

I do not think we should be voting on this bill today until we have answers to those questions.

FIRST 100 DAYS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, in the first 100 days of Congress, my Republican colleagues and I have worked to make America safer. Since the tragic day of September 11 when our country suffered a painful blow to its heart, we have persevered to make sure every American feels secure and knows our freedom will always be protected.

We continue to take strides in the war on terror, here at home and abroad. Our country will not yield to our enemies who lack humanity and principle. As our selfless soldiers move forward and yield freedom and choice overseas, it is critical that they have the most up-to-date protective gear available. In the supplemental appropriations, we designated funding to do just that.

In the REAL ID Act, we implemented the 9/11 Commission's recommendations. By applying critical driver's license reforms and stringent border protection, we ensure that licenses cannot be used by terrorists as a gateway to travel documents, weapons or firearms.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a Nation, a great Nation of liberty. I am privileged as a new Member to vote for these important pieces of legislation protecting our homeland, and I look forward to what our majority will accomplish in the coming days.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we have a very stark example of what is dysfunctional about the Republican's running of this House. We have done nothing about the livable wage that we all believe in. We have done nothing about providing health insurance for the people in this country. Forty-five million have nothing. We have done nothing about the housing prices and problems in this country. We have done nothing about cleaning up the environment. In fact, we continue to be addicted to oil and all we do is pass a bill that gives more money to oil and to coal.

Now, we are not dealing with the problems of the American people. Instead today what we are doing is continuing to pursue the Bush war of folly in Iraq. He has spent \$200 billion of our money so far. He says, "Please give me another 80. I don't know what I'm going to do with it, but I'm going to keep spending it over there."

□ 1030

The electricity is not up in Iraq. The sewer system is not up in Iraq. The telephone system is not up in Iraq. He cannot fix it there or here.

This is a bad bill, and it ought to be voted against.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1268, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF ACT, 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 258 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 258

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1268) making Emergency Supplement Appropriations for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, on behalf of the Committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 748.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief Act, 2005. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and provides that the report shall be considered as read. Additionally, it authorizes the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 748.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1268, the emergency supplemental appropriation, is

intended to fully fund our forces overseas and at home. It helps to ensure the full funding of the important accounts which have been depleted during our global war on terror and our effort to assist the Iraqi and Afghan people in their efforts to establish functioning democracies in their countries.

Additionally, the bill includes important funding for Afghan reconstruction and counter-terrorism assistance, counternarcotics efforts, international food aid, and relief to address the terrible tragedies resulting from the massive tsunami that struck the Southwest Pacific and Indian Oceans in December of 2004.

Mr. Speaker, additionally, this rule provides important increases in coverage for the servicemembers' group life insurance and increases coverage for individual soldiers from \$250,000 to \$400,000. It also increases the one-time death benefit from \$12,000 to \$100,000. While neither of these benefits can ever replace the lives of brave American service personnel lost in action, they can assist their families through the hard times they will face while recovering from the loss of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 258 allows us to fully debate the important issues surrounding the war on terror. Just yesterday we saw on the front page of The Washington Post a graphic photograph that captured the terrible effects of the war on an innocent victim and the courage and compassion of the American soldiers who are engaged in the battle. We should keep this image in mind as we commence the debate on the conference report today. More than any words I could ever utter, that picture illustrates the nobility of our effort, the valor and decency of our soldiers, and the evil and fanaticism of our enemies.

Many may wish to raise policy issues in this debate. That is certainly appropriate. Others may want to discuss issues that, however important, are superfluous to the war on terrorism. Mr. Speaker, I believe in this discussion we should focus our remarks on what truly counts. We have committed 170,000 of our servicemen and -women to fight terrorism and advance the cause of freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan. We owe them our full support in the battles they wage on behalf of the American people and the cause of liberty. This rule and the underlying bill represent the efforts of Congress to keep that solemn commitment to the sons and daughters of America.

Mr. Speaker, to that end I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that supporting our young men and

women in uniform is a priority for each and every Member of this House. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, whether we have agreed with the Bush administration's reasons for going to war in Iraq or opposed them, we all want the United States to be successful in the Middle East.

We may disagree on how we overcome the challenges that lay before us, just as our Founding Fathers hoped and expected we would. But all of us here are patriots, and all of us come to the table with our best intentions in mind.

Our troops in uniform throughout Afghanistan and Iraq have consistently performed their duty with courage and great integrity. It is incumbent upon us here in the people's House to honor those sacrifices in the only real way we can, by providing leadership for this Nation that is as principled and as courageous as each of our fallen soldiers.

We have a responsibility to live up to their example and have the courage to perform our duty with integrity. We must insist on accountability and honesty in this government, and we, too, must always be accountable and honest.

But I fear that in this body, in this Congress, we have not risen to that challenge. Yesterday, while walking through the Senate halls, I saw a picture of Senator Harry Truman conducting a meeting of the Truman Commission, and under that picture there is a statement that says that the Truman Commission saved the taxpayers of the country millions of dollars during the Second World War by ferreting out waste and corruption in the American war effort. And let me remind my colleagues that Senator Truman was investigating his own administration.

The commission's purpose was to maximize every dollar we had to spend, to ferret out corruption and mismanagement, and to infuse a sense of accountability into the American war machine. By all accounts they were successful in their noble endeavor. Their good work saved many American lives by ensuring that our tax dollars were spent on where they needed to be spent, on winning the war. One more helmet, one more bullet, one more tank, it made the difference.

And yet we in this Congress do not have the courage to insist on the same level of accountability today that our forefathers saw fit to employ over 60 years ago.

When this same supplemental was brought before the House earlier this year, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) offered an amendment that would have established a select committee to follow up on a very disturbing report which had been released from the Inspector General's office. The report indicated that \$9 billion of money spent on Iraqi reconstruction was unaccounted for. And for those who are counting out there, that is 9,000 million dollars. We heard reports of payroll checks covering em-

ployees who did not exist and firms being compensated for providing security for flights that never took off. We even heard a report that a Pentagon contract for the development of bullet-proof armor was given to a former army researcher who never delivered a single piece of armor.

These types of incidents squander precious resources, waste time we do not have, and, worse, they place our American soldiers' lives at risk. But the majority in the House defeated our attempts to bring a measure of accountability into the process. And today, 9 months later, that \$9 billion is still missing and none of those incidents I have just mentioned have been investigated, none of them.

