

my fellow members of the Washington State delegation to help the people of our State through this difficult time.

□ 1015

FLIER FROM TERRISFIGHT.ORG

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a flier from the Web site terrisfight.org:

“Terri Schiavo is sentenced to die of starvation by the Florida courts, however:

“Terri responds to verbal, auditory and digital stimuli.

“Terri breaths normally on her own.

“Terri smiles, tries to talk to her family and friends and will move her limbs on command.

“Terri is not in a coma. She is reactive and has sleeping and wakeful periods.

“Terri is not a burden. Her parents, brother and sister have offered to care for her in a safe environment and she has a fund so is not a burden to anyone, taxpayers included.

“Terri’s condition can improve with proper treatment.

“Don’t let the Florida courts starve this innocent woman to death. Terri’s time is running out.”

Congress can and must act this week. We cannot allow the execution of this disabled young woman.

SECURE AMERICA’S COURTHOUSE ACT OF 2005

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this young woman’s story, Ashley Smith, speaks of courage and valor and common sense, that she was able to direct authorities to a courthouse alleged killer, but I believe that her story speaks to an ill that is occurring throughout America, and that is the lack of security in the Nation’s courthouses.

I realize that most who come into the courthouses come for justice, whether they are prosecutor or defendant, whether they are plaintiff or defendant; but in America’s courthouses, there are challenges and difficulties, the killing of a judge’s family in Illinois, the courthouse terror that occurred in Atlanta, Georgia, and the numerous, yet unannounced, threats against courthouse personnel throughout America.

Law enforcement officers who participate in the security of those courthouses are working very hard, but I believe the plight of courthouses and justice in America cries out for congressional response, congressional hearings and congressional legislation.

So I intend to introduce the Secure America’s Courthouse Act of 2005 that

will bring America’s attention to its courthouses both in terms of resources, in terms of equipment and personnel and the protection of the Nation’s judges. I ask my colleagues to join me in the Secure America’s Courthouse Act of 2005.

WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America’s checkbook is being used and abused every minute of every day, and this is more than annoying to taxpayers. It is an insult.

The problems with financial management in the bureaucracy here in Washington cost hardworking taxpayers billions of dollars. Too often, money that comes to Washington never gets back home because it is eaten away by waste, fraud, and abuse.

When the Federal Government cannot account for over \$17 billion it spent in 2001, things need to change.

When the Department of Agriculture recently was unable to account for \$5 billion in receipts and expenditures, things need to change.

When the U.S. General Accounting Office will not certify the Federal Government’s own accounting books because the bookkeeping is so bad, things definitely need to change.

Mr. Speaker, there are countless stories about how the government has not correctly paid on everything from Medicare to food stamps, and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

As we discuss ways to reduce spending and to increase savings, let us get serious about waste, fraud, and abuse.

It is important to remember that our government of the people, for the people is paid for by the people. It is time to stop wasting the people’s money.

ASSOCIATION HEALTH PLANS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about association health plans. Over 60 percent of America’s uninsured are small business owners and their families or the employees who work in a small business.

Now, if you are one of the many small business owners struggling to provide health insurance for yourself, your family and your employees, I need your help encouraging Congress to pass important legislation that would make health insurance more affordable for small business.

My legislation allowing the creation of association health plans would allow small business owners to band together across State lines to purchase health insurance as a group.

This week the House Committee on Education and the Workforce will vote

on the Small Business Health Fairness Act of 2005; and on behalf of the 43 million Americans who want, need, and deserve access to affordable health insurance, I encourage the House to pass this soon.

Association health plans are the answer. Let us get behind them.

WELCOMING HOME HERNANDO COUNTY NATIONAL GUARD

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some good news about what happened in my district this past weekend.

A gentleman by the name of Fred Glass organized a welcome home to Hernando County’s National Guard unit. I was there, State elected officials were there, and local commissioners and locally elected folks were there; but most important, the citizens, family members, and businesses were there to sponsor and to welcome home the National Guard unit that was deployed for a year.

Our National Guard unit served in Iraq and Afghanistan and served with a great deal of dignity. The story was told about how at Christmastime the National Guard unit organized an ability to raise money and to give gifts to the children in Iraq and Afghanistan. Truly, this Member of Congress is very proud of the National Guard unit.

They presented me with a flag that was flown during one of their missions. It is a helicopter unit, and let me tell my colleagues that the pride that they had in their duty as National Guard members certainly was very evident.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1268, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF, 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of

order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived, except for Sections 1113 and 1114. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. In the engrossment of H.R. 1268, the Clerk shall—

(a) add the text of H.R. 418, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1268;

(b) conform the title of H.R. 1268 to reflect the addition to the engrossment of H.R. 418;

(c) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(d) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 151.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, on March 14, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule on House Resolution 151, with 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. This rule accords priority of recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Additionally, this rule attaches the text of H.R. 418, as passed, to the base text of the bill. H.R. 418 previously passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 261 to 161 on February 10 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to be able to manage this rule. This rule provides for an emergency supplemental funding package to sustain our troops in the ongoing war on terror. Most of these funds are directed towards operations in Iraq. Just last week, I returned from Iraq where I personally received numerous briefings regarding

our readiness and our operational capabilities. I heard from our commanders, military personnel, and diplomats on the ground in Iraq. My colleagues and I also had the opportunity to meet with senior and provincial Iraqi political leaders.

Their collective message was clear, compelling, and optimistic. First, things are getting better. Second, our soldiers, Marines, sailors, and airmen believe in their mission. Third, continued congressional support, both moral and financial, is absolutely essential to bring our operations to a successful conclusion. The bulk of H.R. 1268 moves us closer to that objective.

This supplemental appropriations package is the fifth supplemental since September 11 that focuses on meeting the challenges imposed on us by the ongoing global war on terrorism.

