

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie DeLauro King (NY)
Ackerman Dent Kingston
Aderholt Diaz-Balart, L. Kirk
Akin Diaz-Balart, M. Klein (FL)
Alexander Dicks Kline (MN)
Allen Dingell Knollenberg
Altmire Doggett Kucinich
Andrews Donnelly Kuhl (NY)
Arcuri Doolittle LaHood
Baca Doyle Langevin
Bachus Drake Lantos
Baird Dreier Larsen (WA)
Baker Duncan Larson (CT)
Baldwin Edwards Latham
Barrett (SC) Ehlers LaTourette
Barrow Ellison Lee
Bartlett (MD) Ellsworth Levin
Barton (TX) Emanuel Lewis (CA)
Bean Emerson Lewis (GA)
Becerra Engel Lewis (KY)
Berkley English (PA) Linder
Berman Eshoo Lipinski
Berry Etheridge LoBiondo
Biggert Everett Loeb sack
Billakis Fallin Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (GA) Farr Lowey
Bishop (NY) Ferguson Lucas
Bishop (UT) Filner Lungren, Daniel
Blumenauer Forbes E.
Blunt Fortenberry Lynch
Bonner Fossella Mack
Bono Foxx Mahoney (FL)
Boozman Frank (MA) Maloney (NY)
Boren Frelinghuysen Manzullo
Boswell Gallegly Marchant
Boucher Garrett (NJ) Markey
Boustany Gerlach Marshall
Boyd (FL) Giffords Matheson
Boyda (KS) Gilchrest Matsui
Brady (PA) Gillibrand McCarthy (CA)
Brady (TX) Gillmor McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA) Gingrey McCaul (TX)
Brown (SC) Gonzalez McCollum (MN)
Brown, Corrine Gordon McCotter
Brown-Waite, Granger McCrery
Ginny Graves McDermott
Buchanan Green, Al McGovern
Burgess Green, Gene McHugh
Burton (IN) Grijalva McIntyre
Butterfield Gutierrez McKeon
Buyer Hall (NY) McMorris
Calvert Hall (TX) Rodgers
Camp (MI) Hare McNerney
Campbell (CA) Harman McNulty
Cannon Hastert Meehan
Capito Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)
Capps Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY)
Capuano Hayes Melancon
Cardoza Heller Mica
Carnahan Herger Michaud
Carney Herseth Sandlin Miller (MI)
Carson Hill Miller (NC)
Carter Hinchey Miller, Gary
Castle Hinojosa Miller, George
Castor Hirono Mitchell
Chandler Hobson Mollohan
Clarke Hodes Moore (KS)
Clay Hoekstra Moore (WI)
Cleaver Holden Moran (KS)
Clyburn Holt Moran (VA)
Coble Honda Murphy (CT)
Cohen Hooley Murphy, Patrick
Cole (OK) Hoyer Murphy, Tim
Conaway Hulshof Murtha
Conyers Hunter Musgrave
Cooper Inslee Myrick
Costa Issa Nadler
Costello Jackson (IL) Napolitano
Courtney Jackson-Lee (TX) Neal (MA)
Cramer Jefferson Neugebauer
Crenshaw Jindal Nunes
Crowley Johnson (GA) Oberstar
Cuellar Johnson (IL) Obey
Culberson Johnson, E. B. Oliver
Cummings Johnson, Sam Ortiz
Davis (AL) Jones (OH) Pallone
Davis (CA) Kagen Pascarelli
Davis (IL) Kanjorski Pastor
Davis (KY) Kaptur Payne
Davis, David Keller Pearce
Davis, Lincoln Kennedy Perlmutter
Davis, Tom Kildee Peterson (MN)
Deal (GA) Kilpatrick Peterson (PA)
DeFazio Kind Petri
DeGette Kind Pitts
Delahunt King (IA) Platts

Poe Pomeroy Schiff
Porter Schmidt Thornberry
Price (GA) Schwartz Tiahrt
Price (NC) Scott (GA) Tierney
Pryce (OH) Scott (VA) Towns
Putnam Sensenbrenner Turner
Radanovich Sessions Udall (CO)
Rahall Sestak Udall (NM)
Ramstad Shays Upton
Rangel Sherman Van Hollen
Regula Shear-Porter Velázquez
Rehberg Shimkus Visclosky
Reichert Shuler Walberg
Renzi Shuster Walden (OR)
Reyes Simpson Walz (MN)
Reynolds Sires Wamp
Rodriguez Skelton Wasserman
Rogers (AL) Slaughter Schultz
Rogers (KY) Smith (NE) Waters
Rogers (MI) Smith (NJ) Watson
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX) Watt
Roskam Smith (WA) Waxman
Ross Snyder Weiner
Rothman Solis Welch (VT)
Roybal-Allard Souder Weldon (FL)
Ruppersberger Space Weller
Rush Spratt Wexler
Ryan (OH) Stark Whitfield
Ryan (WI) Stupak Wilson (NM)
Salazar Sullivan Wilson (OH)
Sali Sutton Wolf
Sanchez, Linda Tanner Woolsey
T. Tauscher Wu
Sanchez, Loretta Taylor Wynn
Sarbanes Terry Yarmuth
Saxton Thompson (CA) Young (AK)
Schakowsky Thompson (MS) Young (FL)

NAYS—25

Bachmann Goode Royce
Billray Goodlatte Shadegg
Blackburn Hensarling Stearns
Boehner Inglis (SC) Tancredo
Chabot Jordan Tiberi
Feeney Lamborn Westmoreland
Flake McHenry Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL)
Gohmert Pence

NOT VOTING—14

Cantor Israel Paul
Cubin Jones (NC) Pickering
Davis, Jo Ann Lampson Rohrabacher
Fattah Millender Walsh (NY)
Higgins McDonald Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1908

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1591, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1591) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1591, be instructed to insist on subsections (c), (d), (e) and (f) of section 1904 of the House bill, relating to the redeployment of the Armed Forces from Iraq and restrictions on the Secretary of Defense's use of the Armed Forces in Iraq after such redeployment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In doing so, I rise to offer a very simple, straightforward motion to instruct conferees on the fiscal year 2007 emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

The motion to instruct simply insists that House conferees support the previously adopted House position with regard to a timetable for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. This motion, which I will oppose, puts Members on record as either fully supporting our troops or agreeing to a surrender date in Iraq. It is that simple.

