reyes
Edwards (MD)	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Rodriguez
Ellison	Loeb sack	Ross
Ellsworth	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard	Shea-Porter
Ruppersberger	Sherman
Rush	Sires
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter
Sanchez, Linda T.	Smith (WA)
Sanchez, Loretta	Snyder
Sarbanes	Speier
Schakowsky	Spratt
Schauer	Stark
Schiff	Stupak
Schrader	Sutton
Schwartz	Tanner
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Serrano	Tierney
Sestak	Titus
	Tonko

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—10

Barrett (SC)	Deal (GA)	Wamp
Camp	Hoekstra	Young (FL)
Conyers	Inslee	
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	

□ 1354

Messrs. CARDOZA, WHITFIELD, KINGSTON, CHILDERS and HALL of Texas and Ms. KOSMAS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LANGEVIN, ORTIZ, MINNICK, TANNER, PERRIELLO, CHANDLER, CUELLAR, ELLSWORTH, CAMPBELL, RYAN of Ohio, HILL and MARSHALL and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE PLIGHT OF PEOPLE WITH ALBINISM IN EAST AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1088, 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 Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1088, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—418

Ackerman	Buchanan	Delahunt
Aderholt	Burgess	DeLauro
Adler (NJ)	Burton (IN)	Dent
Akin	Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, L.
Alexander	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, M.
Altmire	Calvert	Dicks
Andrews	Campbell	Dingell
Arcuri	Cantor	Doggett
Austria	Cao	Donnelly (IN)
Baca	Capito	Doyle
Bachmann	Capuano	Dreier
Bachus	Cardoza	Driehaus
Baird	Carnahan	Duncan
Baldwin	Carney	Edwards (MD)
Barrow	Carson (IN)	Edwards (TX)
Bartlett	Carter	Ehlers
Bean	Cassidy	Ellison
Berkley	Castle	Ellsworth
Berman	Castor (FL)	Emerson
Berry	Chaffetz	Engel
Biggert	Chandler	Eshoo
Bilbray	Childers	Etheridge
Bilirakis	Chu	Fallin
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Farr
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Fattah
Bishop (UT)	Cleaver	Filner
Blackburn	Clyburn	Flake
Blumenauer	Coble	Fleming
Blunt	Coffman (CO)	Forbes
Boccheri	Cohen	Fortenberry
Boehner	Cole	Foster
Bonner	Conaway	Fox
Bono Mack	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Boozman	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Boren	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Boswell	Costello	Fudge
Boucher	Courtney	Gallegly
Boustany	Crenshaw	Garamendi
Boyd	Crowley	Garrett (NJ)
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Giffords
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Gingrey (GA)
Bright	Dahlkemper	Gohmert
Broun (GA)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)	Goodlatte
Brown, Corrine	Davis (KY)	Gordon (TN)
Brown-Waite,	Davis (TN)	Granger
Ginny	DeFazio	Graves
	DeGette	Grayson