troops are desperately in need of additional funding.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates and our military leadership have told Congress that the money is vital to ensuring our troops have the resources they require to defeat terrorists overseas. Including billions of dollars in unrelated spending is a dangerous impediment. I hope my colleagues will instead support the clean supplemental bill introduced by Representative JERRY LEWIS of California.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

NATIONAL AMERICORPS WEEK

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Resolution 1173, I rise today to recognize National AmeriCorps Week.

Last night, the House passed this resolution overwhelmingly. Since 1994, nearly 500,000 AmeriCorps have served with thousands of nonprofits, public agencies and faith-based organizations across America.

Through AmeriCorps, these individuals dedicate their time and energy in a variety of areas to help meet the needs of local communities. In my home State of California alone, more than 7,900 people this year will participate in one of more than 7,500 AmeriCorps programs throughout the State. One such program is coordinated by the Santa Barbara County Education Office in my district. This program provides daily tutoring and reading for over 700 at-risk students, recruits volunteers for additional educational programs, and works to increase disaster preparedness in the schools in the county.

The 62.4 million hours served by AmeriCorps members have bettered the communities and touched the lives of countless Americans. This is the U.S.A. at its best. To all these incredible AmeriCorps members, I commend you and thank you for your service.

PABLO BACHELET

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate my good friend, Pablo Bachelet, the Latin American correspondent in Washington for my hometown newspaper, The Miami Herald. Pablo is leaving the paper to join the Inter-American Bank for Development.

Pablo, the father of two, is a sophisticated and keen observer of the history and politics of Latin America, writing incisively about democracy, diplomacy and security issues, and exploring the rich and sometimes complicated relationships that America has with the people of this dynamic region.

Pablo has traveled extensively in Latin America, writing about everything from hurricane devastation in Grenada and the struggles against drugs and corruption to the grief caused by the disco fire in Buenos Aires and U.S. policy toward Mexico or Cuba or Colombia or Venezuela.

Throughout his career, Pablo has always displayed a masterful command of the issues to keep us, the Herald's loyal readers, informed about a region so important to our interests. Pablo's extensive experience and knowledge will serve all of us who care deeply about the economic and social progress in Latin America.

My words are not ones of farewell, but ones of welcome for a new beginning and an upward march of a great talent and a warm and thoughtful human being.

Felicidades, Pablo.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1197

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the three amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except that the Chair shall divide the question among each of the three House amendments.

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

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the daily issue of the Congressional Record dated May 15, 2008, such material as he may deem explanatory of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

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

I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1197.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1197 provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2008.

The rule makes in order a motion by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to concur in the Senate amendment with three House amendments. The rule provides 2 hours of debate on the motion controlled by the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides for a division of the question on the adoption of the three House amendments listed in the Rules Committee report. The rule also provides that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated May 15, 2008, such material as he may deem explanatory of the motion.

Madam Speaker, with a deep appreciation for the importance of the legislation before us today, the Rules Committee has reported out a rule that allows for a full, thorough debate on three amendments critical to the future of our Nation. This process will give each Member ample opportunity to vote their conscience on whether to fund the war or not, place conditions on our Iraq policy or not, or choose to support veterans over millionaires.

The legislation we are about to take up was forged with the idea of consensus. It meets the spending requirements made by President Bush, including the $5.8 billion that he asked for to strengthen the levees in New Orleans. In addition, it does not include a single earmark, except those explicitly requested by Mr. Bush's administration.

On the other hand, the legislation is not a blank check because it is important to remember why we are really here today. This is the sixth year of the war in Iraq. More than 4,000 United States service men and women, 28 from my district alone, are dead. Tens of thousands have been wounded and physically disabled, and far too many suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and a host of other mental health issues. What's more, the civilian death total is devastating. Millions, not thousands, of Iraqi men, women and children are dead. Millions more have been forced into camps or other countries that will accept them.

At a time of economic emergency, when the American family is under siege, the war continues to be waged at

a staggering cost to the American taxpayer and at the expense of our economic security.

A few weeks ago, the New York Times reported on the Bush administration's practice of paying off supposedly independent military analysts to shade the truth about what was really happening in Iraq. This administration was so concerned that Americans would find out the truth that they paid former U.S. military personnel to read from prescreened, whitewashed Pentagon talking points to hide from the American people what was happening in their name.

This may be the greatest foreign policy disaster in American history, and the American people overwhelmingly are calling for it to end. They have seen that this insurgency is far from nearing the end. They were told, ''Trust us. The Iraqi war revenues will pay for reconstruction.'' Yet the American people are feeling the pinch as their hard-earned tax dollars finance the rebuilding of a foreign nation while their country's own economy and infrastructure are falling apart. They were told, ''Trust us. We will make sure your sons and daughters have the equipment they need.'' Yet we have all seen the reports of desperate searches through junk heaps to refit ill-equipped armored vehicles. And we have all heard the tales of worried mothers scraping together the family savings to purchase adequate body armor for their children.

They were told, ''Trust us. We will ensure that our fighting men and women will be taken care of when they return home.'' Yet we all remember the disgraceful images of Walter Reed Hospital, the recent reports of appalling living conditions for troops stationed in the barracks at Fort Worth, Texas.

Under such circumstances, it would be an abdication of our duty to perpetuate a clearly unacceptable status quo. For that reason, the legislation we take up today represents a break from the past and a renewed chance of changing a stale, stagnant situation.

It does, indeed, provide immediate funding for our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan who are currently in the field. However, while the needs of our troops will always be at the forefront of our national priorities, funding for this war must not come in the form of a blank check. This funding only comes with conditions that will begin the process for ending this war.

The supplemental requires that troops begin redeployment from Iraq within 30 days, with a goal of completing a full withdrawal in 18 months. We do this not because we concede 1 inch to those who would do our Nation harm or because we lack the will to fight for our national security, we do this because basic respect for our military demands it. No longer will they be asked to fight an open-ended conflict whose finish line keeps moving.

And in keeping with this respect for our troops, the legislation mandates that soldiers must be properly rested and equipped to meet the administration's own standards for combat readiness before redeployment.

Furthermore, we will honor the parents who continue to serve our Nation by finally providing full funding for the military day care centers.

This legislation also keeps our promises to our veterans. Part of the cost of waging war is ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the resources that they need to resume their lives upon their return home. The bill before us dramatically expands the education benefits that veterans of the United States military will receive under the new GI Bill. Not only do our troops deserve this benefit and much more, but every dollar we spend on education today will come back to bolster our economy tomorrow. It is also an investment.

And I would add that this provision is fully paid for by asking the wealthiest, who saw their tax rates drop 19.6 percent in 2004, they have saved around $126,000 since that time, we are asking them please to give us $500 to help fund the GI Bill of Rights.

At no time ever before in the history of this country have we been burdened with massive tax cuts for the wealthy during a time of war. Obviously this has been a new idea of this administration. These actions of fiscal incompetence by the Bush administration left this country's economy struggling, and American families are paying the price. And no families are paying it more than the families of the men and women who are fighting this war. No sacrifice has been asked from any of the rest of us.

Rising levels of sustained joblessness require us to extend unemployment benefits to those workers who understandably cannot find a job. This bill does just that.

Additionally, up until this point, the American people have been unfairly asked to shoulder the full weight of the reconstruction effort in Iraq. The underlying legislation requires that U.S. reconstruction aid be matched dollar for dollar by the Iraqi Government, removing some of the pressure from families already struggling to make ends meet.

Furthermore, it prohibits the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq, blocking this administration from saddling the American people with a costly occupation long after the Army is gone.

Our fellow citizens have been sent to fight a conflict and a war far away from home, and we owe them not only our support and our deep thanks, and not only with words, but with the deeds that we commit to in this Congress. This bill is about who we are as a society and the values that we hold.