It is no secret that many Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, have strong reservations about the manner in which this legislation undermines the authority of the President, our commander in chief. Members are also rightly concerned about how this legislation places military decisions in the hands of politicians rather than the military commanders in the field.

This legislation ought to focus on our troops. It ought to focus on providing those in harm's way with the resources they need to complete their mission successfully. It ought to respect, not micromanage, our combatant commanders in whom we place the ultimate responsibility for prosecuting military actions.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are many things. We are elected to represent the interests of our constituents from our congressional districts. However, as presently written, this legislation makes the dangerous assumption that Congress also has an on-the-ground role in prosecuting the war in Iraq.

In closing, let me remind my colleagues of this: We are not generals. We are not the Secretary of State. And we are most certainly not the commander in chief.

The vote on this motion to instruct will signal whether Members of the

House are willing to provide our men and women in uniform with our unqualified support or whether Members will fully embrace a timetable for withdrawal and surrender.

I urge a "no" vote on this motion to instruct.

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

□ 1915

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, some days it is very interesting to watch what happens in a place like this. This is the most serious issue that this Congress will confront this year, and this motion is addressing that issue in the most unserious manner possible. This motion is presented by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, and then he says he is going to vote against his own motion. I would like for a moment to remind the body of what this House is supposed to be.

The core purpose of this Congress, the main reason for its existence is to deal with issues like this. Today, the United States Congress is supposedly regarded as the greatest deliberative body in the world. We exist today, if we remember our history, we exist today because almost 800 years ago our British forefathers placed the first limitation on the absolute use of executive power in the history of the English speaking world when they forced the English monarch to sign the Magna Carta.

Over 500 years later, that evolved into the United States Constitution, which created three branches of government, with checks and balances designed to prevent arbitrary and unilateral exercise of unchecked executive power in order to protect liberty.

Because of that Constitution, and under the procedures defined by that Constitution, we are here in the fifth year of a war which this country was led into under false premises. And we are debating how the Congress should respond to the President's escalation and intensification of our involvement in an Iraqi civil war. We are also debating his request for another hundred billion dollars to continue that war.

He is also asking for billions of dollars in additional spending for other domestic and international activities, including flood control, nutrition programs, education and cultural exchanges, disease control in Southeast Asia, and salaries for U.S. marshals. The majority of both Houses have voted to try to bring about a change in direction in that war. We believe, at least those of us who supported the bill two weeks ago, we believe that our soldiers won the war that they were asked to wage, but that it is unrealistic to expect them to do something that they have no power to do, which is to force Iraqi politicians to make political compromises necessary to end the carnage in that country.

By this bill, we are attempting to put enough pressure on those Iraqi politi-

cians and those Iraqi factions to make the compromises necessary to allow our troops to end their involvement in that civil war. And to do that, we have in the legislation now before us conditioned our continued presence in Iraq on Iraq's meeting certain performance benchmarks, which were first laid out by the President himself.

This motion, which has now been offered by the gentleman, is an example, I think, of people falling off both sides of the same horse at the same time because we have people who say they don't want us to put limits on the President's conduct of the war, now insisting that in fact we adhere to the very proposals that we passed just 2 weeks ago.

I want to say that this is, I think, despite the fact that it is an unserious motion, I intend to accept it because it is simply, in essence, a re-vote of what the House committed itself to 2 weeks ago.

The reason we have timelines in this bill is because we want to give General Petraeus the ability to use Congress as sort of a bad cop/good cop routine in order to convey to the Iraqi politicians that they must resolve their differences if they expect us to remain there for any significant length of time at all. There is no way that we can create that kind of pressure on Iraqi politicians unless we maintain the proposals that we made in this House bill.

The President wants none of these limitations to pass. I find it interesting that people who say that we should proceed to compromise are now offering a motion which in essence tells us not to compromise. In the end, we know that both sides are going to have to compromise; but in the interest of getting us to conference so that we can begin that long arduous process, which I fear will take many months, I am going to accept the motion of the gentleman, even though I regard it as a very quaint way to move to a position of compromise between the President and the Congress.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our troops fighting in Iraq and the plan put forth by General Petraeus to win this war.

Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID said he believes the war is lost and the surge is failing. What a terrible message for our troops fighting this very minute. Instead of a road map to success, we are being asked to support a plan for defeat. We are being asked to announce to our enemies a date for surrender. Do we think the terrorists will lay down their weapons and go their merry way if we leave? History reminds us otherwise. When the Soviet Union left Afghanistan in the 1980s, the radical Islamists did not lay down their weapons; in fact, they

demolished the Afghani Government and took power.

So what can we expect when we announce today that we are closing, that we are losing, and announce tomorrow that we will leave? Al Qaeda leaders have publicly declared their mission is to expel the Americans from Iraq and establish an Islamic emirate in Iraq. So we have taken them at their word with this surge and showed a new determination to win. In the seven weeks since the surge began, the number of weapon stockpiles we have found has doubled. More tips are coming in from Iraqis who want peace and stability to take hold of their country. Sunni leaders are turning against al Qaeda and Iraqi troops are standing up. Just yesterday, the Iraqi troops took charge of security in the southern province of My Soon, the fourth province to come under full Iraqi security patrol.

General Petraeus is coming next week to brief the Congress on our progress. How are we going to greet this brave general, good morning, General Petraeus, we've decided to run the war? What we need to do as responsible Members of Congress is to exercise our oversight, fund and support our troops, ensure that we give them what they need as they fight for our freedom, what they and their families need as they return, and give this plan a chance, paying close attention to its progress.