And still today we have no Truman Commission of our own to speak of and no language in this conference report that will create one. The question I have for my colleagues today is, why not? Surely the leadership of the House understands that missing \$9 billion of taxpayer money could benefit our troops had we the sense to go and look for it. And without any oversight commission to investigate and prevent the issues of taxpayer dollars by the Pentagon or some unscrupulous government contractors, how can we be sure that the \$82 billion check we are cutting today on behalf of the American taxpayers will actually reach its destination or be used to protect our troops in the line of fire? After all, it is our young men and women in uniform who pay the price for the inability of this body to enforce any standard of accountability.

But this is not the only failure of accountability we see here today. All one had to do was open a newspaper this morning and read that Dr. Ahmed Chalabi, who was honored by sitting there with the first lady in the State of the Union Address, has been named the deputy prime minister of the country and the acting oil minister in the provisional government in Iraq. Do I have to remind this House that just months ago Dr. Chalabi was under intense scrutiny for feeding the U.S. Government bad intelligence, which ultimately led us to invade Iraq? Do I have to remind my colleagues that just months ago Dr. Chalabi was suspected of passing U.S. intelligence to the Iranian Government? Can anyone possibly explain how this man has been allowed to accept such a high-ranking position in the Iraqi provisional government?

We know what should be in the bill: language to create a modern version of the Truman Commission so we can ensure that men like Chalabi do not undermine the war and reconstruction effort, place American soldiers at risk, and rob American taxpayers blind as we continue to pump more and more money into Iraq.

But now I want to touch on what should not be in the bill. The majority believes in instituting a national identification card program for the country, which is in the legislation. Cre-

ating a national identification card is serious business and could have profound implications for all Americans. It should be debated on the floor openly with opportunity for ample discussion and amendment. Instead, the leadership has shoved this extreme measure down our throats as part of the supplemental, knowing full well that many Members would never support the measure in its current form but will be forced to vote for it because we want to support our troops. That is not accountability; that is arrogance.

How dare they hide behind our men and women in uniform as the brave souls risk their lives every day to protect us from danger. How could the leadership of this body use them to protect themselves and their agenda from debate, from democracy, and accountability? This is just the latest example of misuse of power.

Members should be aware that the rule contains a section that authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to file a supplemental report on H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. Members may recall that during the markup of H.R. 748 in Committee on the Judiciary last month, five defeated Democrat amendments were included in the committee report with descriptions that blatantly and grossly mischaracterized the amendments. While the rule will provide for a supplemental report to be filed, it does not require or direct the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to apologize to the authors of the amendments, nor are we sure that it will never happen again.

So just as the leadership concedes the issue and recognizes action must be taken, they are still not accepting the responsibility. I am sure we are supposed to be grateful for this small token, but it would mean much more if those responsible for maligning our colleagues here in the House would accept the responsibility for their actions and fix the report.

I am going to support the conference report because I am supportive of my troops abroad, but it has to be noted that our brave men and women are being used as a tool to cover for the underhanded attempt to institute a national ID card, but also for last week's misguided use of power that maligned several of our colleagues. At the same time, they have failed to infuse the much-needed accountability into the process. This is not the principled leadership we owe the men and women the bill is supposed to protect. This is not courageous. We can do better. We owe our fighting men and women at least that much.

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

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

For the purpose of clarification, I want to quickly address the matter involving the supplemental report on H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion

Notification Act. The purpose of this supplemental report is to change the description of certain amendments considered during the committee markup and process. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has already prepared the supplemental report and shared its contents with the committee's ranking minority member.

I further understand that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is prepared to file a supplemental report immediately after the adoption of this resolution and also to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This supplemental report will be part of the official legislative history of the bill and will amend the descriptions contained in the original report.

This supplemental report responds directly to the questions of privilege raised by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), both of which call for the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary "to report to the House a supplement to House Report 109-51 that corrects the record by describing the five amendments with nonargumentative, objective captions." The text of the proposed supplemental report also includes additional dissenting views from the committee's ranking minority describing his disagreements with the interpretation of the amendments by the majority.

□ 1045

The filing of the supplemental report represents the regular order for correcting problems in earlier committee reports filed with the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, since September 11 of 2001, we have been a Nation at war. We are engaged in a worldwide war on terror, a battle against the forces of terror, terrorists who hate our freedoms, who hate democracy.

But the fact of the matter is that the forces of freedom are winning. We have liberated Afghanistan and brought democracy to that Nation for the first time in its history. Afghanistan has gone from a haven for terrorists to an ally in the War on Terror.

We have liberated Iraq. In January, we saw the dramatic results when the people of Iraq defied the terrorists and went to the polls to elect a new government. We saw another major step with the formation of a new democratic government in Iraq just the other day, and we have seen democratic movements break out in Lebanon. We have seen the Libyan government renounce terror and weapons of mass destruction, and we have seen the leaders of al Qaeda rounded up, including just yesterday, when the number three terrorist in that organization was captured in Pakistan.

Yes, war is difficult, but as we have found throughout our Nation's history, freedom is not free.

That is why we in Congress must take this step today and approve the emergency wartime supplemental. We have a responsibility to ensure that our men and women in uniform have the tools that they need to take the fight to the enemy, and we have an obligation to the families of those brave men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of freedom and security to ensure that they are cared for.

We have an obligation to the newly democratic allies that we have to ensure that they will survive and not revert to repression and to terror.

We have a responsibility to keep the heat on the terrorists. They can run and they can hide, but not forever.

For those who say that we are spending too much on this war, I would ask what price do you put on freedom and on security?

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and this measure. We owe our troops, our allies, and the American people no less.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I expect this conference report to pass overwhelmingly. I am troubled, however, that the conferees failed to include the provision sponsored by Senator BYRD urging Congress to fund operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through the normal budget process.

Our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan are no longer unforeseen expenses; they are known, and they are anticipated. They should be in this budget. This bill is nearly \$82 billion, bringing the total amount the President has received off-budget for Iraq and Afghanistan to nearly \$300 billion in just 2 years.