I am proud to support this rule and the underlying legislation, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

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

I would like to begin by expressing my great appreciation to my very dear friend, the distinguished and very able Chair of the Committee on Rules, my friend from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

And with all due respect to my distinguished committee Chair, I am compelled, not surprisingly, to rise in the strongest possible opposition to this rule.

Over the last 1½ years, my colleagues Messrs. DIAZ-BALART, HASTINGS, and SESSIONS have stood right here at this lectern and opposed many, many deeply flawed rules. We began this Congress very inauspiciously as the leadership jammed through the opening week agenda before even bothering to set up the Rules Committee, allowing Ms. SLAUGHTER to become Chair of that committee. From the very outset, there has been no pretense of concern for due process, not an inkling of respect for the rules of this House.

While we started at a low point, we have sunk lower and lower with each subsequent rule. One by one the Democratic leadership has trampled the rules and traditions of this body in an effort to shut down debate, cut both Republicans and Democrats out of the process, and jam through poorly constructed bills that rarely, rarely, if ever, become public law. I frequently marvel at each new low and assume that we have reached the rock bottom. As we have considered new forms of restrictive rules crafted under an ever-more restrictive process, I have often thought, ''This one takes the cake. The Democratic leadership couldn't possibly stoop any lower than this.'' Until the next comes, shutting down due process to an even greater degree.

So this time I'm not going to say that this rule is the absolute bottom of the barrel. I don't doubt that with a little more time and effort, based on the track record we've seen, the Democratic leadership will find a way to trample the rules and traditions of this House even more thoroughly. I will say that this is clearly the worst example that we've seen in the last 17 months since they have been in charge.

But before I get into the details of this egregious rule, Madam Speaker, I think it's important to discuss why it even matters what kind of a process is used to craft legislation and hold votes. I know the inner workings of the Rules Committee are thought to be so arcane that even some of our colleagues consider them to be a little too ''inside baseball.'' In fact, the distinguished Chair just spent all of her time talking about the bill itself. She didn't talk about the fact that they're trampling on the rights of Republicans and Democrats. Start talking about rules and procedure and regular order, and most Americans' eyes, and even some of our colleagues', start to glaze over.

So to illustrate why process matters, I will use another set of rules that are

more widely understood as an example. Even before the advent of the television show Law & Order, most of us were familiar with the basics of our criminal justice system. We're all familiar with our basic rights enshrined in the Constitution. We cannot be held without a charge. We're protected from self-incrimination and unlawful searches and seizures. We must be read our Miranda rights when placed under arrest. These basic rights are fundamental, fundamental, Madam Speaker, to American democracy. We know that there can be no justice without a fair process, and we know that the protection of the rights of the individual is more important than the outcome of any one particular case.

The Bill of Rights and the laws that have been enacted to uphold it aren't just a cryptic system of rules and regulations. They guarantee, Madam Speaker, they guarantee our civil rights and they guard against tyranny. Without a fair process, power is abused and rights are abridged. Process matters, Madam Speaker. Process matters because process is democracy.

The rules of the House were established for the very same reason. They ensure that the American people, through their elected representatives, have a say in the crafting of laws that govern them. The rules guard against abuses of power, and they ensure that the legislative process is transparent and fair. Thwarting due process is not just arcane political maneuvering around obscure, complicated rules that no one should care about. It subverts the principles of representative democracy. Let me say again, Madam Speaker, the rule that we are considering at this moment very clearly subverts the principles of representative democracy.

The Democratic leadership's casual disregard for these rules and principles has faced growing criticism in the media. Last week the Politico accused them of ''breaking promises,'' promises for an open legislative process that followed regular order and the rules of the House. Not surprisingly, the paper cited today's underlying bill, the supplemental appropriations, as Exhibit A in the Democrats' assault on an open and inclusive process, which was promised at the beginning of this Congress. That's not my saying that; that's an independent newspaper that made that statement.

Even before the new lows of the supplemental, another publication, Investors Business Daily, reported recently on the leadership's ''widening power grab,'' accusing them of ''anti-democratic'' behavior, running a ''dictatorship,'' and ''showing little or no concern for holding actual votes or building consensus on issues.'' Now, Madam Speaker, those are pretty harsh charges coming from a newspaper that is clearly a very independent publication. And they go on to say that this is all being done in an effort to ''manipulate Congress.'' Madam Speaker, ''dictatorship'' and ''anti-democratic,'' those are pretty harsh words, but they are clearly warranted.

The process used to craft the underlying supplemental appropriations bill has been atrocious. Committee work was completely abandoned. Without a single hearing, without a markup, without so much as consulting Mr. LEWIS and the committee members, this bill was concocted behind closed doors. Zero input, zero deliberation, zero consultation. The Senate, of course, won't stand for that kind of treatment and intends to hold a markup later today before proceeding with its floor debate. But the Democratic leaders in this House apparently deem this to be a lesser body, with no right to due process.

The Democratic leadership intended to bring this bill up last week. They had to pull it from the schedule because fiscally conservative Members within their own caucus were outraged at the contents. A week later, Madam Speaker, a backroom deal has now been struck, bringing the remaining Democratic Members on board. How? Bringing Members on board by imposing a tax on small businesses in this country, which is exactly what this is. You see, Democrats love to stir up class warfare by justifying the small business tax as just a tax on the rich. Unless, of course, we are talking about millionaire farmers, and then they like to give them massive government payouts, which is what they did just yesterday in the farm bill.

To add to their inconsistency, they actually waived their own PAYGO rule to fund the farm bill subsidies, and today they refuse to waive the same PAYGO rule and use it as an excuse to levy massive tax increases on small businessmen and women in this country. Only in Washington would such logic be employed.

We became aware of the rough outline of this tax increase, along with every other provision of this bill, only through press reports. Some have reported a $183 billion price tag on this bill. Others have said it would be costing at least $250 billion. Various outlets reported on various provisions. But we didn't get a chance to see for ourselves what was in this massive bill until 3 p.m. yesterday. In fact, the distinguished former Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, the now ranking member, my good friend, Mr. LEWIS, came before us. Within the hour before that 3 p.m. meeting, he had just gotten the copy of the measure.

Most egregious of all, we're not actually considering a bill here today. We will be voting on three amendments to a Senate amendment to an old House bill that has already passed but was never enacted. Did you catch that? If it sounds gimmicky and underhanded, that's because that's exactly what it is. In fact, this morning I heard our colleague Mr. MCDERMOTT on National Public Radio, where he said the crafting of this is tantamount to JOHN KERRY's very famous line in which he said ''I voted for it before I voted against it.'' The Democratic leadership knows that a vote on their full package would never pass; so they plotted a way around an actual vote on final passage.

For anyone who missed that, let me repeat. The House of Representatives will not be permitted a vote on the full underlying proposal. When Investors Business Daily calls this a dictatorship, they seem to have a point.

So what exactly is in this $183–250 billion bill that comes to us without any due process and will pass without a vote? Who can say for sure? But I know that at least $62 billion in new entitlements are included; $11 billion in unemployment insurance, and our friend Mr. WELLER will be talking about this in a few minutes; and at least $51 billion in benefits for veterans. Clearly, these are very, very important issues that need to be addressed.

I don't doubt that the Democratic majority will try to claim that Republicans don't care about our veterans or those facing economic hardship. We hear that time and time again. To the contrary, these are such critically important issues for us that we passionately believe that we must address them in a serious and deliberative way. It is simply not good enough to slap together a proposal without a single moment of testimony or debate, throw some money at our problems, and call it a day.

The very critical issues addressed in this bill, from funding for Iraq and Afghanistan to international food assistance to the tremendously important domestic programs, all of these deserve a substantive, deliberative process. We should have an opportunity to examine which of these are truly emergencies and which should be included in the regular appropriations process. And all of them should have the benefit of an open debate to ensure that we are addressing our priorities effectively.