There is too much at stake in Iraq for responsible leaders to advocate allowing the region to spiral into chaos, and we can't ignore the threat of failure for our country and our citizens.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 3 minutes the gentleman from California, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, DUNCAN HUNTER.

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank my friend, Mr. LEWIS, for giving me a chance to talk about this supplemental bill, this very bad bill, once again.

Mr. Speaker, I have carefully reviewed the language on page 72 of this bill with our counsel as to the exact legal effect of this bill. This bill says that an American unit cannot be introduced into Iraq until a 15-day waiting period has expired. Now, what does that mean? That means if you have hostages being held in a place in Iraq and you want to move a Delta force team across the line, you can't do that for 15 days under the law, should this become law. It says if you have a fleeing target, like the Zarqawi strike that we made a couple of months ago, and time is of the essence and you want to take an F-16 out of Incirlik, Turkey and make a strike, you can't do it without waiting for 15 days after notifying the House Armed Services Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, and presumably the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, if we have an extreme situation in Iraq where Americans have to be rescued or reinforced, I don't want them to come back and notify me

or notify the committee. I want them to do what they have to do and carry out their mission.

This is a very defective bill, and this 15-day waiting requirement in this war against terror where time is of the essence, where American military teams move across country boundaries every day without certifying anything to anybody, this is a real disservice to the forces that work not only in Iraq, but should this be applied to other parts of the world in a future time would be a real disservice to everybody who fights in the war against terror.

I strongly support the motion of the gentleman from California.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the defense appropriations subcommittee, Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MURTHA. This Appropriation Committee will have appropriated \$1.2 trillion for this war and for the Defense Department in one year. When I came to Congress, we had appropriated \$100 billion for defense for the whole year.

We keep talking about progress; that's what the military leaders in Iraq talk about. I wish we saw progress.

I voted for this war because I believed that our Nation was threatened. Two or three weeks later, I realized that we weren't under any threat; we were misled. There was no threat to our national security. We went in with inadequate forces. I'm the one that found the lack of body armor, 44,000 troops without body armor, without armored Humvees; and now 4 years later, we're arguing about timelines where the Iraqis ought to take over the war themselves. We're arguing about allowing the Iraqis to do what the President agreed to. And we want to set a timetable so that they are forced to agree to it. There is no question in my mind every time the Iraqis stumble, the United States steps in and puts our American troops in between the civil war.

I just visited Fort Hood, Fort Stewart and Fort Bragg. The troops are somber. The troops are going to do their job. They're valiant. I am inspired by the troops. But let me tell you, they're burned out. In the schools in Fort Bragg they say they need counseling. In the schools of Fort Bragg they say there's higher truancy. They say the students' achievement has dropped. You know who's suffering? We talk about fighting this war. We're not fighting this war. A very small segment of this population is fighting this war, and they're burned out. I've had troop commanders who were there three times say, we can only spend 10 months in combat and we start making bad decisions; and I believe that.

They say there's progress, and I've just seen over 200 killed in 2 days. We've lost more Americans in the last 4 months than any other period during this war. That's not progress. The electricity production is below prewar level. Production of oil is below prewar level. How do you measure? Rhetoric doesn't measure progress.

In my estimation, this war has been so mishandled. Congress has an obligation to set a standard, to have accountability. And this bill is called the Iraqi Accountability bill, and that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to hold this administration accountable for the mistakes that they have made.

Does anybody know we have 125,000 contractors in Iraq? 125,000. And when we pointed this out to the Secretary of Defense, do you know what he said? He said, "They're making more money than I make."

□ 1930

The Secretary of Defense said these contractors are making more money than he makes, 125,000 of them. They couldn't tell the committee for 2 months how many contractors they had.

They have got a fellow fueling a truck on one side, and he's making \$25,000, and right beside him is a guy making \$80,000 fueling a truck. Why is that? Are we meeting our recruiting standards when we need 125,000 people that are contractors in Iraq riding around shooting people, as I saw in the Washington Post the other day, shooting inadvertently at people? They want to kill somebody, this one guy said? That's the face of America? We've lost credibility because of some of these contractors and the actions of these contractors.

I say we need to set timelines. We need to set a benchmark. We need to say to the Iraqis, it's time for you to take over and decide your own fate, like we did in our own revolution.

I ask Members to vote for this benchmark set by the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I go about recognizing another of my colleagues, let me just take a moment to say that if indeed we had had a traditional open rule on this process, we would not have had the problem that the gentleman has just alluded to. An up-or-down vote on whether we withdraw our troops or not would have been available. We would have satisfied many of the questions.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the former chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is engaged in a struggle with a brutal and cold-blooded enemy, cold-blooded killers. These are the kinds of folks who will kill people on an airplane and fly it into buildings. They will drive a car through a checkpoint, step out of the car, leave the kids in the back seat, and blow it up. They will attack civilians rather than military targets.

It is utter folly to believe that by establishing timelines and saying we are going to pull out today or at some specified date in the future, to believe that by doing that they will evaporate and they will leave us alone.

Maybe it is another good cop-bad cop type of ploy being employed by individuals on the other side of the aisle when the majority leader in the other body today declares the war is lost, conceding that al Qaeda has won. Is the other side willing to concede that al Qaeda has won in Iraq, that they have won in Algeria, that they have won in Morocco, that they have won in Afghanistan and that they have won in Pakistan?

When do they believe is the most appropriate time to confront the enemy that we face today, if we are not willing to confront them in Iraq, if we are not willing to confront them in northern Africa and the other parts of the Middle East or Asia? Are we going to once again wait until they come to the United States?

This is hard and it is tough, but these are cold-blooded, ruthless killers. It is probably inappropriate to call this a war, because the people that we're fighting don't deserve the term of "soldier" or "warriors." They are outlaws, they are criminals, and we cannot concede this to them, like the majority leader in the other body did today. Today, he sent a powerful signal to the rest of the world and to our allies that al Qaeda has won and we have lost. How will our allies respond to that message?