We cannot keep digging ourselves into this deficit hole. Unless our policy changes, and I hope it does, these operations are going to be long-term. And even though no one at the White House or the Pentagon is willing to admit it, everyone in this House knows it. We have to get this spending back into the regular budget process so that it is paid for and does not bankrupt the Federal budget for decades to come. We should be paying these costs like grownups, not passing them on to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am relieved that the conferees reinstated the President's ability to waive the restrictions on the economic aid for Palestine. I recently traveled to Israel and the Palestinian territory with our distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). It became clear to me that what we need out of

any agreement is not just a separate state for the Palestinians, but an economically viable State, where Palestinians can make a decent living, feed their kids, and live with dignity.

The House bill would have made it all but impossible for the U.S. to help create that kind of confidence in the future. At least now the President has some flexibility to show that the U.S. is willing to invest in a secure and dignified future for Palestinians and Israelis alike.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this supplemental, because I cannot support any more money for the policy in Iraq. Over 138,000 troops are serving in Iraq, and I was there over the recess and had the privilege of meeting some of them. These men and women are in Iraq because of lies, because of deceit, and half-truths, and they deserve better than more of the same.

I cannot support ever-increasing funding for the war in Iraq without a clear understanding from this administration about when and how it will bring our own troops home. I am tired of the spin, I am tired of the lack of accountability, and I am tired of the lack of candor. I believe the time to stand up and call for that kind of clarity is now.

Every Member of Congress, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, loves this country, supports our troops, and is doing everything possible to help military families make it through difficult times. This is not in question.

Our policy in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, is what is in question, and I, for one, simply cannot support it.

Mr. Speaker, I expect this conference report to pass overwhelmingly, but there are a number of issues in this bill that I find troubling.

First, I am troubled that the conferees failed to include the provision sponsored by Senator BYRD urging Congress to fund our military, security and reconstruction operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through the normal budget process.

Our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan are no longer unforeseen expenses; they are known and anticipated. They should be in the budget. This bill is nearly \$12 billion, bringing the total amount the President has received off-budget from the Congress for Iraq and Afghanistan to nearly \$300 billion in just two years.

Mr. Speaker, we can't keep digging ourselves into this deficit hole. Unless our policy changes—and I hope it does—these operations are going to be long term. And even though no one at the White House or the Pentagon is willing to admit it, everyone in this House knows it. We have to get this spending back into the regular budget process, back into the regular authorization and appropriations process, so that it is paid for and doesn't bankrupt the federal budget for decades to come.

We should be paying these costs like grown-ups—not passing them on to our children and grandchildren.

Second, I commend the conferees for providing funding to meet critical shortfalls in basic equipment for our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, especially for the Army, the Marines,

and our National Guard and Reservists. I just hope this time the funding works and the shortfalls are met. This is not the first time the Congress has specifically provided funding above and beyond the President's request for body armor, up-armored Humvees, trucks, radios, and the like. But somehow, this equipment never gets to the men and women whose lives are on the line. So I thank the conferees for their work on this matter, and I just hope this time the equipment gets to where it's needed most.

Third, I strongly support the increased life insurance and death benefit payments for our troops, including our Guard and Reservists. But, Mr. Speaker, we could have done this over a year ago when my colleague from Arizona, Mr. RENZI, and I succeeded in doubling the death gratuity and restoring its tax exempt status. We would have done more, but we were told at that time, in no uncertain terms by the Pentagon, that increasing the benefit to \$100,000 was unacceptable. So I am pleased to see this matter satisfactorily resolved.

Fourth, I am very disappointed that the conferees failed to include in the final conference report the Senate-approved amendment offered by Senator DURBIN to close the pay-gap for Federal employees who are National Guard and Reserve members and are now serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. Representatives LANTOS, GRAVES, SHAYS and I have introduced H.R. 838, the HOPE at HOME Act, which would help close the pay gap for all activated and deployed Guard and Reservists, including those who work for the Federal government. Senator DURBIN's provision focused solely on Federal employees, which is the largest employer of National Guard and Reservists, and cost only \$170 million over 5 years. Right, the Federal government praises those private sector employers that by their own choice do the right thing and make up the difference between a Guard or Reservist's civilian pay and their military pay. Rather than just praising others, I believe the Federal government should be a leader in closing the pay-gap, and I am angry that once again the Congress failed to take positive action on this matter.

Fifth, I am pleased that the conferees reinstated the president's ability to waive the restriction on the economic aid for Palestine. I recently had the privilege of traveling to Israel and the Palestinian territories with our distinguished Democratic Leader, Congresswoman PELOSI. It became clear to me that one of the most important things we need out of any peace agreement is not a separate state for the Palestinians, but an economically viable state. We need a Palestinian state where people can make a decent living, feed and care for their children, and live with dignity.

The House-passed bill would have made it all but impossible for the U.S. to help create that kind of confidence in the future. While the restrictions remain, at least now the president has the same flexibility to show that the United States is willing to invest in a secure and dignified future for Palestinians and Israelis alike.

And sixth, I strongly support the funding provided in this supplemental for the tsunami disaster relief and reconstruction, the international peacekeeping missions in Haiti and Darfur, Sudan, and for international food aid programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this supplemental for two major reasons. The first

is that it still contains the Real ID Act. The conferees did not increase the funding levels for border security, as they were instructed to do under the House-passed motion to instruct. Instead, the conferees have chosen to impose these highly restrictive, punitive measures that will burden our states and, I believe, fail to have any meaningful effect on stemming illegal immigration, but will do great harm to those immigrants fleeing persecution, regardless of how they come to our shores seeking protection.

But most importantly, I cannot support this supplemental because I cannot support any more money for the policy in Iraq. Over 138,000 American troops currently serve in Iraq. I had the privilege of meeting some of them when I was in Iraq during the Easter recess.

These men and women are in Iraq because of lies, deceit and half-truths. They deserve better than just more of the same.

I can no longer support ever-increasing funding for the war in Iraq without a clear understanding from this Administration about when and how it will bring our own troops home. I am tired of the spin. I am tired of the lack of accountability. I am tired of the lack of candor. I believe the time to stand up and call for that kind of clarity is now. For others of my colleagues, that time may come 2 years from now, or 4 years from now, or 6 years from now, or maybe never—but for me, the time is now.

Every Member of Congress, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, loves this country, supports our troops, and is trying to do everything possible to help military families make it through this difficult time. This is not in question.