This rule allows for none of this, Madam Speaker. It thwarts the rules and traditions that were put in place to guard against abuses of power, and it blocks consideration of even a single amendment, including the very thoughtful and responsible alternative proposed by the man sitting to my right here, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, Mr. LEWIS. He's offered a clean supplemental appropriations bill which simply provides our troops the funding they need without bogging it down with all kinds of unrelated items or adding new policy that prevents them from carrying out their mission.

Our hope is to get this critical funding to our troops before Memorial Day, which is fast approaching. That's not an arbitrary deadline and it's not a gimmick. Our military commanders have told us that they desperately need this funding now, and we want to be able to go home for Memorial Day and tell our veterans and our military families that we passed a clean bill that funds our troops and their mission. We

want to tell them we crafted a bill without regard to politics, without regard to providing political cover or fodder for political ads. We simply gave the troops the funding they desperately need. Now, Madam Speaker, that's exactly what the distinguished ranking member, Mr. LEWIS, should be able to provide, and I'm going to seek an opportunity for him to do just that.

But, unfortunately, the Democratic majority can't advance their flawed policies without shutting down the process. So they prefer closed rules to open debate. They prefer backroom deals to the transparent committee process. They prefer hollow, ill-gotten victories that die after the House vote to substantive, bipartisan legislation that is enacted into law. That's exactly what we need to do, Madam Speaker.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I am going to urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, 5 years ago in a well-orchestrated public relations stunt that featured landing on an aircraft carrier, President Bush proclaimed, ''In the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed.''

Just 2 weeks ago, on the fifth anniversary of ''Mission Accomplished,'' the White House could only express exasperation that anyone would even make a fuss that 5 years have gone by and we're still in Iraq, deeper than ever.

Well, here's why people are making such a fuss, Madam Speaker: Over 4,000 American service men and women killed in Iraq; over 30,000 of our troops wounded or maimed; a continuing U.S. occupation of Iraq; and a mission that is never ending, never defined, and completely open-ended.

Ironically, the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, the aircraft carrier where President Bush declared victory in Iraq, was just deployed last week for another tour of duty in the Persian Gulf.

Today this House will have a choice to make, whether to continue this war well into next year. Today we will choose whether to support the George Bush strategy of keeping the war going until he can safely get out of town.

□ 1045

Once again, U.S. forces are engaged in some of the most intense combat since the height of the insurgency. Once again, they are battling Iraqi militias, not al Qaeda, in the markets, homes and alleyways of Baghdad. April 2008 was the deadliest month for Iraqi civilians since last August.

The U.N. now reports that 4.7 million Iraqis have been forced by violence to leave their homes. Roughly 2 million of them are refugees in neighboring countries. And another 2.7 million are internally displaced.

What is worse, we don't even have the decency to pay for this war, which has created a mountain of debt that American taxpayers will be paying off for years to come. This generation's mistake is becoming the next generation's burden.

Currently the war costs $2.4 billion each and every week. Reports estimate that the costs of this war, even if we could bring it to an end over the next 2 years, will exceed $3 trillion when we take into account rebuilding our broken military and addressing the needs of our military veterans.

Billions for the care of the severely wounded.

Billions for the care of veterans traumatized by war.

Billions to staunch the flow of suicides by young men and women who have served in Iraq.

And billions more to rebuild and reequip our Armed Forces.

Why can't the Iraqi Government, which is currently running a huge surplus, do more to rebuild their country?

Madam Speaker, I am holding office hours across my congressional district in Massachusetts. These are mainly small towns and communities. Every weekend I meet a steady stream of constituents who come in and who want to talk about the war. People are so disappointed, so frustrated and so angry that this war is still going on. And it is not just Massachusetts. It is Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi and every other State in the Union.

Now I know, Madam Speaker, that there will be opportunities today to support strong conditions on the war and the redeployment of our troops. We will have the opportunity to vote in support of greatly expanded educational benefits for our military veterans and for a generous response to the emergency global food crisis.

And I thank Chairman OBEY for those initiatives.

But Madam Speaker, I cannot vote for one more dime for this war. Enough is enough. Before he leaves town, George Bush should bring our troops home.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I notice my colleague doesn't spend any time at all talking about the rule which is being considered at this time and shutting down democracy which we all aspire to in Iraq and other places in the world.

With that, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the author of the very important measure that will be made in order if we are able to defeat the previous question, a clean supplemental, my good friend from Redlands, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding me this time.

Perhaps the most important counsel I have ever received came from my dear friend and mentor, Dr. Adeline Gunther. ''Gram,'' as we called her, was the founder and guiding light of the University Religious Conference located near the UCLA campus. Gram said to me, ''Always remember, Jerry, what you are not willing to do in order to win.''

Think about that. What you are not willing to do in order to win.

Those running the Democratic leadership of the House need desperately to learn that lesson. So enamored with their power after 12 years out of the majority, the Democrat majority is now moving rapidly in the direction of reinventing the authoritarian system that was a part of their control for the previous 40 years.

The outrageous movement of the Iraq supplemental to the House floor, without consideration by the Committee on Appropriations and under a closed rule, is the case in point.

The supplemental began as a $108 billion request for funding requirements for the troops for the remainder of 2008. This must-pass emergency legislation has now grown to somewhere near $250 billion. A whole array of legislative provisions has been added that could have been and should have been addressed by way of regular order during the appropriations process.

Unfortunately, the supplemental will bypass the Appropriations Committee altogether, and through use of parliamentary trickery, avoid the inconvenient input of Democrat and Republican Members who have real expertise in the subject areas involved.

Regular order is designed to ensure that people's voices and interests are heard on serious public policy questions as they move through the legislative process. To have the Democrat leadership cut off the people's right to be heard by such a crass parliamentary set of maneuvers results in great harm to the Appropriations Committee and seriously undermines the credibility of the world's most admired legislative body.

Only three or four Members, at most, have provided serious input throughout this misguided process. All Members, Democrats and Republicans alike, should be enraged by this arrogant demonstration of dictatorial control. I know from private conversations with many of my friends on the other side of the aisle that there is a great deal of frustration among Democrats with Chairman OBEY and Speaker PELOSI for their excessive and abusive control of this process.

Madam Speaker, let me assure you that my colleagues and I will continue to exercise every tool available to us to protect the established traditions of the House and the fundamentals of our democratic system. It is clear that Speaker PELOSI is willing to do anything, including stifling the voices of nearly every Member of the House, to win.

I urge all of my colleagues to remember the words of my mentor, Dr.

Adeline Gunther, who said, ''Always remember what you are not willing to do in order to win.''

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the Rules chairwoman for yielding to me.

Fourteen million dollars in an hour, 24/7, over 5 years, $10 billion per month, 4,000 dead Americans, tens of thousands of wounded warriors, untold sacrifice of military families, innocent civilians in Iraq killed by the hundreds of thousands, and one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. That is the cost of this war.

And do you know, the President says that he has sacrificed, too. Yes. He has sacrificed. He has given up golf.

And the President has determined to veto the bill when it gets to him because it includes really a patriot tax on people who make over $1 million. They are going to help to pay for things like an expanded GI Bill for our veterans that come back, a GI Bill that will cost about 5 months in Iraq over 10 years, and yet the President has said that he wants to——

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Yes.

Mr. DREIER. I would just like to remind my colleague that 82 percent of the people who fall in the category about what she has just mentioned are small business men and women. And I think we need to realize this is a small business tax.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I take back my time.

We are talking about people who are making over $1 million to pay a small sacrifice for this war where our military families are paying a huge sacrifice.

The question really is, though, what are we doing there? What is the mission of our young men and women? Who is the enemy? Who is our ally? What does victory even look like?

I am not going to vote for another penny for this tragic war except to bring our troops home or to resolve the humanitarian crisis our government has helped create. I am not voting to give more to the real winners of this war, the Halliburtons and the Blackwaters. And I am disappointed about my amendment to stop funding Blackwater. This company raises the question, is it the policy of the United States to let companies like that get away with murder? We should cut that contract and bring our troops home.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, my friend from Janesville, Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong opposition to this emergency supplemental spending bill that not only would bust the budget with billions in nonemergency spending, but it would also raise taxes on small business. I can't think of a worse time to implement a tax increase, with a weak economy that is struggling to create and grow jobs.