This motion to recommit is at least a little bit better in that it says we haven't lost, but we're willing to soon surrender and give up this fight. It is a fight that we can't afford to lose. It is a fight that we need to win.

Take a look at what they said. This is in their playbook. Defeat this motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. It's interesting to hear the gentleman say "we." "We fight." "We aren't going to give up." "We aren't going to surrender."

Let me tell you something. We are not fighting this war. It's the troops overseas. And when I talk to the families, when I go to the hospital, I see the results of this war.

Don't tell me we're fighting this war. It's the troops in the field, a very small segment of the American population that are fighting this war. If the President thinks we should continue the war, he ought to call for a draft and spread it out and let everybody serve in this war, not this small segment making such a sacrifice.

Don't tell me we're fighting in this air-conditioned office. We're not fighting this war. They're fighting it. And I'm proud of every one of them. But don't stand here in this air-conditioned facility and say we are fighting this war.

I am proud of these troops and what they have done. They have won the war. The mission was accomplished. We cannot win it militarily. It can only be won diplomatically.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the

gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from California for the time.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not some choose to acknowledge it, we are at war with militant Islamists who seek our destruction. Yet some on the other side of the aisle today announced that the war is lost in Iraq. This comment shows little understanding of the ability and the determination of our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Naysayers and those who doubt our Nation's ability to prevail over evil have existed throughout the centuries, and it appears that there are those who doubt the ability of this century's greatest generation to defeat these Islamist militant extremists operating in Iraq.

Our mission is just. The soldier cannot be separated from his mission. All I have to do is look to the inspiration of the Parsons brothers from my congressional district, who are serving in Iraq. They know that we must and indeed we can succeed.

Huber Parsons was with the 101st Airborne for two long Iraq deployments. He is currently on his third deployment with the Army Stryker Brigade. His twin brother, Bill, has served two tours in Afghanistan and two tours in Iraq. And their little brother, Charlie, is on his first deployment in Iraq. All three brothers are deployed in Iraq right now.

I ask for the Parsons brothers and for all of our brave men and women serving our Nation in Iraq that we not put them at increased risk with these arbitrary, artificial deadlines.

My stepson, Douglas, and my daughter-in-law, Lindsay, both served in Iraq as Marine fighter pilots, and tomorrow Lindsay will be deploying to Afghanistan to continue her military service.

Arbitrary deadlines and the consequences of retreating and failure are personal issues for me. Establishing arbitrary deadlines for withdrawal of our forces before Iraq is stable and secure gives the insurgents, as well as the Islamic extremist terrorists, a roadmap, a how-to guide, on how to defeat the United States, our Iraqi partners and other coalition forces in Iraq. Our troops understand this. Our enemies understand this. Our allies understand it; we must as well.

We met with Egyptian leader Mubarak just 2 weeks ago in a bipartisan congressional delegation, and this is what he told us: "Withdrawing from Iraq without creating stability will mean that the U.S. will suffer and all of us in the region will suffer. I know how these terrorists think," Mubarak said to us, "and they will come after you and then come after us."

He continued by saying, "The way to control Iran is for the U.S. to succeed in stabilizing Iraq. Withdrawal of your forces in Iraq without making Iraq stable will strengthen Iran and will cause you harm and will cause all of us harm."

Mr. Speaker, we either stand now against the Islamic militant jihadists operating in Iraq or have these militants continue to threaten our men and women fighting the forces that seek our destruction. We cannot leave our troops serving in Iraq or anywhere else vulnerable to the whims of arm-chair generals in Congress.

Support our troops. Reject this motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when you listen to the debate, you can understand that we could be in Iraq for many, many years to come and could expand the war beyond Iraq unless we take a new approach which places diplomacy as the path to peace.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers didn't lose the war. I maintain the war was lost the minute the White House fabricated a cause for war. The Bible says that which is crooked cannot be made straight, and our adventure in Iraq will prove the Bible was right.

On the one hand, some of my friends do not believe in any timetable to withdraw from Iraq, which means we could stay in Iraq indefinitely; on the other hand, some of my friends believe in timetables, even nonbinding timetables, which means we could stay in Iraq indefinitely.

I believe we are being presented with an insufficient choice. Congress is under no obligation to appropriate any more money for this war, yet we give the President \$100 billion. We are under no obligation to give him any money to continue the war. We can best support the troops by using money that is in the pipeline to bring the troops home. I believe that is what the American people want.

Congress recently approved \$97 billion in the supplemental. That could keep the war going well into next summer. Congress approved a budget a week later that would keep the war going into 2009.

Nearly 200 people died in the carnage in Baghdad yesterday. We understand that the occupation is fueling the insurgency. Our troop casualties are mounting towards 3,300. Last night, I spoke to the sister of one of those casualties who was a young Marine from my district. She raised the plea, what can we do to end this war?

Innocent civilian casualties are rising. The conservative estimate in June 2006 of the Lancet Report set at 650,000 the number of innocent civilian casualties. It is quite possible that at this time those casualties could be approaching 1 million. The cost of the war is upwards of \$800 billion into 2008. We are borrowing money from China to wage a war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MURTHA's account of the disaster to our military does not need to be added to. But what should be said right now is that we are facing

limited choices, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I have proposed H.R. 1234, a plan to end the war, which begins with Congress not funding the war, pulling the plug on funding and moving forward with a plan that reaches out to the international community to get out of Iraq.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SAXTON. I would like to thank Mr. LEWIS for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this vote to me is about Jacqueline, Kate and Allie. Most of you don't know Jacqueline, Kate and Allie. You see, they are my granddaughters, the next generation, the generation that will perhaps be most affected by this policy.