Our policy in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, is what is in question. And I, for one, can simply not support it.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the emergency war supplemental, and I commend in particular the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and all the members of his committee, for masterful and disciplined work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last year I traveled to Iraq and Afghanistan to meet with troops and local leaders. I witnessed firsthand the challenges and opportunities they face, and I can tell my colleagues with conviction that heroes and a future of freedom are being forged every day in Iraq and Afghanistan. And while much work remains, I am more confident than ever in the justice and the ultimate success of our cause.

And, Mr. Speaker, I remain confident that we here in Congress must do our duty, demonstrating the idealism and the perseverance of the American people, stand with the men and women

serving in our Armed Forces, and speed the passage of this emergency supplemental bill without rancor or without delay.

The men and women who liberated Iraq and Afghanistan deserve our very best. They deserve the resources they need to get the job done and come home safe.

It was just this morning I received an e-mail from Dawn Heister, the courageous widow of Master Sergeant Mike Heister, who fell in Afghanistan along with four other Hoosiers just the day before Easter. The courage in her e-mail inspired and moved my wife and I to such an extent that I rise today and dedicate my humble efforts and my vote today in favor of this emergency war supplemental in the memory of Master Sergeant Mike Heister and his brave wife.

But just like our troops, the American people deserve the very best protection, and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the members of his committee, have succeeded in adding \$635 million in budgetary resources for increased border security and enforcement, and this also is a critical advance in the war on terror. The money, just like what we will invest in Iraq and Afghanistan, will help hire, train, and equip and support an additional complement of over 500 Border Patrol agents and relieve current facility overcrowding.

We also will provide resources for training. It will provide the Department of Homeland Security with additional resources to train and hire criminal investigators and immigration enforcement agents, recognizing that the 9/11 Commission concluded that for the terrorists, travel documents are every bit as powerful and important as weapons. This legislation will require all States to prove lawful presence in the United States if their driver's licenses are to be accepted as a form of identification as a travel document to a Federal official, including Federal officials working at airports for the Transportation Security Administration.

So I say, we are doing our part to provide for the common defense. We are standing with our soldiers abroad as they fight on the front lines of the war on terror. But this legislation also importantly and urgently speeds additional resources to the fight here at home, with its increased complement of support for border security and travel security.

I applaud, again, the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the House Committee on Appropriations for their disciplined and principled manner of approaching this legislation. I urge my colleagues to affirm their leadership with a yea vote, and I urge the passage of the emergency war supplemental.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Let me simply say that I intend to support this legislation when we actually get to it, but that does not mean I am happy with the contents of it.

There are clearly more than seven or eight items, major items that I find very problematic. But what I want to do at this time is to alert the House to the contents of the motion that we would make on the rule if the previous question is not adopted.

If the previous question is not adopted, we would be offering a request to establish a select committee such as the Truman Committee back in World War II to investigate and study the awarding and carrying out of government contracts to conduct activities in Afghanistan and Iraq. I would simply point out, all one has to do is to read the newspapers daily to understand how badly this is needed.

The Washington Post this morning has the most recent story: "Audit of Iraq Spending Spurs Criminal Probe," and then it talks about opening a criminal inquiry into millions of dollars missing in Iraq after auditors have uncovered indications of fraud and nearly \$100 million in reconstruction spending that could not be properly accounted for. The article goes on to say, the audit of U.S. funds found that the contract files were "unavailable, incomplete, inconsistent and unreliable." Other than that, they were terrific. And the article points out that as a result, auditors have said the U.S. Government may have trouble making a case against contractors who overbill or do not do what they are supposed to do.

Now, we have been virtually begging on bended knee to get this Congress to establish a committee with teeth to look into this problem. We met with no success. I would point out that stands in stark contrast to what happened in 1941 when then Senator Harry Truman became aware of similar stories, and he saw to it that a committee was created in the Congress to investigate that situation. That committee held 432 public hearings and 300 executive sessions and issued 51 reports and saved the taxpayers a load of money.

I would also point out, that was a case where a democratic Congress was investigating a democratic administration, and no great harm was done to the republic in the process. A lot of good was done.

So I just want to urge Members to vote against the rule because, in my mind, this Congress is derelict in its duty and, in my mind, any Member of Congress who refuses to recognize how the taxpayers' dollars are being siphoned off every day by these operations, by these sloppy operations in Iraq, they are contributing to the fact that the taxpayers are being fleeced. They may not be wanting to do that, but that is the practical effect of their actions.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later, we are going to have this committee, because we are going

to be stuck in Iraq for another 5 years, and we are going to see stories like this headline every week. It is about time we got around to setting up a cleanup brigade to deal with the problem before we are all acutely embarrassed by it.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that while I would urge support for the underlying bill, I would urge that the rule not be supported until we have had an opportunity for this House to meet its oversight responsibilities. We ought to be acting like a watchdog in this case. Instead, we are acting like puppy dogs. That is not going to help the taxpayer very much.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of not only this rule, but the conference report as well. I want to congratulate my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), and I know we are going to be hearing from the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) in just a few minutes some very thoughtful remarks.

But I want to begin by saying that this is the first supplemental appropriations bill that our very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has brought to the House floor. And I take my hat off to him, as I know both Democrats and Republicans will, for the phenomenal job that he is doing as the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill is one which encompasses, as we all know, the very important aspect of ensuring that our men and women in uniform, as we are in the midst of the war on terror, including Iraq, have what they need. It also is focused on ensuring that we provide some relief to those who were hit so badly by the tsunami that took place at the end of last year. This also is, Mr. Speaker, a very great testament to the commitment that was made by the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) last fall.

□ 1100

I had the privilege of serving with a number of our colleagues as a conferee on the intelligence reform package, the implementation of the recommendations from the 9/11 Commission.

And we know that border security is a very important aspect of that. Those of us who were House conferees on the Republican side pushed very hard to make sure that we could deal with the driver's license issue, the asylum issue, and the effort to close the 3½-mile gap in the border fence which has been discussed here many, many times.

We had an amendment that was offered by our then former colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. Ose),

to complete that 3½-mile gap. We worked very hard to ensure that when it came to the issues of driver's licenses, that we did not impose a mandate on the States. We simply said to the States, as is included in this measure, that if a State chooses to give driver's licenses to people who are here illegally, then those driver's licenses cannot be used for any Federal purpose: getting on board an aircraft, going into a Federal courthouse, applying for any Federal program.