Republicans will not support this bill. The President will veto this bill. Yet the Democratic leadership brings it to the floor and continues to play politics with funding for our troops.

The President's request, submitted 15 months ago, was for $108 billion. The Democrats, once again, can't help themselves. And they have added an additional $6.6 billion of this. And to add insult to injury to the American taxpayer and our troops in harm's way, this amount actually reduces the President's request by $3.5 billion.

I guess that's what you get when a bill is written unilaterally and in secret.

If the majority brought us a clean supplemental with just funding for the troops, it would undoubtedly have been passed with a big bipartisan vote and sent to the President before Memorial Day so there is no disruption in funding. That should be what we're doing, and not playing politics with funding for our troops.

That is what a majority would do if they were serious about passing a bill and not playing politics.

But that is not what the Democrat majority has done here. Instead, 15 months after the President asked for the troop funding, the majority has brought a bloated bill to the floor that will cost the American taxpayer $250 billion over the next decade.

This is a bill they wrote in secret, without allowing committee markups, while only allowing Members 18 hours to review a bill that would provide an amount equivalent to 26 percent of the spending in last year's regular appropriation bills, and without allowing the full House to work its will in an open and Democratic process.

It violates the budget passed by the majority by adding $6.6 billion to the amounts assumed for the war supplemental for the House-passed budget resolution. And the Democratic leadership has decided to lard this bill up with $66 billion in mandatory spending.

While they raise taxes to pay for the GI benefits, this bill adds billions in funding that has nothing to do with the war and is not fully offset.

So they say they are meeting the PAYGO rules. But they don't meet it for all the other spending in this bill. Mandatory spending does not belong in war emergency supplementals. The mandatory provisions in question deserve serious debate as stand-alone bills.

Why are they hiding this in a war supplemental? They should be proud of these provisions and let them withstand the full light of day through the regular committee process. And if increasing spending by over $66 billion wasn't enough, they are proposing to raise taxes on Americans as well, to tax and spend rather than paying for this increase with reductions in other spending.

The last thing we ought to be doing today is raise taxes. They will say this is a tax on millionaires. But this tax is going to hit small businesses. These are the job creators in America. This is the worst thing we can do as this economy is struggling.

Yesterday the House waived the PAYGO rule to give farm subsidies to millionaires.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yesterday, the House waived the PAYGO rules to give farm subsidies to millionaires.

Today, the House wants to enforce PAYGO to raise taxes on small businesses. I fear for this institution. The majority is taking us down a slippery slope. And I don't think they are going to be able to put this genie back in the bottle. The committees have been ignored. The budget has been ignored. The rules have been ignored. What is next?

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Today I rise in strong support of the rule and of the domestic priorities the House will consider today as a part of H.R. 2642

I strongly support provisions to expand and improve the GI benefits for veterans education. Our veterans who have served our country in combat and who are looking to begin to complete their college education deserve GI benefits.

I also strongly support provisions which provide vital support for workers by extending unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks. In the district that I represent in California, east Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, unemployment rates are above 8 percent.

This legislation will help to keep food on the table for our families and our workers affected by the declining economy. This legislation also appropriately includes a moratorium on seven misguided Medicaid regulations. More than 170,000 people in my district alone in California rely on Medi-Cal for their health care. And although Healthy Families serves more than 19,000 children in my district, another 18,000 children remain uninsured.

If the regulations go into effect in Los Angeles County, we will also devastate our Los Angeles Unified School District and our public hospitals who serve many working class people.

I am pleased that today we are prioritizing education for our veterans, the health of low-income Medicaid

beneficiaries, and of course our families and working families. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and provisions which address pressing domestic needs.

I strongly disagree that small business owners and wealthy millionaires are going to be heavily impacted by this resolution. That is the Republican playbook, trying to tell you that somehow we are going to harm those people that are requiring and calling out for our assistance. This bill addresses their issues.

□ 1100

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me say in the name of saying they are taxing the rich, the facts show it. Eighty-two percent of the people who fall in that category are small businessmen and women. That's just the facts.

With that, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Morris, Illinois (Mr. WELLER), the ranking member of the Income Security and Family Support Subcommittee of Ways and Means.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I also rise to oppose the way that the House majority, the Democratic majority, is managing this legislation, bringing forward a fiscal year irresponsible supplemental bill.

I would note, as I recall, on January 29, the Speaker of the House made a statement on the bipartisan economic stimulus package that was about to pass, and Speaker PELOSI said, ''Let's hope for the Senate to take their lead from us and be disciplined, focused, fiscally responsible, and act in a timely, temporary, and targeted way on behalf of meeting the needs of the American people.''

I agree with the Speaker that we should act in a way that is timely, temporary and targeted.

Unfortunately, that's not what the House is being offered today. In addition to a large tax increase, the bill before us today includes an untargeted and overly expensive extension of unemployment benefits.

Consistent with the Speaker's call for targeting help to those who need it most, I introduced legislation and offered an amendment in the Ways and Means Committee to focus extended unemployment benefits on people and States with relatively high or fast-rising unemployment rates.

Combined with regular unemployment benefits available in all States under my amendment, a total of 39 weeks of benefits would be available to unemployed workers whose jobs are hardest to find. On Main Street U.S.A. that helps those who need the help most. Yet this targeted approach was rejected by our Democratic colleagues, the majority on the committee.

Why target benefits? Why target benefits to only relatively high unemployment States? For the same reason, the Democratic legislation proposes longer benefits in high unemployment States because workers there have a harder time finding new jobs and thus are in need of extended benefits.

Targeting is especially important today since today's national unemployment rate is a low 5.0 percent with a third of all States having unemployment rates below 4 percent. That national unemployment rate is well below the lowest prior level when such a program was created in the past. I have a note in 2002 it was 5.7 percent, and, again, today's unemployment rate is 5 percent.

This targeted approach that I offered is also more fiscally responsible. The untargeted Democratic approach costs at least twice as much as a targeted approach and, as the Congressional Budget Office has reported, the Democrat legislation will require State tax increases to pay those additional costs.

The bill before the House would require State tax increases, State tax hikes, totaling $1 billion over just next 5 years.

If this program is extended, as all such temporary programs have been, the tax increases required will only grow. The Speaker was right, we need to act in a way that is fiscally responsible and targeted.

Unfortunately, this legislation before us today achieves neither of these goals and adds to budget deficits and requires payroll tax increases. We can and should do better than this.

CONGRESS HAS NEVER EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AT TODAY'S LOW UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Democratic leaders want to extend unemployment benefits nationwide, with the Federal Government picking up all of the $16 billion tab.

Since the 1950s, Congress has created 7 special or ''temporary'' extended benefits programs, which can double the length of total unemployment benefits from the 26 weeks to 52 weeks—or longer—per laid off worker. The logic of these programs is to provide additional weeks of benefits when jobs are relatively hard to find.

Today's national unemployment rate is a relatively low 5.0 percent. Congress has never created a temporary extended benefits program at such a low unemployment rate. The next lowest unemployment rate when such a program was created in U.S. history was when the last such program was created in March 2002. The unemployment rate then was 5.7 percent—significantly higher than today's 5.0 percent unemployment rate.

TODAY'S U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER THAN AVERAGE RATE AT START OF PRIOR EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAMS

It is also useful to compare today's relatively low 5.0 percent unemployment rate with average rates when prior special Federal programs started. When such programs started, average unemployment rates were far higher than the Nation's unemployment rate today.

Today's unemployment rate (5.0 percent) is more than 2 percentage points below the average unemployment rate in the month when Congress chose to start such special programs (7.3 percent).