□ 1945

To many in this Chamber, I am afraid this vote is not about the next generation; it is about setting a date for surrender. I believe it is time that this House go on record and vote on whether emergency funding bills should have a troop withdrawal timeline.

I want to reiterate to my colleagues the message that we are sending if we include such a timeline in this bill. Make no mistake, it is nothing less than a date certain for surrender.

Some in this Congress believe that the withdrawal timeline will send a message to the Iraqi Government to get serious about taking the lead and stabilizing Iraq. This is a flawed argument. It is flawed because it fails to address the collateral effects, the other effects and damage this message will do to the Iraqi people, the United States, to our allies, and to future American generations.

A surrender timeline for our troops will send a very clear message to al Qaeda, to the Sunni insurgent groups, and to the Shiite militias in Iraq. It will tell them that Americans no longer have the stomach to see this through.

The Iranians, who are continuing down the road of development of nuclear weapon capability despite sanctions and international pressure, will also take note of our timeline. Ahmadinejad already believes that Americans are incapable of resistance. He has said so. Our partner nations in the Middle East are watching to see the level of American commitment to Iraq before they increase their level of assistance. If we tell them we are going to pull up stakes and go home in 2008, can we expect much support from Saudi Arabia, from Egypt, from Qatar, from the UAE, from Jordan? I don't think so.

A surrender timeline will cause us to lose credibility with our allies, our other allies in the war on terror. Al Qaeda's front man, al-Zawahiri, warned our Iraqi counterparts already that America is about to depart and abandon them, just as we abandoned our allies in Vietnam. A surrender timeline

will certainly degrade the level of trust and confidence that Iraqi soldiers have toward our forces. The negative effect of this surrender timeline on our troops will be significant as well.

Some in Congress say the war is already lost. We have heard that already. In my opinion, it is not. We are on the right track with a renewed strategy toward Iraqi security.

Fred Kagan of the American Enterprise Institute recently commented: "The conflict in Iraq is central to our foreign policy and our future, indeed, our well-being. Surely we must keep fighting to win," he said, "as long as victory remains possible. And it is possible although not certain," he said, "that we will win in Iraq. Right now, the signs are more hopeful than they have been in many months. It would be a tragedy for America and for Iraq to abandon the fight just as the possibility of success begins to emerge."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to understand what this war has really done. This war has gutted our influence in the Middle East, it's gutted our influence in the world, it's divided our own country, and it's united our enemies. Outside of that, it's been a terrific idea.

Our troops won the war clearly, cleanly, and quickly. But now they are stuck in a civil war. And as the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out, the only solution to that civil war is a political and diplomatic compromise, and there are no American soldiers who can get that done.

Although it certainly isn't intended to do it, this motion in fact carries out the comments made by Secretary of Defense Gates, who testified before our committee, before Mr. MURTHA's subcommittee, that the war was militarily unwinnable, that it could only be won on the political and diplomatic front. In fact, *The Washington Post* carried this paragraph this morning. It said: "Secretary Robert Gates told reporters traveling with him in the Middle East that congressional demands for withdrawal had been constructive. 'The strong feelings expressed in Congress about the timetable probably had a positive impact, in terms of communicating to the Iraqis that this is not an open ended commitment,' Gates said."

When the bill was before us the first time, our Republican friends did not bother to offer a recommittal motion. Why? Because they were divided about how to proceed. They could reach no agreement. They had no policy. Now they are offering a motion which they say they are going to vote against. Is that the best they can do? We have heard talk about a surrender date.

The only surrender that is involved here today is the surrender of the obligation of this Congress to oversee Presidential and executive branch policy. The only surrender is the total surrender of our obligation and our au-

thority to a White House that has demonstrated from day one that it had not a clue of what it was getting into, and it today has not a clue about how to get out.

We have to provide better leadership than that, and that is what this bill before us tries to do. I would urge support for the gentleman's motion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYS.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

There is not a Member of Congress who isn't tormented by the war in Iraq. There is not a Member of Congress that has not attended a funeral of a brave man or woman who has lost their life and seen the family's torment. So I just want to say for the record, all of us wrestle with this, Mr. MURTHA, as you wrestle with this issue. We come to a different conclusion than you do, but it is as sincere and heartfelt as yours is.

I have been to Iraq 16 times. I try to go every 3 to 4 months. I think we made huge mistakes in 2003. I don't think we turned things around and started to move forward until June of 2004, when we transferred power to the Iraqis. I saw the rest of 2004 and all of 2005 as pretty stunning.

And then in 2006 we had this new government. It took them 4 months to become a government. And as you are going upstream and you are not making progress, you fall behind. The Samarra bombing was a catastrophe. For most of 2006 this government did not take decisive action. But on my last trip, the one we took just a few weeks ago, I started to see something that gives me hope, and it runs in the face of the resolution in the supplemental. I am seeing Anbar province turning around because the Iraqi Sunnis have come to us and said, we want to confront the insurgents in our province.

I spoke to 40 Iraqi soldiers in the Red Zone, not in the marketplace, and asked them, do you feel safe when you go home? Only about three or four told me they didn't feel safe. And, remember, they work 20 days, then they go home for 10. I saw their feeling of safety encouraging.

The Baiji oil refinery, which we took back with five battalions from the Iraqi Security Force is no longer a source of income for the insurgents. We have gotten at the corruption at the refinery; and now, instead of 20 trucks a day, we are having 200 trucks a day, and we feel fairly certain the oil is going to the right places and the insurgents aren't getting these dollars.

I am not against timelines; I am just against timelines in the supplemental. January 1, 2008 is one of them; April 1, 2008 is another; and, if the best happens, September 1, 2008. I am not against a timeline; I am against those timelines.

We need to give the Iraqis timelines that give them the time to resolve

their differences. We attacked them; they did not attack us. We abolished all their security forces. How could we possibly leave before we give them the chance to have their Army stand up, their police stand up, their border patrol stand up? We attacked them. It is a moral obligation to give them the opportunity to defend themselves.