So States are still free to do whatever they would like; but this provision is addressed, I think, very adequately, focusing on our security. Well, these issues that we discussed and tried to include in the 9/11 Conference last fall unfortunately were not able to be included because our colleagues in the other body chose to resist. And we had a commitment from Speaker HASTERT that the first must-pass piece of legislation would include the very important border security items which are so important for us.

And I am happy to say that Speaker HASTERT and Chairman LEWIS have included these provisions. I also wanted to compliment President Bush who has strongly supported the effort to include the Real ID Act in this measure. This is a very important first step towards dealing with the issue of border security. I am pleased, we are planning next week to hold hearings on H.R. 98, our goal of putting into place a counterfeit-proof social security card, so that we can also play a role in diminishing that magnet which draws people illegally across the border; and in so doing, we can allow the Border Patrol to focus their attention on the potential terrorist threat coming across our borders and other criminals.

And so we have got very important things that we are doing. No one knows whether this is a panacea. It is still a problem with which we have to contend, but the measures that are included in this supplemental appropriations bill are critical to dealing with that challenge that we face.

I thank my friends for their hard work on this. I generally congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and all who have been involved on both sides of the aisle in implementation of this important measure.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could give my full congratulations. I appreciate the leadership of our members of the Appropriations Committee; but might I say, Mr. Speaker, that there are a lot of Achilles heels in this particular legislation.

I will quickly say that my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), talks about security.

And, frankly, this bill and the President's mark and budget cuts border security in half, cuts the ICE officers in half. So, really, there is no border security in this bill.

And then they try to patchwork immigration. Today I am going to introduce the Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act that really confronts the question that Americans are concerned about, getting in front of the immigration concern and not behind it.

The Real ID bill takes away Americans' rights, denies asylees the opportunity to come into this country where for years we have brought those that have been mutilated and raped. It is not a bill that confronts the values of America.

And then, of course, it is a back-door way to correct the abuse that was rendered in the Committee on the Judiciary characterizing Members' amendments that dealt with protecting children and providing rights to clergy and grandparents as having to do with a criminal act. There is no response to that, other than a back-door opportunity to clarify the Record.

Where is the apology? Why were these amendments mischaracterized in the first place? Particularly since the same amendments, dealing with clergy, dealing with taxicab drivers, dealing with grandparents and aunts and uncles, providing teenagers that opportunity to consult with them, were also in 2002, and never characterized as wrongly as they were characterized now.

This is a wool-over-your-eyes. Unfortunately, the tragedy in Iraq continues to grow, now almost 160 people killed in the last 4 days. When is the administration going to speak to the issue of a solution in Iraq. This bill does not answer the question.

Certainly we support our troops. We wish for them the best. These moneys are necessary, but they are clouded with a lot of baggage that does not help the American troops. This is a "no" on the rule, and this certainly is worthy of consideration of this appropriation that does not answer the concerns of Americans. While our soldiers are fighting, Rome is burning. This is a bad bill, and it is a bad rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Rule in H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, The Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief for 2005 purports to do and I thank the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for what Section 2 of the rule proposes to do. For Representative NADLER, Representative SCOTT, Ranking Member CONYERS, and me, Section 2 of this rule represents an effort to appease aggrieved Members of Congress. The cure is not complete, and I plan to offer a point of personal privilege to highlight this unfortunate action by the majority next week.

SECTION 2 OF H. RES. 258

Section 2 of the rule provides that "The Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, on behalf of the Committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 748." While I thank the Gentleman from Wis-

consin for his effort, unfortunately, this language is neither hortatory nor fully protective of the privileges offered by House Report 109-51.

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON RULE H. RES. 258

Mr. Speaker, we must include in the underlying conference report a concurrent resolution adding the Tierney-Leach accountability amendment.

The Tierney-Leach accountability amendment would create a Select Congressional Committee—based on the Truman Committee that existed from 1941 to 1948 during World War II—to investigate and study the awarding and carrying out of Government contracts to conduct military and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We must look to our history, Mr. Speaker, and look to the Truman Select Committee as a precedent for a select committee to investigate government contracting during wartime. In 1941, with the United States engaged in a major military build-up as part of World War II, Senator Harry Truman (D-MO) became aware of widespread stories of contractor mismanagement in military contracts. Senator Truman rightly called upon Congress to create a select committee to study and investigate contracting, which Congress did on March 1, 1941. From its creation in 1941 until it expired in 1948, the Truman Committee held 432 public hearings and 300 executive sessions, went on hundreds of fact-finding missions, and issued 51 reports. Throughout, the Truman Committee earned high marks for its thoroughness and efficiency and ensured that taxpayer dollars were being well-spent.

There is ample evidence of the necessity of a modern-day Truman Committee. Since 2003, numerous questions have arisen about U.S. government contracting in Iraq. From the start of our involvement in Iraq, questions have arisen about how contracts have been awarded, the size of those contracts, the quality of contractor work, and the use of taxpayers dollars.

Since 2003, there have been many examples of the misuse of American taxpayer dollars in Iraqi contracting. Nearly \$9 billion of money spent on Iraqi reconstruction is unaccounted for because of inefficiencies and bad management, according to the Special Inspector General for the Iraqi Reconstruction. In one case, the Inspector General raised the possibility that thousands of "ghost employees" were on an unnamed ministry's payroll. Furthermore, a government contractor defrauded the Coalition Provisional Authority of tens of millions of dollars in Iraq reconstruction funds and little is being done to try to recover the money, according to the reports of whistleblowers. For example, the firm was paid \$15 million to provide security for civilian flights into Baghdad even though no planes flew during the term of the contract.

Ensuring vigilant oversight of taxpayer dollars should not be a partisan issue. Vigilant congressional oversight of large sums during wartime should not be a partisan issue. The Truman Committee was created at a time when Democrats controlled the White House, the House and the Senate. A Democratic Congress was demanding careful oversight of a Democratic Administration. Democrats are pleased that this select committee is being co-sponsored by a Democrat and a Republican—Rep. TIERNEY and Rep. LEACH.

We owe it to American taxpayers to oversee how taxpayer dollars are being spent. Billions

are being spent in Iraq and Afghanistan. Indeed, according to CRS, this \$81.3 billion supplemental appropriations bill being considered by the House is in addition to the \$201 billion that the Department of Defense has received, since the 9/11 attacks, for soldiers deployed or supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. What is in question is how taxpayer dollars are being spent, whether taxpayers are getting their money's worth, and whether the high-quality equipment and services that warfighters deserve and require are being delivered. A new Truman Committee would allow us to get the facts on U.S. contracting in both military and reconstruction activities and to fix whatever problems exist.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule for the emergency supplemental appropriations act and the underlying bill.