TODAY'S UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS BELOW THE AVERAGE FOR ALL OF THE 1980S AND 1990S

The current unemployment rate is so low it is actually below the average of entire recent decades.

If you look at the 1980s and 1990s—two decades that saw record job creation in the U.S.— and average all the months, you find those decades actually had higher average unemployment rates than today's 5.0 percent rate.

If such a program should exist today—when the Nation's unemployment rate is quite low by historical standards—when should it not? Creating such a program now is in effect an argument for permanently extending unemployment benefits, which would require at least $12 billion more per year in Federal spending and payroll taxes, in addition to State payroll tax hikes.

TODAY'S 5.0 PERCENT UNEMPLOYMENT RATE DOES NOT REFLECT AN ''EMERGENCY''

The Democratic leadership is suggesting that a special ''emergency'' nationwide extended unemployment benefit program is needed because today's job market is so weak.

Actually, only 20 percent of all months in the past four decades had unemployment rates below today's level. So if today's job market constitutes an ''emergency,'' then the U.S. economy has almost always been in a similar or even worse emergency situation throughout the past four decades. That's a hard case for even the biggest economic pessimist to make.

TODAY'S UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS BELOW THE AVERAGE THROUGHOUT THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

Democratic Members are always trying to take credit for the strong economy of the 1990s, even though it was the Republican Congress and its policies of tax relief, spending restraint, and welfare reform that actually promoted record economic growth and budget surpluses.

But let's accept the Democratic rhetoric for a minute that the Clinton era economy was just about the best ever.

What was the average unemployment rate during the 8 years of the Clinton Administration? 5.2 percent—which is above today's 5.0 percent rate. Did a special extended benefits program operate throughout the Clinton Administrations? No. Did a special extended benefits program operate during all the months when the unemployment rate was 5.0 percent or higher? No again.

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS ARE BETTER THAN IN 1996—WHICH PRESIDENT CLINTON CALLED THE ''HEALTHIEST'' ECONOMY ''IN THREE DECADES''

It's worth considering another reason why Democratic leaders are so determined to argue that today's economy is so bad: Politics.

Compare today with 1996: 20 million more employees; a lower unemployment rate; a lower long-term unemployment rate; and fewer average weeks of unemployment. All better today than the 1996 levels.

But what did President Clinton, then running for a second term, think about the U.S. economy in 1996? In his State of the Union Address that year he said: ''Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades.'' (January 23, 1996) So when a Democrat is in the White House running for reelection, the economy is healthy and strong. And of course no one calls for a special extended benefits program.

But with a Republican in the White House, and despite better economic statistics today,

Democrats portray the current economy as another Depression. Here's how Senator CHUCK SCHUMER put it: ''The bottom line is that this administration is the owner of the worst jobs record since Herbert Hoover.'' (Press Release, March 7, 2008)

THE DEMOCRATIC ''EMERGENCY'' EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM IS POORLY TARGETED

Despite today's relatively low unemployment rate, there are reasonable, arguments for extending unemployment benefits in areas where jobs are scarce. That's the approach Republicans proposed in the Ways and Means Committee, but which Democratic Members rejected. This approach would expand a current program that targets Federal funds for extended unemployment benefits on States with high unemployment rates. Temporarily expanding that program would provide more help to workers where jobs are scarce and the added help is needed most.

Early on, Speaker PELOSI seemed to agree with the need for such a ''targeted'' approach. In her January 29, 2008 statement on the bipartisan economic stimulus check package, the Speaker said: ''Let's hope for the Senate to take their lead from us and be disciplined, focused, fiscally responsible, and act in a timely, temporary, and targeted way on behalf of meeting the needs of the American people.''

Unfortunately, the proposed Democratic program does not follow this ''targeted'' approach. Nearly all of its benefits—more than $12 billion of the $14 billion in total benefit spending (not counting administrative costs) in the coming year—would be paid regardless of local unemployment rates. That's poorly targeted, and not fiscally responsible.

UNDER THE UNTARGETED DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM, FEDERAL BENEFITS WOULD BE PAID IN MANY STATES WITH VERY LOW UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

One key reason why the Democratic program is poorly targeted is because extended unemployment benefits would be paid in all states, regardless of the availability of jobs there.

In March 2008, a full 15 States had unemployment rates under 4 percent. Another 17 States had unemployment rates between 4.0 and 4.9 percent. That makes 32 States—two thirds of all States—with current unemployment rates under 5 percent. Those are very low unemployment rates by any measure. Another 13 States have unemployment rates between 5.0 and 5.9 percent.

That leaves just 6 States with unemployment rates of 6 percent or higher, which is the Democratic Members' own definition of ''high unemployment.'' Under their own criteria, 45 States today are ''low unemployment'' and only 6 are ''high unemployment'' (includes D.C.). But all States would receive Federal funds to pay extended benefits to workers.

CURRENT LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS BELOW THE AVERAGE SINCE 1980

Democratic Members have suggested that record numbers of workers today have been out of work for long periods. Actually, the current share of all workers who are long-term unemployed—defined as those who have been out of work for more than 6 months—is below average.

The average long-term unemployment rate for all months since January 1980—covering nearly three full decades, and including two of the longest expansions in U.S. history—was 1.0 percent. So in the average month in the past generation, 1 percent of the labor force had been out of work for more than 6 months.

How does that compare with today? The long-term unemployment rate in April 2008 was 0.9 percent—below the average for the past generation. That means fewer current workers are long-term unemployed than in the typical month in the past 28 plus years.

That's hardly the case Democratic Members have been making for what an ''emergency'' situation this is. In fact, current conditions are better than average when it comes to assessing how many American workers are unemployed for long periods.

LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT TODAY IS BELOW LEVEL IN 1994 WHEN DEMOCRATIC LEADERS ENDED THE EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM THEY CREATED

Some Democratic Members seem to think whether you support creating a special extended benefits program—and under what terms—determines whether you support workers or not. One even said it was ''unconscionable'' to try and target extended benefits to only those in high unemployment States, as Republicans have proposed and even the AFL–CIO apparently supports.

Yet when Democrats last held a majority in Congress in 1994 they created a special Federal extended benefits program. The Democratic Majority in Congress back then allowed that program to expire in April 1994. But back then a significantly GREATER share of unemployed workers were long-term unemployed than today—21 percent then versus less than 18 percent today.

Was it ''unconscionable'' to ''turn off' that prior special program in April 1994? Weren't they ''leaving workers out in the cold'' or ''shutting them out'' or whatever metaphor Democratic Members use now against those who support a more targeted approach today, when conditions are objectively better in terms of long-term unemployment?

THE UNTARGETED DEMOCRATIC EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM WOULD DRAIN FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS

Some Democratic Members claim there are ''plenty'' of Federal funds to pay for these benefits. Are they right?

To answer that, you have to ask ''what are the chances this special program will last only 12 months as advertised?'' A key fact is since 1970 none of the 5 special programs created by Congress ended as originally proposed; every one was extended. So chances are high that program created now wouldn't stop after just 12 months, either.

In fact, the average total duration of such programs is about 30 months. The untargeted Democratic program would cost about $1 billion per month. So if its length is ''average,'' the total cost will reach $30 billion. That's almost the balance in the Federal unemployment trust funds today.

But remember this program would start at a record low unemployment rate. Also, such programs tend to operate until the unemployment rate falls to the level where it started, or less. So let's assume the program starts now and runs as long as one following the 2001 recession that started and stopped only when the unemployment rate fell below 5.0 percent. That program would operate for 47 months—from now until April 2012—cost $47 billion or more and fully drain the Federal unemployment trust funds, which currently hold just $35 billion.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Amendment 3 concerns unemployment compensation. It's estimated that in the first 6 months of this year, 1.3 million Americans will exhaust their benefits. The number of long-term unemployed Americans is almost twice as high now as it was in the last recession.