If we want to talk about timelines, let's work it out together. Let's establish timelines that give Iraqis time to do what they need to do.

I am voting against this resolution. It is harmful to Iraqis and harmful to Americans.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me first of all say at the outset that I agree with Mr. MURTHA. We're not fighting this war. There's nobody in the Congress of the United States that's paying more taxes to pay for this war. There's nobody who's saving on metal to fight this war. There's nobody who's saving on rubber to fight this war. There's nobody whose gasoline is being rationed to fight this war. Our troops are fighting this war, their families are fighting this war, but this Nation is not at war.

There is nobody in this Congress, not one of the 435 Members of this Congress, who wants to lose this war. There is nobody in this House who does not want to defeat al Qaeda. Nobody. Everybody wants to protect this country. Nobody wants to lose another American. Everybody understands that the fight against terrorism will require risks. But, Mr. Speaker, this House deserves more than this game playing of offering motions that we are then going to vote against. In effect, this is a motion to reconsider the vote by which the previous bill was adopted. It couldn't be made now, but that is effectively what it is. And those who voted against that bill will vote against this motion. The public needs to understand that a serious motion could have been made here to change the policy, but that is not what was done. This is an attempt to try to politically get people in a vote that is going to be characterized as surrender.

Let me call my colleagues' attention to June 24, 1997. Our troops were deployed in Bosnia stopping genocide, seeing a dictator arrested and sent to The Hague and tried for genocide. He died before the trial was over. But let me call your attention to that vote, because that vote was about setting timelines. It was offered by Mr. BUYER, who is now the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Mr. BUYER offered that motion and we debated it. I was opposed to it. We hadn't lost a single troop in Bosnia, not one. We had spent a pittance compared to what we have spent here. We have lost

10 percent of the troops we have lost in the last 120 days.

Bob Gates said this policy was failing. He's our Secretary of Defense. Or let me put it this way: he didn't say that; he said we were not winning. That's a different way of saying it more accurately. I'm sorry.

But on June 24, 1997, that came to a vote about setting timelines on an effort that was extraordinarily successful, brought peace to the Balkans, or at least a lack of genocide, a lack of ethnic cleansing. But Mr. BUYER said we need to come home. We weren't losing troops, it wasn't costing us that much money, and we certainly were not losing.

On that timeline, Mr. BOEHNER voted "yes," after 18 months in Bosnia. Not 4 years, 4 years and 1 month. After 18 months, you wanted to set a timeline. Mr. BOEHNER, your leader, voted "yes."

□ 2000

Mr. BLUNT, your whip, voted "yes." Mr. HASTERT, your former Speaker, voted "yes." Mr. HUNTER, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, setting timelines, voted "yes." Mr. Hyde, who was then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, voted "yes." Mr. HOEKSTRA, who spoke earlier tonight, voted "yes" on setting timelines.

And yes, let me remind Mr. LEWIS, you voted "yes." You voted "yes" on a timeline where we had lost no troops, where we had stopped genocide in its tracks, where we were not threatened with loss of life. All we were threatened with was coming home and not keeping the peace, keeping the stability, trying to make sure that we were successful.

I urge every one of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this Republican motion. They don't mean it, but to reiterate to the American public that we were serious, that we want to make sure, as Bob Gates has said and been quoted by Mr. OBEY and others, this was a useful effort for us to make.

Why? Because what we want to do is make sure the Iraqis at least are fighting this war, making sure that the Iraqis meet the criteria and benchmarks set by whom? By President Bush, not by us. President George Bush, the Commander in Chief, said they need to meet these benchmarks. But if the message we send them is, we're there forever, why meet the benchmarks? Why put their people at risk? If we're all prepared to simply have our men and women at risk in lieu of Iraqi soldiers and police at risk? Why indeed?

We need to expect accountability and participation by those whose country it is. We deposed their dictator and declared some few months later that our mission was accomplished. Unfortunately, because of the flawed policies that were pursued, we have not yet succeeded.

I voted to give the President authority and I disagreed with the gentleman

from Pennsylvania when he said in November of 2005, let's get out, not immediately, but consistent with the safety of our troops. But I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. OBEY and the overwhelming majority of the American public, some 70 percent, who say it is time to let the Iraqis know that it is their fight, that we have supported them, we will train them, we will protect our troops on the ground, we will protect our diplomatic missions, and we will give them assistance in arms, but this is their fight now. We are there to help them, but it is their fight.

That's what this says, and it says 15 months from now, not tomorrow. To characterize this as any kind of a surrender is not honest debate, I suggest to you. Because if it is, then your June 24, 1997, which almost all of you voted for, was a cry for surrender. I didn't believe it then, don't believe it now. You had a difference of view as to what would best resolve the situation in Bosnia. Now the issue is Iraq.

My colleagues on my side of the aisle, we took a position with which the overwhelming majority of the American public agree. They are ahead of us on this. Let us once again sustain that position. Nobody on this side of the aisle was not being serious. Nobody on this side of the aisle did not give this very serious, thoughtful, prayerful consideration. And when you voted, you voted for America. When you voted, you voted for our troops. When you voted, you voted for success in our foreign policy and in our fight against terrorism.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have offered a motion which they are not for. They could have offered, I suggest, some serious alternatives. They did not.

I urge my colleagues, vote "yes," reaffirm the policy statement that we need a new direction in Iraq. Staying the course has not worked. Let's make a change. Vote "yes."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take much time at this moment, but the gentleman who just spoke is my long-term colleague on the Committee on Appropriations. We have worked together for years. He knows full well how strongly I feel about having primary consideration of almost non-partisanship in defense matters.

At the same time, some time ago, I discussed with the gentleman the importance of our working together in the tradition of the committee. One of the traditions is that our committee does not operate under closed rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, you know, I have listened to the debate with great interest. I listened to Mr. MURTHA, for whom I have great respect, when he talked about the price being paid by our troops and what he has seen at Walter Reed and Bethesda. I would just remind him that he is not

the only one that has been out there. Many of us have talked to our troops who have been wounded. War is hell, there is no question about it, but sometimes you have to fight like the dickens in order to preserve your way of life.