In addition to the needed funds to sustain military operations and reconstruction efforts in the Middle East, this legislation contains two key provisions that I would like to highlight. The first is language that ensures that funds in the bill will not be used to cancel the multiyear contract for C-130J procurement.

Currently more than half the fleet of combat-ready C-130s is over 30 years old. Although their longevity is clearly a testament to the value of these critical aircraft, we should be very concerned that the C-130E and H models continue to age at alarming rates, putting our tactical airlift capability at risk in the near term.

In fact, several weeks ago, the Air Force announced that they are grounding much of the C-130E models because of severe fatigue in their wings, including a dozen that have been flying missions in and out of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, some of these planes were used in Vietnam, and we are literally flying their wings off in the Middle East. The Air Force has long anticipated the aging of the older models, which only makes it more remarkable that the multiyear contract to replace these planes has been carved out of the 2006 budget.

Mr. Speaker, because of the growing problem that the Air Force faces in its tactical airlift program, I support the C-130J language, and I would like to express my sincere thanks to the appropriations chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and the conferees for retaining this language.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the conferees for protecting the Real ID provisions of H.R. 1268. As our Rules Committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), just mentioned, this would establish and rapidly implement voluntarily regulations for State driver's licenses and identification document security standards.

It would increase the burden of proof of claiming asylum. It would synchronize terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, and also facilitate the completion of the San Diego border fence.

These provisions were recommended by the 9/11 Commission, bipartisan, 10 members; and they are important for securing our borders from illegal entry and possible terrorist activity. Our immigration laws are in need of reform, and I believe these provisions are a positive step in the right direction.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am sad that a bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) worked so hard on, which contains \$82 billion, would still be more an example of how not to do business.

First of all, it is a testimony to the lack of planning on behalf of this administration for conducting the war in Iraq. They still could not give us, after 3 years of planning and activity, could not give a reasonable number in advance, to be able to budget properly, instead of putting together a supplemental effort.

It continues to give, in my judgment, too much money to the wrong people to do the wrong things. And we have been slow to, despite the attention of this Congress, the lavish amount of money and expressions of concern by individual Members to protect our troops, we have still been slow to meet their needs on simple things like arming their vehicles.

But one of the worst things for me in this supplemental is that we have grafted onto it the Real ID Act. This element that we debated here contains what I think is the worst single example of legislative precedent in the 10 years that I have been here, where in order to deal with a 3½ mile gap in constructing a fence. For 10 years Congress and the administration has been willing to provide waivers for specific problems, where two administrations have been circling it, where rather than deal with the specifics and solve the problem, this legislation incorporates section 102 which waives all rules and regulations along not just this 3½ mile gap, but along the entire 7,514 border with Canada and with Mexico.

It is not just an environmental problem. It waives all rules, all regulations, all Federal standards for an indeterminate width along 7,500 miles, and vests it in the hands of the Homeland Security Department, hardly a paragon of efficiency and sensitivity.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge my colleagues to take a hard look at this. You do not want to establish a precedent like this in Federal legislation.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my good friend.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this supplemental bill is a good bill. I was privileged to go with my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), to Iraq. We visited with the troops. And some of the troops indicated that they got the satellite transmissions, some of the news. They had heard some of our friends on the other side of the aisle saying they were wasting their lives. They had heard some of newscasters saying that they were wasting lives.

But they said after the election they knew why they were there: they were setting a historical precedent in the cradle of civilization. They were doing good and they knew it, and they know it today. And we owe it to our troops to make sure that they have everything they need to make Iraq, or give them the opportunity to create that democracy.

In talking to Sunnis, the Sunnis were upset with their leadership that told them not to vote. They said, please, if you would just stand behind the Iraqi police and armed services to make sure we get one more chance to vote. One former general under Saddam Hussein said, if you will do that, I believe you will see 95 percent of the violence in Iraq go away.

Folks, this is historic, what we have undertaken; and it does not just help Iraq. It deals with terrorism around the world. It sends that message. It has already sent shivers throughout the Middle East, and it has helped us right here in America. That is why we are doing it. So we need to support that.

Also, I want to address one other thing that has been brought up. I have heard people on television, I have heard colleagues across the aisle, some folks I have great respect for, indicating that there is nothing in the Real ID bill that would have changed anything on 9/11.

And I have respect for some of these people that I have heard say that, and I wish that they would read the bill instead of just relying on talking points or something from the leadership. Because, if you look, under evidence of lawful status, which is required in order to have a driver's license that will be an acceptable form of identification to get on an airplane, it says, you cannot use a driver's license if it does not come from a State that makes sure you are in lawful status.

And if you are in a temporary status, it must be a temporary driver's license that says on there the same date your permit to be in this country expires. If we had had that in place on 9/11, then every one of the hijackers would have tried to get onboard an airplane with an invalid, out-of-date driver's license, and should have been stopped.

Folks, this goes in a number of directions, all coming together to help with the fight against terrorism. It would have helped on 9/11; it will help prevent 9/11s in the future. I would encourage everyone to support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond to the previous speaker and to remind him that the hijackers, many of them, had driver's licenses from the State of Virginia, and others had visas and passports. So I do not think this national ID card would have stopped them.

□ 1115

Also, if he is referring to Members on our side saying that we are not safer than we were on 9/11, I would report that was a government report saying that TSA has made us no safer than it was before.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the supplemental. I do believe that we need to provide our troops with the tools and the resources that they need to do their job safely and effectively.

I have had an opportunity on two separate occasions now, Mr. Speaker, to travel to Iraq to visit our troops in the field, and nothing has made me feel prouder to be an American than seeing our troops in action. They are well trained. They are well motivated. They are the best that we have to offer. I know we all hope and pray for the safety of their mission and their safe return home to be reunited with their families.

I also want to commend the troops and the families of the 1158 Transportation Unit and the 128 Infantry Guard Unit in western Wisconsin that are currently serving in the Iraq theater right now.

But I do have some concerns in regard to the supplemental. I do believe that we owe a higher responsibility to our troops and their families and our taxpayers by supporting more oversight and accountability in this bill, such as the creation of a Truman Commission that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) has been advocating for some time. We need more accountability on how the money is being used or misused in Iraq right now. We need to fix that.