This is targeted at the long-term unemployed wherever they live. The Republican approach, Mr. WELLER's approach, the President's opposition, it's not targeted. It misses tens of thousands of people who are unemployed for more than the 26 weeks. I come from Michigan with a high unemployment level. I want all the unemployed long-term to be covered wherever they live.

I think it's time that the minority and the President get out of the offices they reside in and get into the shoes of typical American families.

I read a letter that came from a person in Roseville whose husband had lost his job as a machinist:

''With the job market as bleak as it is today, the fear that unemployment benefits may run out is something no family should have to face. My husband has been actively seeking work since his layoff, but there's simply nothing to be had right now. I've never seen him look so sad and upset in all our nearly 30 years of marriage. The President and Congress must be made to understand that what is happening to the workers of this country, and most especially, to the people of Michigan is not something they've chosen for themselves.''

Opposition to extension of unemployment compensation is unconscionable. I urge support for amendment 3.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. In light of the fact there is much more time remaining on the other side, may I ask the distinguished Chair if she might proceed and yield some of her time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise enthusiastically to support this very important rule.

I congratulate the very strategic design of the Appropriations Committee. This is tough, and I thank the Rules Committee for listening to us as we presented our amendments.

But I rise today to say that war is ugly. But we applaud and appreciate the young men and women on the front lines. We forever honor them. Just a few minutes ago I was in a room listening to returning war veterans from Iraq, and they gave us these words, horrible stories, such as calling the

Iraqis hajis or sand niggers, telling us about the impact on their families, how many families were destroyed, how many have attempted to commit suicide.

I offered an amendment that many focused on the idea that everything we have asked the soldiers to do under the 2002 resolution has been done, and, therefore, it should expire. The President has no more authority to continue this war.

Then I wanted to debunk the actions of what happened to the Vietnam vets and call for a national day of celebration, a national day of honor for all the returning war heroes that will come home. This is what we should be doing today as we vote against the funding of this war in Iraq. It is important to stand for these soldiers.

But I am glad that we have extended GI benefits for veterans' education. Some of them were telling us that they are now being denied these benefits because of a general discharge, because of their opposition to the war. Yes, it is valuable because we move on to help Americans in this bill as well, extending unemployment compensation, getting rid of these cuts in Medicaid and making sure that we don't damage specialty hospitals that are in our rural and inner city areas who are helping us.

I am grateful to what the Appropriations Committee did on world and food hunger. It is a disaster, and they moved it up higher than what the President asked for. We had a briefing on world hunger and it was appalling what is going on around the world. I am grad that we have monies for refugee assistance and the Merida funding.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The Merida initiative is funding for this horrible drug war between Mexico and its own citizens that's spilling over into the United States. I am appreciative of these dollars, but, my friends, we have got to stop the utilization of drugs here in the United States.

It looks like it's McDonald's where they send these various drugs. When I say that, I am not talking about McDonald's, but I am suggesting that the pinpoints of where these drugs are dropped off in the United States, it is tragic. As we send more money and more money to Mexico, we have got to begin to devise a new policy for drug opposition here in the United States.

Vote against the funding for the war. The underlying other amendments are very good.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1197, Rule providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642—Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008. While I offer my support for amendments No. 2 and No. 3, I must oppose amendment No. 1. While amendments 2 and 3 contain provisions beneficial to the American people, designed to improve our economy and protect our young men and women, amendment 1 continues a disastrous policy of providing unrestricted funding to continue the Bush administration's war in Iraq.

I oppose amendment No. 1 because I stand with the American taxpayers who have paid over $600 billion to finance the misadventure in Iraq. I stand with the 4076 fallen heroes who stand even taller in death because they gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Last May, I was proud to vote for H.R. 1591, a supplemental spending bill that would have provided funds for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, which included a timetable for the redeployment of U.S. troops. Though this bill passed the House by a clear majority, the President opted to veto this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I must oppose amendment No. 1. This amendment provides a total of $162.9 billion for the Department of Defense for FY 2008 and FY 2009, funds that are handed over without any strings. The amendment does not withhold funding for the Iraq war, a war that so many of my colleagues in Congress oppose, and which only 32 percent of Americans now support. The amendment does not require that war funds can only be used for the responsible redeployment of American troop's home from Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I voted against the 2002 Iraq War Resolution. I am proud of that vote. I have consistently voted against the administration's practice of submitting a request for war funding through an emergency supplemental rather than the regular appropriations process which would subject the funding request to more rigorous scrutiny and require it to be balanced against other pressing national priorities. I cannot support legislation that provides the President with the resources to prolong his ill-advised war effort unrestrained.

I rise today in strong support of amendment No. 2. This amendment lays out a responsible U.S. policy toward Iraq, requiring that troops begin redeployment from Iraq within 30 days, with a goal of completing the withdrawal of combat troops by December 2009. As a Member of both the Out of Iraq and the Progressive Caucuses, I am proud to vote for legislation that, like other measures passed by this Congress, begins the process of withdrawing U.S. men and women from Iraq.

In addition, Madam Speaker this legislation specifically requires that any agreement between the United States and the government of Iraq committing future U.S. forces must be specifically authorized by Congress. The governments of Iraq and the United States announced their intention to forge a "strategic framework agreement," a long-term, bilateral pact, to be completed by July 31, 2008. This negotiated agreement is to be based on the "Declaration of Principles for a Long-Term Relationship of Cooperation and Friendship Between the Republic of Iraq and the United States of America," signed November 26, 2007, by Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki and President Bush.

Under the Declaration of Principles, the parties will negotiate a security agreement, under which the United States will support the Iraqi government and security forces in providing security and stability and fighting al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups. The Declaration of Principles envisions an agreement setting forth a wide-ranging set of commitments, which will cover issues including politics, economics, and security. In hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, administration officials have indicated that the President intends to negotiate this agreement as an executive agreement, not subject to Congressional approval. It is essential that any agreement which commits future U.S. troops to the defense of Iraq is outside the purview of existing authorizations, and such an agreement must be submitted to the Congress for approval. This legislation also prohibits the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, amendment No. 2 requires that the Iraqi government step up and pay its share of Iraqi reconstruction efforts. I am concerned that the United States has paid and continues to pay a disproportionate amount for Iraq reconstruction, especially when the Iraqi government reportedly has a $25–30 billion budget surplus this year. To date the United States has appropriated more than $45 billion for Iraq reconstruction. American funded reconstruction programs have included: the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces.

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

There are a number of other key provisions in this amendment. It requires the President to reach an agreement with Iraq to subsidize fuel costs for U.S. Armed Forces operating in Iraq so that our military pays what Iraqis pay. It requires that troop's meet the Pentagon's definition of "combat ready" before they are deployed to Iraq; Prohibits troops from being deployed longer than Pentagon guidelines recommend; and requires that troops spend adequate time at home between deployments. This legislation makes substantial strides toward cleaning up contracting in Iraq, expanding current law to make all contractors working in war zones subject to prosecution for offenses that would otherwise be in violation of U.S. law; extending the statute of limitations for fraud cases during wartime; and amending the Federal criminal code to prohibit profiteering and fraud involving contractors overseas. In addition, it prohibits interrogation techniques not authorized in the Army Field Manual, a provision necessary in eliminating torture.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Madam Speaker, the third amendment to H.R. 2642 provides over $21.2 billion for much needed domestic programs and foreign aid. By extending unemployment benefits, expanding veterans' education benefits, and placing a moratorium on the Bush administration's seven Medicaid regulations; this amendment gets us closer to where the Economic Stimulus package should have taken us.

This amendment will provide increased funds for food aid, military hospitals, and the reconstruction of the Louisiana levees.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD AID

As many of you know, we are facing an international food crisis. According to the International Monetary Fund, IMF, global food prices have increased an average of 43 percent. In fact since March 2007, wheat has increased by 146 percent, soybean has increased by 71 percent, corn by 41 percent, and rice prices have increased by 29 percent, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Many factors have played into this crisis. In China, India, and other emerging markets experiencing rapid economic growth, consumers are increasing their demand for food, oil, and energy supplies. Rising energy costs have directly raised the cost of agricultural production. Adverse weather-related events have lowered crop yields, particularly affecting wheat harvests. Depreciation of the U.S. dollar accounts for part of the increase in U.S. food prices, while increased production of biofuel has raised the price of corn.