I would like to remind you just a little bit about history. You mentioned a revolution; that brought some things to my mind. In 1776, in the winter, four of George Washington subordinate generals went to Congress and asked them to remove him, and Mr. Lee of Virginia led the fight in Congress to have George Washington removed because he was ineffective, he could not win.

One of my ancestors was at Valley Forge with George Washington when he was 14 years old, and what I want to remind you is George Washington was not removed. They didn't listen to the Congress of the United States. They didn't let Congress change things. They left him as Commander in Chief, and as a result, he won the Revolutionary War. And we are free today, and he is the father of our country.

Now, the reason I bring this up is it wasn't right then for Congress to meddle and try to micromanage the war, and it is not right now for Congress to micromanage this war. General Petraeus is the one that ought to be making the decisions, not we in this body. Let the chief executive, the Commander in Chief, run the war, not 435 or 535 Members of Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend from California, that in the Revolutionary War they fought for 7 years against the greatest army in the history of the world at that time, ragged, with no shoes, no ammunition, and they outworked them and outfought them because they were on their homeland.

That is what I am saying the Iraqis should do. It is the Iraqis' country. The Americans should not be dying for Iraqis, caught in this civil war.

We have appropriated \$1.2 trillion. We have appropriated over \$140 billion more than the White House asked for, \$140 billion more for the troops, to support the troops. We have given everything they asked for. In this Iraq accountability bill, we give them \$4 billion more than the President asked for. We put a strategic reserve in, and we also take care of the health care, the post-traumatic stress. We take care of brain damage. We take care of the troops. We want to make sure the troops have what they need.

And to go back to the Revolutionary War, my great-grandfather's grandfather fought in the Revolutionary War on the right side and he prevailed. We don't have any letters from him, but we have letters from my great-grandfather who served in the Civil War on the right side, and he talks about how tough it was in the Civil War. But we

fought our own Civil War, and my great-grandmother lived to be 96; I was 6 years old, and she said, you are put on this Earth to make a difference.

We need to make a difference in this Congress, to change the direction of a mishandled war. We need to have oversight and accountability for the \$1.2 trillion that we have spent on the Defense Department in 1 year.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could you give me an idea of what amount of time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard over and over again once again in this debate about all the lies that got us into this war. Let's go back to the lies that got us in this war. And I was really gratified to hear my friend across the aisle, from Ohio, a moment ago refer to a quote from the Bible. In that same book, it constantly talks about forgiveness.

Yes, we heard the administration talk about weapons of mass destruction over and over again, the Secretary of State, but it is high time we moved on. It is time to forgive President Clinton for all those lies. It is time to forgive Madeline Albright for all those lies. It is time to forgive President Bush for being so dadgum gullible that he believed all the stuff that was passed on to him. So let's forgive them and move on.

Now to fulfill, Mr. Speaker, a commitment that I had at the funeral of Travis Buford from Douglas in my district: He died February 22 in Iraq, an IED, and among the tears, as we stood there, it was an open casket, and I asked his mother if there was anything I could do. She said, just tell the Congress to shut up and let the military finish their job. I've done what I said I would.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin has no additional speakers, I am ready to close.

Mr. OBEY. Then let me yield myself 2 minutes before the gentleman closes.

Mr. Speaker, 2 nights ago I was watching the Public Television series on the Iraq War, and I saw one of the gentlemen who is generally regarded as being one of the intellectual architects of that war, Richard Perle, say the following: "We do not leave the battlefield with the first casualty."

I would simply note that an awful lot of people who have never seen a battlefield or been anywhere near one seem to be awfully anxious to make that kind of a statement.

When I heard that comment, I was reminded of a comment of my old friend, the philosopher, Archie the

Cockroach, who said once that there is always a comforting thought in time of trouble when it's somebody else's trouble.

But as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, there has been no sense of shared sacrifice in this country over this war. The only sacrifice most Americans are being asked to undergo is to take a tax cut.

Well, it seems to me that we ought to start asking whether it is right and indeed whether it is moral to allow a tiny band of American citizenry, military families, to bear the entire burden of this war that so many noncombatants seem to be so enthusiastic about. It seems to me we need to bring about a different policy that will indeed have equal sacrifice.

There are a lot of people who are apparently willing to fight to the last drop of somebody else's blood. I think it is time for that to stop.

We, on this side of the aisle, choose to take seriously the gentleman's motion, even though he himself indicates he does not intend to take his own motion seriously because he intends to vote against it.

I would urge that every Member on this side of the aisle, and I hope on the other side, would take this motion with the deadly seriousness that it deserves. Because lives are at stake. They are the lives of innocent Iraqis and they are the lives of innocent American troops who are simply being asked to carry out a policy which is increasingly futile.

I urge an "aye" vote on the gentleman's motion.

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

□ 2015

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague dealing with this time and circumstance. I do not intend to take a lot of time.

But it is important for all those listening, and who were concerned about this issue, to know that we take this matter very, very seriously, and our motion is a serious one. It is my view that a "yes" vote for this bill is a bill that will undermine the potential effectiveness of our troops for the remainder of the time that they remain in Iraq, and that a "no" vote is the only way, the only way to express support for our troops' efforts and guarantee, in many ways, the opportunity for success. This legislation ought to focus on those troops.

As I said earlier, it ought to focus on providing those in harm's way with the resources they need to complete their mission successfully. Further, it ought to respect, not micromanage, our combatant commanders who have the responsibility for carrying forward this war successfully.

It's no secret that many Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, have strong reservations about the manner in which this legisla-

tion undermines the authority of the President and the Commander in Chief. It is not acceptable that we find ourselves suddenly presuming that we can afford to have 435 Commanders in Chief by way of this House.