Specifically, this supplemental provides for the replenishing of those accounts that the military has exhausted during sustained operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other areas of the world. Additionally, it provides important funding to assist in our efforts to address the disastrous results of the recent tsunami in South Asia and the Indian Ocean. Finally, there are important measures dedicated to improving the benefits due to our soldiers and meeting the diplomatic costs that our efforts have necessitated.

Important obligations are met in this legislation. Specifically, this bill provides saving \$76.8 billion for total defense expenditures, a full \$1.8 billion over the President's request, funding other important military shortfalls identified by committees of the Congress. The vast majority of these dollars will directly support our servicemen in the area of operations. These include purchases such as an additional 47,000 sets of body armor, 1,700 new armored Humvees and \$408 million to harden the facilities that protect our servicemen from indirect fire.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations also addressed several other issues inside the supplemental that are essential to successfully prosecuting our global war on terror. Among them are the inclusion of Army modularity reform and the construction of a new American embassy in Baghdad.

Specifically, with respect to Army modularity, the committee took some important steps to ensure that our troops who will deploy in the near future are able to leverage more combat power from their current formations by adding a brigade at the division level. This ultimately supports the Army's attempt to transform the service to make it lighter, faster, more efficient and to reorient itself to its core competencies. Put simply, Army modularity, the movement to new brigade formations, will put more soldiers in the fight and allow us to use our combat personnel much more efficiently.

With respect to the embassy in Baghdad, the committee took a close look

at the State Department's request and reduced it by 10 percent. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the embassy, I am aware that many Members have concerns about its high cost. However, let me be clear about the need for this extraordinary expenditure.

Having visited the Baghdad embassy twice before, it is clear to me that a new facility is required. This is not an optional item. The United States should not occupy one of Saddam Hussein's palaces indefinitely, for to do so only reinforces the impression in parts of the Arab world that the United States is an occupying power.

More importantly, Iraq is a very dangerous diplomatic post. Indeed, it is so dangerous that essentially every State Department employee based in Baghdad is a volunteer. Like our soldiers, these brave career civil servants need and deserve the best security we can provide them while they perform their vital functions. A new, secure embassy is indispensable to achieving this objective.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1268 takes a number of important steps forward in addressing the needs of our military. Today, we are likely to debate several amendments that would have a gutting effect on this underlying legislation. I would strongly urge Members to closely examine such amendments and reject them.

□ 1030

Our debate today is not over the war. The President and the Congress have already made that decision. Our focus should be to give our forces the resources they need to successfully complete their dangerous and challenging mission.

The bill we have before us today is an excellent and timely piece of legislation with strong bipartisan input and support. Therefore, I urge the support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the third major supplemental appropriations bill Congress has considered for Iraq and Afghanistan. A war and reconstruction that the administration told us could be completely financed by Iraqi oil revenues has cost the American taxpayer a staggering \$275 billion, and the end is nowhere in sight. As the price of this war continues to climb, we can no longer afford to ignore the equally expansive "accountability" gap that has developed in the White House.

Harry Truman was famous for saying the buck stops here. After all, he was the President, and to him that meant he had to take responsibility for his government. He was accountable to the people he served.

But time and again our current President has demonstrated his unwillingness to be held accountable for any decision, or commitment or blunder of

his administration. And what is particularly disappointing is the willingness of the Republican leadership to assist the administration in its need to avoid accountability.

Let me give an example. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) came before the Committee on Rules last night, offered an amendment which would have established a select committee to follow up on a very disturbing report just released from the Inspector General's Office. The report indicates that \$9 billion spent on Iraqi reconstruction is unaccounted for and no one knows where it is.

In one case, the Inspector General raised the possibility that thousands of ghost employees were on one unnamed ministry's payroll. In another case, a firm was allegedly paid \$15 million to provide security during civilian flights into Baghdad even though no planes flew during the term of the contract. In another case, a Pentagon contract for the development of bulletproof armor was given to a "former Army researcher who had never mass-produced anything," and according to the New York Times, the researcher tried for a year to meet the order and finally was forced to give up completely.

These types of incidents squander precious resources, waste time we often do not have, and place American's lives at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we heard of another report just this morning that Halliburton has overcharged us, according to the Pentagon, by \$100 million.

The Tierney amendment would have established a House select committee to further investigate the allegations, much like the successful Truman Committee was established during the Second World War. The Committee on Rules Democrats tried to get the amendment made in order because we expect accountability from our government, but we were voted down on a party-line vote. Why?

No one can reasonably suggest that this body does not have time to get to the bottom of these unresolved issues. After all, we spend on average only 2 days a week in this Chamber, and half the time we do spend here we are renaming Post Offices and honoring foreign dignitaries, and a few athletic endeavors.

If we have enough time for that, we certainly have enough time to track down \$9 billion that the administration seems to have misplaced. We have the time and energy to address rampant corruption in the way our contracts in Iraq are being administered. Certainly we have the will to infuse some accountability into the process, but apparently the leadership does not have the time or the will and truly demonstrates the hypocrisy of those in the majority who say they are for saving taxpayer money, except when it is being wasted by their administration. But it raises a more important question, and that is if we in this body will not hold the White House accountable

for losing \$9 billion, then who will? If it is not our job in this Chamber, then whose is it?

There is another disturbing aspect to the lack of accountability in Iraq contracting. The administration was supposed to issue two reports detailing spending on both military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq. That was done by law, one of the reports due on October 31, 2004, the other due January 1, 2005. Neither report has ever been delivered to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has a legal obligation to provide the reports to Congress and they are breaking the law by not providing them. The majority in this body is breaking its bond of trust with the American people by not demanding these reports, and with them a measure of accountability for their administration.

The American people expect the leadership of this Congress to be more than a rubber stamp for an administration that has shown itself to be secretive and dishonest time and time again. We have a responsibility to our fellow Americans, to our Constitution, to ensure that all branches of the government are held accountable to the American people.