I also have a concern that we are not paying for anything. It is awfully easy to come to the House floor and puff ourselves up and claim that we are supportive of the troops, we are doing all of these nice things for them and the families when we do not have the responsibility to pay for it. \$82 billion today, well over \$300 billion and counting, all deficit financing and we are mortgaging our children's and grandchildren's future. This is exactly why the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and I offered an amendment to strip funding for the creation of an embassy in Iraq, not because we do not agree that one is necessary, but because we wanted to make the point

that that is not an emergency item. None of this is unexpected emergency circumstances, and, therefore, we need to start budgeting and practice fiscal responsibility again. Miraculously, the embassy is back in this bill, another \$600 million, none of it paid for.

Finally, I am concerned that there is no objective criteria to measure progress in Iraq. During the Second World War, you could pretty much put pins on maps and see the progress of the front lines. You could do that in Korea. In Vietnam, we had body counts that did not work very well, nor was it an appropriate measure to use. Today we have no objective criteria for us to understand whether we are succeeding and making progress there. I think that's one of the reasons why public support is dropping. I think we need to get some type of criteria for ourselves, for the troops, for their families and for the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly respond to a couple of points that my good friend made. First, I would remind him that we did not pay for World War II or Korea or Vietnam out of current revenue. It is not unusual to finance wars in this particular fashion.

Second, as to the point on the embassy, I have been to Iraq four times and have met with our folks there and, frankly, I think they deserve the very best protection they can get as quick as we can get it. They are every bit as much at risk as people that wear the uniform of the United States. They are all volunteers. They have done a wonderful job representing our country. They deserve and need a safe place to operate out of. I am very glad that that particular measure was put back in during conference.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) to respond.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's comments, but just to correct the historical record, you may recall in the 1960s, President Johnson did decide to pay for the war. There were some tax increases in order to support the ongoing military operation. It can be done. It should be done in this instance as well. We have been there for a couple years now. We are going to be there in future years. We need to start paying for this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

Let me say as President Reagan used to say, Here we go again. Another supplemental spending bill for the war in Iraq and why?

Because time and time again, the Republicans refuse to spend one cent for this war in their sham budget, a budget

every Democrat opposed this year and last year; because we need these so-called off budget bills to cover up the exploding deficits the Republicans have given, not to us, but to our children and grandchildren totaling \$27,000 for every American.

We are going to need a death tax relief just to pay for the birth tax that our children and grandchildren will have to pay.

To add insult to injury, the Republicans have added to this must-pass spending bill for our troops the REAL ID Act. These provisions, which are supposed to make our country more secure, will do nothing but place more anti-immigrant restrictions making it harder for honest people fleeing religious prosecution from entering our country, and added a \$100 million unfunded mandate onto our States. If this were in place, it would not have prevented the attacks of 9/11. That is purely false.

The 9/11 Commission has said they are unwarranted. It was added by the right wing extremist from the Republican conference. This legislation, which, again, the 9/11 Commission has called "unwarranted," was added by the right wing extremists in the Republican caucus whose joy in bashing immigrants is exceeded only by their zest for tax cuts for the wealthy in this country.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose any rule that does not allow for consideration of an amendment to investigate the government contracts with regard to our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This supplemental that we are talking about under the rule is \$82 billion in additional spending, bringing it to almost \$300 billion for spending on combat operations, occupation and support for our military personnel.

Congress rightfully is trying to meet its operational and technical and equipment needs of our troops. But it also has to ensure that these funds are properly managed and that they are monitored, and in that regard, we have been largely silent in this Congress.

We should make no mistake about it, there is more than enough reasons to be careful and to scrutinize the procurement process. The Center for Strategic and International Studies made an analysis and said as little as 27 cents of every dollar spent on Iraqi reconstruction has actually filtered down to projects benefiting Iraqis.

Taxpayers for Common Sense cited a KPMG study. It said that the Commander's Emergency Response Program, which is a program designed to

allow U.S. military officers to quickly fund small reconstruction projects, maintain little documentation on how tax dollars were spent: 42 cases worth, \$13 billion, where there were no contracts on file; 142 cases totaling \$40 million, where there was no proof that the work was even done.

These are only a few of the examples. We have a situation where it is reported by BBC News that Transparency International warns that post-war Iraq reconstruction is in danger of becoming the biggest corruption scandal in history. They said there is evidence of high levels of corruption in post-war Iraq, and it is critical of the United States' handling of reconstruction programs. And they said they favor a small number of large firms who they awarded public contracts, and they were all too secretive.

We have report after report of Halliburton and other corporations not having enough oversight. The Wall Street Journal reports that the Pentagon auditors are questioning \$212 million that Halliburton company billed Washington to deliver fuel to Iraq saying that it may well constitute overbilling. This criticism continues to go on about sole-source contracts and other issues that ought to be explored.

We can have substantive differences about the merits of the way we are conducting military policy. But there ought to be unanimous agreement in this Congress ensuring our role that taxpayer dollars are effectively and judiciously spent.

We should establish a select committee. That is why the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and I filed a Truman Commission measure that should be included as an amendment to this bill. It would put a select committee to study, among other things, the bidding, the contracting, the auditing standards, and issuance of government contracts, the oversight procedures, and the forms of payment and safeguards against money laundering, the accountability of contractors and government officials involved in procurement, and the allocation of contracts to foreign companies and small businesses.

Yes, we modelled it after the original Truman Commission. In 1941, that Truman Committee saved about \$15 billion in taxpayer money; 432 public hearings; 1,800 witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to have oversight done by this body. It is our job to do it. It is demanded by it. We should craft a rule that protects this amendment and ensures the public resources are safeguarded.

The Truman Committee was also unanimously respected for its focus on fact-finding and its refusal to succumb to partisan considerations. Mr. LEACH and I share that view and believe that congressional oversight of these huge sums should not be a partisan issue. Critics may say that there is no need to create

a select committee when Congress has standing committees to perform this role. Regrettably, those standing committees have not vigorously exercised their institutional oversight role. While Mr. SHAYS's Subcommittee on National Security has attempted to draw attention to this issue, the full Government Reform Committee has convened only four hearings on the Iraq contracting process.