Sadly, approximately 1 billion people—or one sixth of the world's population—subsist on less than $1 per day. Of this population, 162 million survive on less than $0.50 per day. Overall, increased food prices particularly affect developing countries, and the poorest people within those countries, where populations spend a larger proportional share of income on basic food commodities.

That is why I, along with other Hunger Caucus members hosted a forum on the food crisis and what it is doing to our children. We met with leaders of the international aid community to come up with pragmatic solutions to the global hunger crisis, both in the short-term and the long-term.

In my district I submitted an appropriations request for the Houston Food Bank to expand their collection and distribution of food to the good people of Houston. We each have to do our part, not only in our district by supporting much needed programs and organizations, but across this great Nation and the rest of the world.

This amendment would give $9.9 billion, $496 million above the President's request for the State Department, USAID and International Food Assistance. It is simply unacceptable in this day and age that children are going hungry. We have millions of dollars to bailout Bear Stearns, let's find that same money to help our families and our children.

EXPANDED GI BENEFITS FOR VETERANS EDUCATION

As champion for veterans, I am especially pleased to see the expansion of education benefits to veterans under the GI bill.

EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The number of Americans looking for work has grown by 800,000 over the last year, and the number of American jobs has declined by 260,000 since the beginning of 2008. This supplemental would extend unemployment benefits for workers who have exhausted their benefits by up to 13 weeks in every state as well as an additional 13 weeks in states with high unemployment.

PROTECTING THE MEDICAID SAFETY NET ACT OF 2008 (H.R. 5613)

The Bush administration sought to cut services and payments to American families by adding seven different Medicaid regulations to the stimulus. This amendment places a much needed moratorium on those regulations giving back to our seniors, families, and those with disabilities as well as cut payments to safety net providers.

REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

$675 million, $454 million above the President's request, to address the refugee crisis in Iraq and elsewhere.

MERIDA

This amendment would give $461.5 million, $88.5 million below the President's request for the initiative to provide counter narcotics and law enforcement assistance in Mexico, $400 million, and Central America, $61.5 million.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The $4.6 billion for military construction, $2.2 billion over the President's request, including $939 million for BRAC, over $210 million for the military child care centers that the President announced in the State of the Union but never funded, and $992 million for military hospitals to prevent the types of problems that faced Walter Reed.

BUREAU OF PRISONS

This $178 million urgently needed to meet rising incarceration costs and growing inmate population. The administration would have paid for these costs with cuts to state and local law enforcement funding.

CLEANING UP CONTRACTING (H.R. 3928 AND H.R. 5712)

Increases accountability and transparency in Federal contracting by requiring companies that receive more than 80 percent of their revenue from the Federal Government to disclose the names and salaries of their top officers, and requires Federal contractors to report violations of Federal criminal law and overpayments on contracts over $5 million.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I understand that my good friend from Cleveland was unable to get time from his side of the aisle.

And so at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cleveland, the Democratic Presidential candidate, Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I regretfully oppose this rule, not because I lack appreciation for the work of my colleagues in trying to craft a bill that would get consensus, but because we are right back to where we were in January of 2007. We made a commitment that we would take control of this Congress and would end the war. Now, with this bill, we are saying we will set a goal of 18 months from now. So what happens 18 months from now? We have to end this war by stopping the funding.

In this bill we are telling the Iraqis they are going to have to pay for the reconstruction. We are telling the Iraqis they are going to have to give a discount price for oil, so they are going to subsidize the war against their own country.

We are losing a lot in this war, not only hundreds of billions of dollars, not only the lives of our troops, not only the injuries, but we are also losing our sense of humanity and compassion. There have been over 1 million innocent Iraqis killed as a result of this war.

Vote against this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I support this rule, in part, because it allows Congress to finally rein in an out-of-control policy by the administration in Iraq.

For too long our Congress has stood by while an administration has pursued a course in Iraq fraught with peril, with no plan for its conclusion, with no plan for resolution, with no meaningful plan for international involvement, to end this problem in Iraq. While Congress has not reined in this administration, the American people have been raising a hue and cry for relief from this negligent lack of plan in Iraq.

I came across, a few weeks ago, some work that some citizens had done to provide an exit strategy from Iraq. This is a plan called A Responsible Plan to End the War in Iraq. It was organized by a group of citizens, a woman from Carnation, Washington, named Darcy Burner. It is endorsed by considerable military thinking, endorsed by Major General Paul Eaton, U.S. Army, retired, former Security Transition Commanding General in Iraq; Dr. Lawrence Korb, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration; Brigadier General John Johns, specialist in counterinsurgency and nation-building; Captain Larry Seaquist, U.S. Navy, retired, former commander of the USS *Iowa* and Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy Planning.

Here is a plan that has considerable parallels to the amendment we will be allowed to offer to finally having some responsible plan to end the war in Iraq. A meaningful timetable, a statement about permanent bases, meaningful requirements for not overburdening our military. It's time, simply, for Congress to act. This rule allows us to do so. We should pass it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire again how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, with that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Brooksville, Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

□ 1115

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I am the lead Republican on the post-9/11 Veterans Education Assistance Act. Congress needs to increase benefits for those fighting in our military to cover the true cost of a college education, and that is what that bill does.

Despite my obvious support for this provision in the supplemental, I am

saddened because I cannot vote for its passage as part of amendment 3 today. I cannot because the Democrats have chosen to include an egregious tax on small businesses in amendment 3. While claiming this tax is for American's veterans, in reality the majority of it is paying for their penchant to send foreign aid money to governments, many of whom do not support the United States of America.

However, when the fortunes of this Nation's veterans are at stake, the majority always seems to play games. There is no need for this tax, and certainly it is not welcomed at a time when our economy is struggling. But unfortunately, the tax-and-spend folks are here at it again, and this is part of the largest tax increase in history.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has any more requests for time.

Mr. DREIER. Yes, we have a couple of speakers and then I am going to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Let me yield to my very good friend from Wichita, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and who has worked long and hard here, for 1 minute.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, Washington is broken and it needs to be changed. This rule is poorly devised and the underlying bill is poorly conceived. This bill did not go through the committee process, it is unprecedented and it violates the intent of the rules of the House.

Why is this important, Madam Speaker? Well, the American people would not allow the Democrat leadership to cancel the next election. The American people would not allow one person to determine who our next President is going to be; but on a smaller scale, that is exactly what has happened on this bill.

The Speaker of the House has determined what is in this bill, not the appropriate committee. An election was cancelled. There was no vote. The representatives of the people did not have a voice in this process. We did not have any committee hearings. This is not the democratic process. Washington is broken and it needs to be changed.

The rule accepts this violation of our own House rules, that's why I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule because Washington is broken and it needs to be changed. We have to change the process here because Washington is broken and it needs to be changed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I hope the House will forgive my laryngitis today.

Madam Speaker, I have just heard complaints from the minority side of the aisle about the process by which this proposal is being brought to us. This criticism about process comes from the same crowd that brought a $40 billion proposal to the floor 2 days after 9/11 without ever running that proposal through either the appropriations subcommittee or the Appropriations Committee. That criticism comes from the same crowd——

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. No. I didn't interrupt you. You always ask someone to yield in order to interrupt their train of thought. I would appreciate if you would stop doing that with me.

Mr. DREIER. That is not my goal, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls the time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, ahead of time, I will not yield to anyone until I have completed my statement.

This criticism on process comes from the same crowd that stood by and allowed 30 pages of unread material to be surreptitiously and anonymously slipped into a conference report on the defense bill after the conference report had completed action, language which insulated the drug industry from liability in cases where their products injured the health of customers.