And speaking of accountability, this supplemental increases the military death gratuity from \$12,000 to \$100,000 and subsidized life insurance benefits from \$250,000 to \$400,000 for families of soldiers who died or were killed on active duty from October 7, 2001.

This is critical language which does two important things for our fighting men and women: Expands their life insurance and increases their death benefits. But what happened, these benefits, which will be legislating on an appropriation bill, require protection from the Committee on Rules against a point of order on the floor of the House. Sadly, the leadership refused to grant that protection in this rule, and those two measures are left open to a point of order.

Therefore, any single Member of this body can stand up and knock out those provisions without any debate, without any vote, without any opportunity for dissent. This was no accident. Clearly the rule was written this way by design because we had to wait to get the rule after they completed those negotiations.

And why are the benefits of our fighting men and women not worthy of protection? The sad truth is these men and women have the courage to protect us with their lives, and yet some in this Chamber do not have the courage to protect them with even a vote on the House floor.

The Republican leadership has resorted to setting up a point of order to ensure the benefit increases never make it into law because they do not have the courage to vote it down themselves and they do not want to be accountable for the vote.

The bill also includes funding for body armor, armored Humvees, elec-

tronic jammers and other necessary items to protect our troops which are long overdue. But as we listen to Member after Member rising to pay homage to the sacrifice of our fighting forces, I want my fellow Americans to remember who was willing to sacrifice those men and women on the House floor today.

I also want them to remember two very important amendments which were not made in order by the Committee on Rules. The amendments by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) would have expanded veterans' health care and mental health care, but they were not included in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is why at the conclusion of the debate I will ask Members to defeat the previous question to the rule so we can get a vote on the Hooley and DeLauro amendments and so we can move to protect the language in the bill which increases the benefits for our military personnel.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines are over in Iraq today risking their lives to protect America and the world. The least we can do is provide them with decent health care when they return. Once we vote, our fellow Americans will know exactly where we all stand on health care for our veterans despite the rhetoric and legislative tricks, and that is what I like to call held accountable.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just for an informational point, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) makes an excellent point about sections 1113 and 1114. I want to inform the gentlewoman that at the conclusion I will be offering an amendment to protect those sections from points of order.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support including the REAL ID Act in the supplemental spending bill on the floor today.

As we saw post-9/11, Congress must protect our Nation's borders against the threat of terrorism. Just last week, my district saw the unfortunate confluence of illegal immigration, Social Security fraud and potential terrorist threats meeting together.

In my hometown of Crystal River, Florida, the nuclear power plant was found to have contracted with illegal immigrant day laborers through a contract who had used fake or stolen ID and Social Security numbers to obtain government-issued driver's licenses. Thankfully, these men have been arrested by the FBI and fully interviewed by Customs enforcement agents.

Who is to say that the seemingly harmless workers could not have really

been agents of a terrorist group that is intent on blowing up or hijacking a nuclear power plant? As we saw with flight schools before 9/11, it is often the little things that are overlooked in our constant fight against terrorism that lead to the biggest problems.

As President Bush has said time and time again, we have to be right hundreds of times each and every day in our fight against terrorism, and they only have to be right once.

I voted against the 9/11 intelligence reform bill primarily because it omitted the ID standard reforms that the 9/11 Commission called for and that America needed. Had the REAL ID Act been in place, the Department of Motor Vehicles would have been required to verify the Social Security numbers used by these workers. This check would have shown that the numbers were really issued to men that had been deceased for 40 years and would have disallowed the men from gaining access to a supposedly secure nuclear power facility.

I would hate to see a future terrorist attack that Congress could have prevented by tightening our access to driver's licenses. We need the Senate to pass the REAL ID bill, and I am delighted it was added onto this supplemental budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these much-needed reforms and to vote in favor of the REAL ID Act included in the supplemental bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS); the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). They have written a bill that seeks to address the needs of our troops and provide needed reconstruction funds to Iraq, Afghanistan and those nations devastated by the recent tsunami.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) took special care in ensuring that this bill contains adequate vehicle and personal protection for our troops in Iraq, and to make sure that our military will be adequately equipped and supplied for upcoming troop rotations in Iraq.

It is, therefore, difficult for me to rise and declare my opposition to this bill. My opposition is not meant as an affront to their hard work and care for the security of our troops. Every single Member of this House, including myself, shares their concerns and their commitment to the safety and well-being of our men and women in uniform who are serving so courageously under such difficult circumstances, nor do I object to the foreign aid of this bill.

So why do I rise in opposition? It is quite simple. Once this supplemental is signed into law, Congress will have provided this administration with nearly \$300 billion for military and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Two years after we invaded Iraq President Bush still asked for these moneys under emergency authority. Tomorrow we are going to debate the President's budget. There are no funds in his budget or the Republican budget resolution for the continuing war in Iraq or security operations in Afghanistan. Why not? Is the President telling us that all our troops are coming home next year, or is he just saying that we can look forward to year after year of so-called emergency bills totaling hundreds of billions of dollars because his administration has no idea how long we are going to be engaged in Iraq and how much it is going to cost the American people in blood and treasure.

I believe Congress must know the answers to those questions before we vote more money for this war. These funds should be in the budget, and the cost of these wars should be projected over the next 5 years just like every item in the budget. We know we are in Iraq. It is not a surprise. It is certainly not an unforeseen emergency. The President has told us we are going to be there next year, so why is there no money for these operations in the budget? How much do they project these wars will cost? How do they propose we pay for it? Right now we borrow money to pay for the war, nearly \$300 billion worth. We do not pay for it, we simply go deeper and deeper into debt and pass the bill on to our children.

Mr. Speaker, this is a profound failure of accountability, the failure to level with the American people.

This week when Congress debates the budget resolution we will be asked to vote for a bill which cuts education, cuts health care, cuts veterans benefits, economic development for our cities and towns, and many other critical projects. But the war, it is not part of the budget or subject to cuts or reconciliation. It is all off the books.