It breaks, in my judgment, some of the fundamental traditions of the Appropriations Committee, which calls for an open process whereby we can deal with each other in as close as a nonpartisan way as possible. Indeed, a "no" vote on this legislation expresses strongly our concern for allowing our troops to do their work, to do it effectively, and to get home as soon as possible as we continue to be the voice, the significant voice for freedom remaining in this world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 199, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—215

Abercrombie	Conyers	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Cooper	Hall (NY)
Allen	Costa	Hare
Altmire	Costello	Harman
Andrews	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Arcuri	Cramer	Herseth Sandlin
Baca	Crowley	Hill
Baird	Cuellar	Hinchey
Baldwin	Cummings	Hinojosa
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hirono
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hodes
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Holt
Berman	DeFazio	Honda
Berry	DeGette	Hooley
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Inslee
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	Doyle	(TX)
Boyd (FL)	Edwards	Jefferson
Boyda (KS)	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Engel	Jones (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Kagen
Butterfield	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Capps	Farr	Kaptur
Capuano	Filner	Kennedy
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Carnahan	Giffords	Kilpatrick
Carson	Gilchrest	Kind
Castor	Gillibrand	Klein (FL)
Chandler	Gonzalez	Langevin
Clarke	Gordon	Lantos
Clay	Green, Al	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lee
Cohen		Levin

Lewis (GA) Obey
Lipinski Oliver
Loebbeck Ortiz
Lofgren, Zoe Pallone
Lowey Pascarell
Lynch Pastor
Mahoney (FL) Payne
Maloney (NY) Perlmutter
Markey Pomeroy
Matsui Price (NC)
McCarthy (NY) Rahall
McCollum (MN) Rangel
McDermott Reyes
McGovern Rodriguez
McIntyre Ross
McNerney Rothman
McNulty Roybal-Allard
Meehan Ruppertsberger
Meek (FL) Rush
Meeks (NY) Ryan (OH)
Melancon Salazar
Michaud Sanchez, Linda
Miller (NC) T.
Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta
Mitchell Sarbanes
Mollohan Schakowsky
Moore (KS) Schiff
Moore (WI) Schwartz
Moran (VA) Scott (GA)
Murphy (CT) Scott (VA)
Murphy, Patrick Serrano
Murtha Sestak
Nadler Shea-Porter
Napolitano Sherman
Neal (MA) Shuler
Oberstar Sires

NAYS—199

Aderholt Ferguson
Akin Flake
Alexander Forbes
Bachmann Fortenberry
Bachus Fossella
Baker Foxx
Barrett (SC) Franks (AZ)
Barrow Frelinghuysen
Bartlett (MD) Gallegly
Barton (TX) Garrett (NJ)
Biggert Gerlach
Billbray Gillmor
Bilirakis Gingrey
Bishop (UT) Gohmert
Blackburn Goode
Blunt Goodlatte
Boehner Granger
Bonner Graves
Bono Hall (TX)
Boozman Hastert
Boren Hastings (WA)
Boustany Hayes
Brady (TX) Heller
Brown (SC) Hensarling
Brown-Waite, Herger
Ginny Hobson
Buchanan Hoekstra
Burgess Holden
Burton (IN) Hulshof
Buyer Hunter
Calvert Inglis (SC)
Camp (MI) Issa
Campbell (CA) Jindal
Capito Johnson (IL)
Carney Johnson, Sam
Carter Jordan
Castle Keller
Chabot King (IA)
Coble King (NY)
Cole (OK) Kingston
Conaway Kirk
Crenshaw Kline (MN)
Culberson Knollenberg
Davis (KY) Kuhl (NY)
Davis, David LaHood
Davis, Tom Lamborn
Deal (GA) Latham
Dent LaTourette
Diaz-Balart, L. Lewis (CA)
Diaz-Balart, M. Lewis (KY)
Doolittle Linder
Drake LoBiondo
Dreier Lucas
Duncan Lungren, Daniel
Ehlers E.
Ellsworth Mack
Emerson Manzullo
English (PA) Marchant
Everett Marshall
Fallin Matheson
Feeney McCarthy (CA)

Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—18

Cannon
Cantor
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Donnelly
Fattah
Higgins
Israel
Jones (NC)
Lampson
Millender-
McDonald
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Rohrabacher
Shadegg
Walsh (NY)
Wicker

□ 2040

Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. MCHUGH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WATT and Mr. CHANDLER changed their 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.

Stated against:

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 235, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. OBEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. PRICE of North Carolina, DICKS, EDWARDS, MOLLOHAN, OLVER, SERRANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. CLYBURN, LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, ROGERS of Kentucky, WOLF, WALSH, HOBSON, KNOLLENBERG, KINGSTON, FRELINGHUYSEN, and WICKER.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 493, GENETIC INFORMATION NONDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to file a supplemental report on H.R. 493.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1332, SMALL BUSINESS LENDING IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2007

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is expected to meet the week of April 23 to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration H.R. 1332, the Small Business Lending Improvements Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 30 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, no later than 3 p.m. on Monday, April 23. Members are strongly advised to adhere to the noticed amendment deadline to ensure amendments receive consideration.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Small Business. A copy of that bill will be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee.

Amendments should be drafted by legislative counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, 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 gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNITED NATIONS MUST BE LEADING VOICE AGAINST GENOCIDE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly disappointed that United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has given in to Turkey's demands and cancelled an exhibit commemorating the 13th anniversary of the Rwanda genocide.

□ 2045

Turkey, as usual, was offended by references in the exhibit to the Armenian genocide in Turkey during World War I.

As a representative of the international community, the United Nations must be the leading voice against genocide. That includes all genocides, including the Armenian genocide. Unless the United Nations takes a stand against Turkey's denial, its value to the international community is greatly undermined.

As the 92nd anniversary of the Armenian genocide approaches, Turkey's recent behavior is yet another example of why it is so important for Congress to reaffirm the Armenian genocide by