This comes from the same crowd that several years ago blocked the ability of this House to vote on a single matter that had anything at all to do with the most significant domestic appropriation bill, the Labor-Health-Education bill. They simply wrapped it into other items and refused to allow the House to work its will on any piece of that proposal which had more than 500 programs which were insulated from House review.

This comes from the same crowd that brought three supplemental appropriation bills to the floor without running those bills through the Appropriations Committee or subcommittee.

Now they say that they want one vote on the package all put together. Well, let me tell you, what we are trying to do is to avoid Members having to look at everything in one package. What we are trying to do is to give them a straight up-or-down vote, a clean shot on the issue of whether you want to provide funding for the war or not. It is a procedurally neutral approach. If you want funding for the war, you vote ''yes'' and if you don't want it, you vote ''no.'' That way you can't hide on that issue. It stands out there alone, and people see where you stand.

We are also having a separate vote on whether or not we should impose conditions on the administration in exchange for the use of that money, straight up-or-down vote, clean shot at it, can't hide behind any other issue.

And thirdly, we are taking the administration's other requests and two priorities of our own and putting them together in a third amendment, again separate, not tied into a big package, out there so that Members can choose up or down whether they want to do that or not. I make no apology for that.

Now we are being lectured about the fact that this is a bloated bill. Out of all of the appropriated items in this bill, all but $2 billion are requested by the administration. Congress has the temerity to be asking to spend 1 percent of the appropriated amount in this bill. The rest the President takes ownership of.

Secondly, we are being told, Oh, it's terrible because we've taken a military bill and ''larded'' it up was the term that the gentleman from Janesville used, that we larded it up with unemployment compensation and with the expanded GI Bill. Well, I suppose additional unemployment compensation benefits may look like lard to a Member who makes $165,000 a year; but to people who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and have been out of work for 6 months, it doesn't look like lard to them; it looks like basic bread, and I think we should be ashamed of the fact that we haven't provided this sooner.

It also may look like lard to the gentleman from Janesville for us to say that we want to provide expanded education benefits to the GIs who fought this war. But I would remind every Member of this House, this is the first war in my knowledge where we have never had any sense of shared sacrifice. The only people in this society who are being asked to sacrifice are the veterans and the military families. They have been sent to Iraq and Afghanistan again and again and again, and we have the quaint idea that we ought to be able to take 6 percent of the cost of that war to date, 6 percent, and devote it to expanding education benefits for people who have sacrificed by wearing the uniform of the United States.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin 2 additional minutes.

Mr. OBEY. We pay for that by providing what the majority leader refers to as a patriots' premium, a one-half of 1 percent increase in taxes for the most fortunate people in this society who make more than a million bucks a year.

If you think that is even a close question, whether we ought to put the GIs before those fortunate folks, then it is no wonder you lost the seat in Mississippi 2 days ago.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me begin by apologizing to my friend from Wausau. The notion of engaging in debate on the House floor is something I feel strongly about, and I am always happy to yield to people when they make requests for me to yield. I was simply asking my friend to

yield because of the fact that the $40 billion post-9/11 supplemental about which my friend complained and referred to as ''this crowd'' came to this floor under unanimous consent, a bipartisan agreement.

And the three supplemental appropriations, Madam Speaker, about which my friend referred, never, never, denied a motion to recommit to the minority. And I ensured as chairman of the Rules Committee at that time the right of the minority would, in fact, be maintained.

Madam Speaker, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to my friend from Auburn, Washington, the former sheriff, DAVID REICHERT.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. Yesterday the Culberson-Reichert-Shays Iraqi reconstruction amendment was offered and subsequently ruled out of order before the Rules Committee.

The intent of this amendment was to allow for the recent gains in Iraq to continue and at the same time reduce the burden on American taxpayers. Since April 2003, United States taxpayers have spent more than $46 billion in reconstruction in Iraq.

This amendment would have allowed us to begin to reduce American taxpayer dollars going to Iraq for reconstruction. This amendment would have directed that U.S. taxpayer dollars going to Iraq, to come to Iraq in the form of a loan. It would have enabled the Iraqis to still have a steady flow of reconstruction funding should they be unable to draw down their own funds.

Now is the time, especially with skyrocketing oil prices, for the Iraqis to stand up and take responsibility for their own reconstruction. In order for the Iraqi Government to stand up their economy, they must take the responsibility, they must bear the costs for reconstruction of their own country, not the American taxpayer. I oppose this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I inquire, is the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee the final speaker for the majority?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say at the outset, and again the last thing I want to do is offend my friend from Wausau by asking him to yield at any point, but I would be happy to yield to him if he wants to respond to what I am about to say. And that is, the fact of the matter is we have in this Congress the single highest number of closed rules in the 219-year history of the Republic. Never before has this, has the United States Congress had such a period of closed rules. I will tell you, it is absolutely outrageous. Why, because we were promised something that was much, much different than that.

On a supplemental appropriations bill, my good friend, the chairman of the committee said, ''The majority leadership decide to obliterate the legislative process. They discarded a bipartisan committee product, and they threw in unrelated, partisan political items that characterized a full partisan agenda. They have taken abusive power to a new level.''

Madam Speaker, let me say that when we did that, we provided the minority a right to have a bite at the apple, a motion to recommit. They had an opportunity to offer a proposal. I will tell you it is just plain wrong to see what has been taking place here.

I am going to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question so I can amend the rule to simply give Republicans one simple bite at the apple, something we always guaranteed the now-majority.

Mr. LEWIS, the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, introduced a bill on Tuesday, H.R. 6062, a clean supplemental, to provide troop funding without strings and extraneous spending. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make in order an alternative motion to concur by Mr. LEWIS which would simply state that the House concurs in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of H.R. 6062. This way the House has the opportunity to send the Senate a clean supplemental to get our troops the money that they desperately need without the hocus-pocus, three-in-one vote political gamesmanship that we have before us at this moment.

□ 1130

It's simply the right thing for us to do to send that clean supplemental.

Madam Speaker, at this point I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the text of the extraneous material and the amendment included in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it's just one simple bite at the apple, something we always guaranteed the Democrats when we were in charge. It's one amendment. We're just trying to help the Democratic majority become the majority that they promised that they would be. It's not too late. Let them do it, Madam Speaker.

Vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, let me say to my colleagues, voting for this rule gives the President not only what he has asked for the funding of the troops, but allows the people in the House who oppose that to have an opportunity to vote ''no.''

We also note, in response to Mr. REICHERT, that it does have an orderly withdrawal of troops beginning in December 2009, ending in 18 months.

This is a well-crafted piece of legislation of which I am extremely proud. I urge everyone to vote for the bill and rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1197 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike section 2, re-designate section 3 as section 2, and add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. Prior to consideration of the motion specified in section 1, and without intervention of any point of order, it shall be in order for Representative LEWIS of California or his designee to offer the motion specified in section 4. Such motion shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. The motion referred to in section 4 is a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 with an amendment striking the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and inserting in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 6026 as introduced on May 13. 2008.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution ..... [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time, and I am pleased to move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1197, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5614, H.R. 406, and H.R. 5872.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bono Mack
Carnahan
Crenshaw
DeGette
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Hulshof
Larson (CT)
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Rush
Wynn

□ 1157

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 200, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)

Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—200

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Mack
Crenshaw
DeGette
Gerlach
Gillibrand
Hulshof
Larson (CT)
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Rush
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1205

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORIGINAL SAINT-GAUDENS DOUBLE EAGLE ULTRA-HIGH RELIEF PALLADIUM BULLION COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5614, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5614, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Boehner
Bono Mack
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
DeGette
Dingell
Edwards
Gerlach
Gillibrand
Hulshof
Kirk
Larson (CT)
Lewis (KY)
Loebsack
Mack
Myrick
Rush
Wynn