From the very first day when we were told the U.S. had to invade Iraq we have been lied to. We were lied to about the weapons of mass destruction. We were lied to about Saddam Hussein having ties to al Qaeda. We were lied to about how much the war would cost and how long it would take to bring stability to Iraq.

We are here today debating a bill that is filled with armored Humvees and personal body armor for our troops. But, Mr. Speaker, we provided money for those items in 2002 before we went to war in Iraq, and we provided it again in the first supplemental on Iraq and in the second supplemental on Iraq and in the third supplemental on Iraq. So why are so many of our troops still lacking body armor and still driving unprotected vehicles? Congress sent that money specifically to meet those needs. So what happened to the money?

Why were those needs not met? That is a deadly serious question of accountability.

□ 1045

The Pentagon's own inspector general says that nearly \$9 billion in reconstruction funds for Iraq cannot be accounted for. Another \$15 million may have been subject to fraud by the very companies the Pentagon chooses to give contracts to for services in Iraq. That is taxpayer money provided by my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have a real debate about our policy in Iraq. Every few months we get an emergency supplemental for the war on Iraq. We are told we have to vote for it in order to show our support for our troops, and I expect that this bill will probably pass overwhelmingly. But it is just more of the same.

There comes a time when you just have to stop and say no more, not until we get real answers to hard questions, not until we know where we are going in Iraq and how much it is going to cost.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill; and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. And, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. Last October, 282 Members of Congress voted for landmark legislation that fulfilled our duty to our constituents to make America an appreciably safer place. H.R. 10 truly reflected the hard-earned lesson of 9/11.

Unfortunately, the other body saw fit to strip from the bill some of its most vital provisions, measures designed to ensure that terrorists would never again be able to carry out their nefarious plots by abusing our immigration system and our identity documents.

Today, leadership is fulfilling a commitment that it made to the American people that these provisions would yet become law. Today's rule makes the text of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act, a self-executing amendment to the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) introduced, and the House last month passed, the REAL ID Act containing many of the provisions stripped from the intelligence reform bill last year. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for ensuring that the will of this House will be done, and that this crucial legislation will be enacted into law.

The goal of the REAL ID Act is straightforward. It seeks to prevent another catastrophic terrorist act by deterring terrorist travel. These terrorist methods of operation were mentioned

both in the 9/11 Commission report and the 9/11 staff report on terrorist travel. Page 49 of the terrorist travel report states: "Abuse of the immigration system and a lack of interior enforcement were unwittingly working together to support terrorist activities." Page 59 states: "Members of al Qaeda clearly valued freedom of movement as critical to their ability to plan and carry out the attacks prior to September 11."

The REAL ID Act contains four provisions aimed at disrupting terrorist travel. First, it addresses the use of a driver's license as a form of Federal identification. American citizens have the right to know who is in their country, that people are who they say they are, and that the name on the driver's license is the real holder's name, not some alias.

The REAL ID Act will establish a uniform rule for all States that temporary driver's licenses for foreign visitors expire when their visa terms expire and establish tough rules for confirming identity before driver's licenses are issued.

Second, this legislation will tighten our asylum system. Some judges have made asylum laws vulnerable to fraud and abuse. We will end judge-imposed presumptions that benefit suspected terrorists so that we will stop providing them a safe haven.

The REAL ID Act will reduce the opportunity for immigration fraud so that we can protect honest asylum seekers and stop rewarding the terrorists and criminals who falsely claim persecution.

Third, the REAL ID Act will waive Federal laws to the extent necessary to complete gaps in the San Diego border security fence which is still unfinished 8 years after congressional authorization.

The REAL ID Act contains one final commonsense provision that helps protect Americans from terrorists who have been able to successfully infiltrate the United States: currently, certain terrorism-related grounds of inadmissibility to our country are not also grounds for deportation. The REAL ID Act makes aliens deportable from the U.S. for terrorism-related offenses to the same extent that they would be inadmissible to the United States to begin with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that can be said about this bill. Let me simply say that I opposed going to war in the first place. I think this country was misled into war on the basis of bad information and false information. And I believe some of that was purposeful.

I think that our attack on Iraq is the dumbest American war since the War of 1812. But nonetheless, that is past history. We now have the question of

whether or not we are going to pay for the war which we have waged. And at this point, I do not believe we have any choice.

What I do wish is that the administration would be forthcoming about the full cost of the war, because you can bet just as surely as you sit here today that the administration will be back for even more money to cover the costs which are allegedly being provided for under this bill today. I think the administration is giving us the facts about the cost of this war on the installment plan. And by the time the full truth comes out, the costs will be much higher than this bill implies today.

I also believe that it is dead wrong for this Congress to decline to appoint a Truman-like committee to investigate profiteering and fraud by contractors in Iraq.

Just the story today about Halliburton in *The Washington Post* ought to be enough to prod this Congress into setting up a meaningful investigative committee. As has been pointed out, Harry Truman, when he was in the Senate, conducted almost 400 hearings and issued over 50 reports on war profiteering during World War II. That was a Democratic Congress investigating a Democratic administration and it did no harm to the country. I hope that today this House will still agree to appoint that kind of a committee.

Having said that, I think there is a far more important issue which is associated with this bill. Mr. Speaker, as we know, some of what appears in the newspaper can be right and some can be wrong, but there have been a number of stories which have appeared in the newspaper about the activities of the Defense Department which I find highly disturbing. I quote from one story Sunday, January 23, *Washington Post*: "The Pentagon expanding into the CIA's historic bailiwick has created a new espionage arm and is reinterpreting U.S. law to give Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld broad authority over clandestine operations abroad."

That article goes on to say: "The Pentagon official said they are establishing the strategic support branch using reprogrammed funds without explicit congressional authority or appropriation."

It then goes on to say: "One Republican Member of Congress with a substantial role in national security oversight declined to speak publicly against political allies, but he is quoted as saying, 'It sounds like there's an angle here of let's get around having any oversight by having the military do something that normally the CIA does and not tell anybody. That immediately raises all kinds of red flags for me. Why aren't they telling us?'"

I think that question needs to be answered.

There are a number of other comments in the press which are along the

same lines. I would simply get to the last one by reading a portion of an article that appeared in the *New Yorker* several weeks ago. I just want to read one paragraph: "The new rules will enable the special forces community to set up what it calls action teams in the target countries overseas which can be used to find and eliminate terrorist organizations. 'Do you remember the right-wing execution squads in El Salvador?' the former high-level intelligence official asked me, referring to the military-led gangs that committed atrocities in the early 1980s. 'We founded them and we financed them,' he said. 'The objective now is to recruit locals in any area we want and we aren't going to tell the Congress about it.'"

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Congress has a right to demand that we be told about it. I had originally intended to offer an amendment today which would have fenced and prohibited the expenditure of the intelligence funds in this bill until we get from the administration an understanding about how we are going to be informed on these matters. And I do not mean after the fact.

I had intended to offer that amendment, but yesterday I received a phone call from Andy Card, the President's chief of staff, who asked me to at least temporarily withhold offering that amendment, and he gave me his commitment that the administration would try to work out an arrangement to see to it that the leaders of the Intelligence Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and the Appropriations Committee are given the adequate information that they need to make choices around here.

I told him that I would be willing to withhold that amendment on this bill with the understanding that if we have not got this worked out very quickly, that we will have an opportunity to deal with this issue on the next regular vehicle moving through here, which would be either the armed services bill or the defense appropriations bill.

This, in my view, is the most important issue associated with this bill, and I intend to be back here with just such an amendment if we do not get the kind of reporting from the administration that we have a right to expect under the Constitution.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just make a couple of quick points. I was not in Congress when the decision, on a bipartisan basis, was made to give the President the authority to commence hostilities in Iraq, but I do think it was the right decision, and I do think that it has been vindicated frankly by things that have happened recently not only in Iraq but throughout the Middle East.

Regardless of that, I think my friend makes a good point, and I appreciate his support for this particular piece of legislation. I know it is very difficult. But the real question here is not the

war, as I tried to mention in my opening comments. That is a decision that has already been made by Congress. The real question on this particular piece of legislation on this rule is are we going to provide people the resources they need to get the job done that we asked them to do. I think it is very important that we do that on a bipartisan basis. I think that will be a very powerful message in Iraq and a very powerful message around the Middle East.

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

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

Ms. HOOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Last night, I offered an amendment before the Rules Committee that would have added \$1.2 billion to this bill for VA health care and \$100 million for reintegration services for National Guard members being released from active duty. Unfortunately, my amendment was not ruled in order.

America is currently asking more of its all-volunteer military force than it ever has before. Yet even as America prepares to continue its large and prolonged military campaign in Iraq, it has done very little to provide for the veterans of this war. Our obligation to support our troops does not end when they leave Iraq. But how are we supposed to provide adequate health care to these new veterans when we cannot even meet the needs of our current veterans?

□ 1100

Last year's budget was \$1.3 billion short of the amount that VA Secretary Principi, as well as the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, stated is needed just to maintain the current level of veterans' health care services.

We also need to make sure that our returning soldiers have the readjustment assistance they need, particularly for members of the Guard and Reserve. Members of the National Guard returning home face immense challenges in transitioning out of active duty deployments and back to civilian life. They do not go home to a base. They go home. They are scattered throughout the State. While the State Guard offices are working to provide these returning soldiers with important information regarding their health care, employment assistance, and other transitional services, they do not have the resources needed to complete the education and counseling necessary for a smooth transition back to civilian life. Our returning soldiers deserve better.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can consider this important amendment and keep our promises to our Nation's veterans.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, but because it is important to get our troops in the field the equipment that they need I will support the supplemental legislation that also includes desperately needed aid to Sudan and the victims of the tsunami and provides economic development funding for projects in Palestinian controlled areas of the West Bank.

Yet I remain concerned that the legislation provides no funding for immediate mental health needs of our troops. The House is not even being given a chance to consider an amendment that I wanted to offer that would have added \$263 million in DOD and VA funding for this issue. This at a time when the Army tells us that as many as one in six returning soldiers suffer from symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder. If that is not an emergency, then I do not know what is.

Providing badly needed funding for the Defense Department to improve its training programs for military families on the detection of mental health problems in service members returning from combat is an issue this committee agreed the Defense Department should consider in the 2005 Defense appropriations bill. As such, this amendment would have increased by 20 percent our spending on specialized PTSD programs within the DOD, within the Veterans Administration, and go to treating the symptoms of PTSD such as substance abuse and homelessness. It would have embraced new technology in the Veterans Administration, promoted the use of private sector mental health professionals and students to be able to reach more troops and their families, especially in rural and underserved areas.

More than 500 soldiers have been evacuated from Iraq for mental health reasons since the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom. We know the damage PTSD can do away from the battlefield, ruining families, causing alcoholism, drug abuse, and homelessness. Our men and women in uniform deserve a better homecoming than that.

Let us do the right thing for our troops, address this issue soon, and give our soldiers the mental health services that they have earned.

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

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

I will be asking Members to join with me in voting "no" on the previous question so that I can modify the rule and allow the House to consider two very critical amendments for our Nation's combat soldiers that were rejected last night in the Committee on Rules. The first amendment by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) will help our Iraq and Afghan-

istan veterans in two important ways: First, it will provide an additional \$1.2 billion for veterans' health care. Additionally, it will provide \$100 million for reintegration services for the Army and National Guard members being released from active duty and returning to civilian life.

The second amendment by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) would expand mental health care by providing \$238 million to the VA for a post-deployment mental health initiative and \$35 million for the Defense Department to contract with private mental health providers for counseling the returning service members.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that a "no" vote on the previous question will not block consideration of the supplemental. The bill will still be considered in its entirety. However, a "yes" vote will prevent us from voting to help our veterans in these very important areas. I urge all Members to join with me in supporting our soldiers and vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendments be printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments just to go through some of the specific provisions of this particular legislation because I think the vote that we are getting ready to cast is so exceptionally important.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the defense portion of this particular appropriation, it includes a total of \$76.8 billion for total defense expenditures. That is again \$1.8 billion over what the administration requested. The additions over the request are in support of deployed and soon to be deployed or returning troops and to assist in force protection and to increase the survivability of troops in the field.

Within the total Defense fund, \$3.1 billion is provided for activities under the jurisdiction of the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. The following table summarizes, which I will submit for the RECORD, the committee's addition to the request within the Defense Subcommittee.

So we have an extensive addition that I think actually improves the administration's original request. In addition to the Defense expenditures, we have included other moneys for foreign operations. The committee has added \$1.7 billion in net foreign assistance funds within the Foreign Operations,

Export Financing and Related Programs Subcommittee. Within these funds, the committee has identified \$1.7 billion in urgent or critical items funded in the bill as an emergency that are directly related to the War on Terror or aiding recovery to the tsunami victims. The committee also provides \$1 billion of important items that further U.S. global interests but has offset this spending with a corresponding rescission of \$1 billion in previously appropriated assistance to Turkey. These funds were provided in the first Iraq supplemental of 2 years ago and require a positive vote of the Turkish Parliament to be expended. There is widespread agreement that this will not take place anytime soon.

Within the \$1.7 billion of emergency assistance, there is \$594 million to the counternarcotics effort and for police training in Afghanistan; \$400 million is requested to train Afghan police, and \$194 million and \$66 million below the request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and I want to begin by congratulating the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), who has worked long and hard on this and has made four trips to Iraq and understands extraordinarily well how critically important it is for us to ensure that we get the resources necessary for our men and women in uniform there.

We have many important things that need to be done in this measure. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) talked in his opening remarks about the need for us to ensure the completion of our compound. It is not just an embassy, our compound, in Baghdad. I am one who would be very critical of a massive expenditure for a huge compound like this, but we have got to realize, as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) said, that sending a message throughout Iraq that we are taking over a former palace of Saddam Hussein would not be the right signal for us to send. And that is why it is essential that we proceed with the construction of this very important compound.

I think it is also very important for us to note that we have got to provide a reimbursement for the important humanitarian assistance that is being provided to those who have suffered, the over 150,000 who were killed, the people who have suffered from the tsunami. It is very important for us to deal with that.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is also very important for us to recognize that this is the first must-pass piece of legislation. And what does that say? It says that we are keeping our word based on a very rigorous debate that we had last fall in the 108th Congress, and that had to do with implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, the intelligence reforms. And just to

remind our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of us, and I was privileged to serve as one of the five House Republican conferees on that bill to implement the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, and one of the things that we focused on was border security, realizing that Mohammed Atta, one of the individuals who flew a plane into one of the World Trade Center towers, had a valid driver's license, as did the 19 others who were involved in the terrorist attacks on September 11. But Mohammed Atta was in a unique position. He had been pulled over for a traffic violation and was actually scheduled to appear in court for that violation after September 11, and we all know what he did. He brought down one of the World Trade Center towers. And that is why we felt very strongly last fall when we were negotiating that conference agreement that we include language that this House overwhelmingly voted in support of, and that was to deal with this driver's license question, the problem of having people get into their hands, people who are here illegally, access to driver's licenses. And that is why we took those provisions. And, unfortunately, because the other body would not allow us to include those in the 9/11 conference, we had gotten to a point where we said we would include those in the first must-pass piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first must-pass piece of legislation. And the REAL ID Act, which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and a wide range of other Members have offered include, it was a measure that was passed with strong bipartisan support here, 260 votes, and it is designed to do a number of very important things that are focused on our border security, which is tied to our national security, a very important aspect of our national security. It says that those States that provide driver's licenses to people who are here illegally cannot have those driver's licenses used for any Federal purpose, meaning that we recognize the importance of federalism, we recognize States rights, which is a very important thing for us to do, but what we do say is that those States which grant licenses to people who are here illegally, those licenses cannot be used for a Federal purpose, meaning getting on board an aircraft, meaning going into a Federal courthouse, applying for any kind of Federal program. The idea behind it is that we hope we will not see States granting driver's licenses to people who are here illegally. That is really our goal.

One of the reasons that I enthusiastically supported Arnold Schwarzenegger for Governor of California 1½ years ago was the goal of ensuring that we did not see driver's licenses get into the hands of people who are here illegally.

So this measure which we are going to be voting on here today, I am happy to say we have now included this in the rule itself. By voting for the rule, we will be including that measure.

But another provision that is very important happens to be the goal that we have of closing the 3½ mile gap that exists in the 14-mile fence that goes from the Pacific Ocean to what is called the Otay Mesa on the border between San Diego and Tijuana. We have been able to see a great deal of success, based on reports that we have had from our border patrol agents, with the existence of this 14-mile fence. But, unfortunately, my California Coastal Commission, and I say it is my California Coastal Commission because I am a Californian, and I do not support what they have done, but they have chosen to sue the Federal Government to prevent completion of that 3½ mile gap in the 14-mile fence because of the fact that something known as the Bell's vireo bird has chosen to nest on that fence. And, Mr. Speaker, it is very sad that in the name of improving the environment and saving this bird, we have seen the environment devastated as well as the serious exacerbation of the illegal immigration problem across that border. Why? Because now through what is known as the Tijuana estuary we see people flowing in great numbers and all kinds of waste and devastation is there.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), and our former colleague, Doug Ose, who worked hard on this issue over the past several years.

Back in 1997, with the support of President Clinton, we passed legislation that was designed to build this 14-mile fence, and it is an amazing commentary that it took a shorter period of time to win the Second World War than it has to complete this 14-mile fence. I believe that with passage of this very, very important rule and the legislation itself, we will be able to deal with that.

Mr. Speaker, we have done a number of very important things in this measure, aid and support for our efforts in Iraq, and we have enjoyed resounding success. Is it still a "tough slog," as the Secretary of Defense said? Absolutely. No one ever claimed that war is easy. But we are enjoying success now, as we see the people of Iraq, 8.5 million strong, casting their ballots; as we see their great appreciation for the U.S. support there; as we see this realization with the leadership in Iraq, it is not the United States Government, the leadership in Iraq or the 275 Members of the Transitional National Assembly.

So we are in position right now where we are doing the right thing with passage of this legislation. It is absolutely essential.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma:

On page 2, line 9–10, strike “, except for Sections 1113 and 1114”.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this amendment intends to protect sections 1113 and 1114 against points of order. The Committee on Rules last night exposed these provisions at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who has since asked the Committee on Rules to protect the provisions.

The amendment is necessary to protect the important Military Death Gratuity Benefits contained in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this particular amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to say that I believe we have had an excellent debate on the rule. What is clear to me is the importance and timeliness of this legislation. With that said, I would again encourage Members to listen carefully to the following debate and to support the underlying legislation.

Additionally, I would encourage Members to be cautious when it comes to considering the amendments. This bill has been carefully crafted and worked out in a way to ensure that our servicemen receive the best equipment when they go forward into war.

Finally, I would ask the Members to remember that this is not a vote about the wisdom of the war in Iraq. The President and the Congress made that decision years ago. This vote is about giving those we have asked to execute our policy in Iraq the tools they need to do their job. The men and women serving our cause in Iraq ask for nothing more. In good conscience we should give them nothing less.

To close, I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 151—RULE ON H.R. 1268 MARCH 2005 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN AND TSUNAMI RELIEF

At the end of the resolution add the following:

SEC. 3. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in section 4, which may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member designated or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in section 3 are as follows:

(a) Amendment offered by Representative Hooley:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1268, AS REPORTED
(SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2005)
OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY OF OREGON

At the end of title V (page 69, after line 17), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated in this Act, there is hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2005—

(1) for “Department of Defense—Military—Military Personnel—National Guard Personnel, Army”, \$100,000,000, to be available for the provision of services for the reintegration into civilian life of members of the Army National Guard being released from active duty; and

(2) for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Veterans Health Administration—Medical Services”, \$1,200,000,000.

(b) The amounts provided under this section are designated as an emergency pursuant to section 402 of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress).

(b) Amendment offered by Representative DeLauro:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. _____, AS REPORTED
(SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 2005)

OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO OF CONNECTICUT
At the end of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated in this Act, there is hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2005—

(1) for “Department of Defense—Defense Health Program”, \$35,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 shall be available for Department of Defense contracts with private mental health providers for counseling for returning servicemembers and \$10,000,000 shall be available for other mental health programs within the Department of Defense; and

(2) for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Veterans Health Administration—Medical Services”, \$238,000,000, to be available for a post-deployment mental health initiative within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) The amounts provided under this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

This rule adds to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations legislative language by Rep. SENSENBRENNER that is completely unrelated to the Supplemental and will allow millions of people to drive our streets and freeways without insurance or a driver's license.

Yes, we are speaking about undocumented immigrants. Yes, they broke the law and are here illegally. But, do we somehow think that denying these people the ability to legally drive is going to force them back to their home countries?

That's ridiculous.

Do we want millions of unsafe, untrained drivers on our streets with no insurance?

This provision does nothing to make America safer.

It is simply anti-immigrant legislation disguised as homeland security.

No one doubts that our immigration system is broken and needs to be fixed.

The Sensenbrenner provision is not the solution to our immigration problems and does not make our country safer.

The Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill is for funding our men and women in uniform overseas, not for controversial anti-immigrant agendas.

Our men and women in uniform are risking their lives for our country, and need our financial support. They need armored personnel carriers, bulletproof vests, and the tools necessary to do their job as safely as possible.

The Senate needs to be able to discuss and vote on the driver's license issue on its own merits, and not have this sneaked into our emergency war funding.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the amendment or on final passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 195, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	English (PA)	Kolbe
Akin	Everett	Kuhl (NY)
Alexander	Feeney	LaHood
Bachus	Ferguson	Latham
Baker	Fitzpatrick (PA)	LaTourette
Barrett (SC)	Flake	Leach
Bartlett (MD)	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bass	Fortenberry	Linder
Beauprez	Fossella	LoBiondo
Biggert	Fox	Lucas
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	E.
Blackburn	Gallegly	Mack
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo
Boehner	Gerlach	Marchant
Bonilla	Gibbons	McCaul (TX)
Bonner	Gilchrest	McCotter
Bono	Gillmor	McCreary
Boozman	Gingrey	McHenry
Boustany	Gohmert	McHugh
Bradley (NH)	Goode	McKeon
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McMorris
Brown (SC)	Granger	Mica
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Miller (FL)
Ginny	Green (WI)	Miller (MI)
Burton (IN)	Gutknecht	Miller, Gary
Buyer	Hall	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Harris	Murphy
Camp	Hart	Musgrave
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Cantor	Hayes	Neugebauer
Capito	Hayworth	Ney
Carter	Hefley	Northup
Castle	Hensarling	Nunes
Chabot	Herger	Nussle
Chocola	Hobson	Osborne
Coble	Hoekstra	Otter
Cole (OK)	Hostettler	Oxley
Conaway	Hulshof	Paul
Cox	Hunter	Pearce
Crenshaw	Hyde	Pence
Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Peterson (PA)
Culberson	Issa	Petri
Cunningham	Istook	Pickering
Davis (KY)	Jenkins	Pitts
Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal	Platts
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Poe
Deal (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Pombo
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Porter
Dent	Jones (NC)	Portman
Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly	Pryce (OH)
Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Putnam
Drake	King (IA)	Radanovich
Dreier	King (NY)	Ramstad
Duncan	Kingston	Regula
Ehlers	Kirk	Rehberg
Emerson	Kline	Reichert

Renzi	Shimkus	Tiahrt
Reynolds	Shuster	Tiberi
Rogers (AL)	Simmons	Turner
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Upton
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Royce	Sodrel	Weldon (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Weller
Schwarz (MI)	Sullivan	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Tancred	Wicker
Sessions	Taylor (NC)	Wilson (SC)
Shadegg	Terry	Wolf
Shays	Thomas	Young (AK)
Sherwood	Thornberry	Young (FL)

NAYS—195

Ackerman	Grijalva	Oberstar
Allen	Gutierrez	Obey
Andrews	Harman	Oliver
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Baldwin	Herseth	Owens
Barrow	Higgins	Pallone
Bean	Hinche	Pastor
Becerra	Holden	Payne
Berkley	Holt	Pelosi
Berman	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Hooley	Pomeroy
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Inlee	Rahall
Blumenauer	Israel	Rangel
Boren	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Ross
Boucher	(TX)	Rothman
Boyd	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Kaptur	Sabo
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Salazar
Capuano	Kildee	Salazar
Cardin	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kind	T.
Carnahan	Kucinich	Sánchez, Loretta
Carson	Langevin	Sanders
Case	Lantos	Schakowsky
Chandler	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Schwartz (PA)
Clyburn	Lee	Scott (GA)
Conyers	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Costa	Lipinski	Sherman
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Skelton
Cramer	Lowey	Slaughter
Crowley	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Maloney	Snyder
Cummings	Markey	Solis
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Spratt
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Stark
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Strickland
Davis (IL)	McCarthy	Stupak
Davis (TN)	McCollum (MN)	Tanner
DeFazio	McDermott	Tauscher
DeGette	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Delahunt	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McKinney	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McNulty	Tierney
Dingell	Meehan	Towns
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Towns
Doyle	Mees (NY)	Udall (CO)
Edwards	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Emanuel	Menendez	Van Hollen
Engel	Michaud	Velázquez
Eshoo	Millender	Visclosky
Etheridge	McDonald	Wasserman
Evans	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Farr	Miller, George	Watson
Fattah	Mollohan	Watt
Filner	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Ford	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Murtha	Wilson (NM)
Gordon	Nadler	Woolsey
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wu
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	Wynn

NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie	Jones (OH)	Shaw
Baird	Knollenberg	Sweeney
Boehert	Norwood	Walsh
Brown, Corrine	Pascrell	Waters
Burgess	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
Clay	Ruppersberger	
Hinojosa	Saxton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1144

Messrs. DAVIS of Tennessee, GORDON, VISCLOSKEY, PETERSON of Minnesota, AL GREEN of Texas, CLEAV-ER and CRAMER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of March 15, 2005, the House had a procedural vote on H.R. 1268, the FY 2005 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill. On House rollcall vote No. 69, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is the resolution, as amended. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—INTEGRITY OF PROCEEDINGS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE CONSTITUTION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, offer a privileged resolution that I noticed, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 153

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States authorizes the House of Representatives to “determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member”;

Whereas, in 1968, in compliance with this authority and to uphold its integrity and ensure that Members act in a manner that reflects credit on the House of Representatives, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was established;

Whereas, the ethics procedures in effect during the 108th Congress, and in the three preceding Congresses, were enacted in 1997 in a bipartisan manner by an overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives upon the bipartisan recommendation of the ten-member Ethics Reform Task Force, which conducted a thorough and lengthy review of the entire ethics process;

Whereas, in the 109th Congress, for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, decisions affecting the ethics process have been made on a partisan basis without consulting the Democratic Members of the Committee or of the House;

Whereas, the Chairman of the Committee, and two of his Republican colleagues, were dismissed from the Committee;

Whereas, in a statement to the press, the departing Chairman of the Committee stated “[t]here is a bad perception out there that there was a purge in the Committee and that people were put in that would protect our side of the aisle better than I did,” and a replaced Republican Member, also in a statement to the press, referring to his dismissal

from the Committee, noted his belief that “the decision was a direct result of our work in the last session;”

Whereas, the newly appointed Chairman of the Committee improperly and unilaterally fired non-partisan Committee staff who assisted in the ethics work in the last session;

Whereas, these actions have subjected the Committee to public ridicule, produced contempt for the ethics process, created the public perception that their purpose was to protect a Member of the House, and weakened the ability of the Committee to adequately obtain information and properly conduct its investigative duties, all of which has brought discredit to the House; now be it

Resolved, that the Speaker shall appoint a bi-partisan task force with equal representation of the majority and minority parties to make recommendations to restore public confidence in the ethics process; and be it further

Resolved, that the task force report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives no later than May 2, 2005.

□ 1145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair has reviewed the resolution and finds that it does present a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance, not only because we are working with the minority leader of the House, but because the gentlewoman is from California, that I must move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay on the table 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 194, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—223

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	DeLay
Akin	Ginny	Dent
Alexander	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Baker	Buyer	Doolittle
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Drake
Bartlett (MD)	Camp	Dreier
Barton (TX)	Cannon	Duncan
Bass	Cantor	Ehlers
Beauprez	Capito	Emerson
Biggert	Carter	English (PA)
Bilirakis	Castle	Everett
Bishop (UT)	Chocola	Feeney
Blackburn	Coble	Ferguson
Blunt	Cole (OK)	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Boehert	Conaway	Flake
Boehner	Cox	Foley
Bonilla	Crenshaw	Forbes
Bonner	Cubin	Fortenberry
Bono	Culberson	Fossella
Boozman	Cunningham	Fox
Boustany	Davis (KY)	Franks (AZ)
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Jo Ann	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Davis, Tom	Gallegly
Brown (SC)	Deal (GA)	Garrett (NJ)