Similarly, the House Armed Services Committee touched on this issue during a June 2004 Readiness Subcommittee hearing, however—beyond that—they have not pursued the issue. To that point, highlighting the need for such a select committee, the Ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON, has co-sponsored the bill from which this amendment is based.

Critics may disqualify this amendment on a technicality, suggesting it authorizes an appropriations bill. To that, I would respectfully point out that there are other provisions of this bill—some of which strengthen the underlying text—that include authorizing language.

I would ask that this Committee craft a rule that protects this amendment and ensures that our ever-scarce public resources will be safeguarded.

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

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time and for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as the daughter of a veteran, I want to first express my profound respect for our brave men and women serving in Iraq, but we are not helping these brave troops if we blindly sign yet another blank check for this unjust and unnecessary war in Iraq.

This \$82 billion supplemental would bring the total war spending to over \$300 billion. How can we sign off on another \$82 billion check when the Bush administration has failed to provide the proper accounting of where the taxpayer money is going? How can we sign off on this check when our own government reported yesterday that another \$100 million cannot be accounted for?

This is on top of the \$9 billion from last year that is still missing. How can we sign this check if the Bush administration has offered no plan to bring our troops home?

Furthermore, are we safer today than we were before this unnecessary war started? Iraq is now a breeding ground for terrorists. We are less safe as a result of this war. Members know and I know. Before the invasion of Iraq, there was no connection between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden. Still, this administration would have us also believe that adding the unrelated anti-immigrant provisions to this supplemental bill would make us safer, but the fact is REAL ID will do nothing to make us safe.

This administration has much to account for. They are cutting Section 8 for our seniors and our poor. They are cutting the budget for housing for people living with AIDS. They are cutting

housing for the disabled. They are cutting Medicaid. When you look at \$13.5 billion over the next 5 years for our veterans, they are cutting that. They are making the least of these pay for this war. That is wrong.

This is a whole new level of immorality that I have ever seen. This distortion of the facts with regard to Iraq and the fact that they told us that weapons of mass destruction were there, we know that is not the case. We know that. You know that. Yet another \$82 billion to fund this war that has not made this country any safer. It has made us less safe.

When you look at what is happening in our own country, when you look at health care, when you look at the people out there in the street that are suffering, why do they have to pay for this war? I ask for a no vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to respond to some of the points my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) made.

Not helping our soldiers? A blank check? This bill is anything but a blank check. Let me read a couple of things in here. Just running down operations and maintenance, Navy, \$3.4 billion; operations and maintenance, Marine Corps. There is line after line of great specificity my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was very careful in crafting a bill that will meet the needs of our personnel.

The immoral thing to do would be to commit 170,000 people to combat and not resupply them and not reequip them and not give them the things they need on a daily basis to not only be successful, but to provide for their own safety and security.

It is very legitimate to debate the war. Although I remind my good friend on the other side of the aisle, this body and the other body vote on a bipartisan basis to make the commitment in Iraq. I could read off name after name, including the distinguished nominee from the other body, of my friends on the other side of the aisle, a candidate for President last time, who voted in favor of this particular contest.

Having made that decision, once we place people on the line under fire and in danger, we owe it to them to provide them what they need. We can continue to debate policy. That is a very legitimate point, but I think it would be the height of folly and irresponsibility to not fund people when they are in the field in action. Frankly, it would send the wrong signal to our adversaries, and more importantly, the wrong signal to our own men and women and their families. And not to support the rule, and certainly not to support the supplemental appropriations, I believe, would be a grave and terrible mistake for this country.

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

□ 1130

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from my colleague if he is ready to yield back, then I will close.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I certainly am prepared.

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

I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule to instruct the enrolling clerk to make an important addition to the conference report.

This addition will establish a select committee to investigate the awarding and carrying out of war-related contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Nearly \$9 billion of money spent on the Iraq reconstruction is unaccounted for because of inefficiencies and bad management, according to the Special Inspector General for the Iraqi Reconstruction. Ensuring vigilant oversight of taxpayer dollars should not be a partisan issue.

I want to stress that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the emergency supplemental report. A "no" vote will simply allow the House to create a much-needed select committee to investigate government contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

A "yes" vote on the previous question will prevent the House from establishing this important select committee.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The 9/11 Commission was constituted in order to tell the American public what we could do to avoid or stave off another attack like the one that occurred on 9/11. I rise in support of this rule taking up the conference report because I think the components that we have included, recommended by the 9/11 Commission, are vital for the purpose of national security for the United States.

Let us look at the consequences of the 19 hijackers who, by violating procedures with respect to identification, were able to shop from State to State, from California to Virginia to Florida, and obtain between them over 60 different types of IDs. I will remind the body that in terms of the aliases used

just by those 19 individuals, they used 364 aliases between them. So as a consequence, it was virtually impossible for authorities to follow or detect as they changed their identities, as they used these documents in order to rent cars, as they used these documents in order to take flight training lessons, to learn how to fly here in the United States, as they used these fraudulent documents even to board airplanes and crash them into the Twin Towers and into the Pentagon. We have to ask ourselves is there something we, as an institution, could do to make certain that this did not occur again?

The 9/11 Commission has laid out a strategy for a secure identification system, and basically what we are talking about is simply minimum standards so that all States know the rudimentary requirements to make certain that people are who they say they are. Because the 9/11 hijackers abused the process and went from State to State, we know for a fact that we need minimum standards.

We know that it only makes sense that when Mohamed Atta was given a visa that was valid for only 6 months but could use it to obtain a driver's license that was valid for 6 years, that, in fact, we were not tailoring our laws to fit our national security concerns.

There are other provisions as well, the reform of amnesty, the completion of the border fence, the expedited approval. But as we look at the border security issue with respect to completion of the border fence, I talked to a border agent who had stopped an individual originally from Kyrgyzstan who had trained in Afghanistan, who had trained there in Jihad, at the fence. What this particular border guard told me was that there is a 3-mile gap in that triple barrier fence, and it was within that area of that gap that this individual tried to come into the U.S. and was apprehended and returned.

I think we need to give our border security personnel the assets that they have requested. We need to help them do their job, and the completion of this triple barrier fence will achieve that objective because it is in the interest of national security.

I think it is proper we bring it up and include it in this bill.

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

Let me take the time I have remaining to just say that we are not doing what the 9/11 Commission asked. They wanted us to negotiate with our States on whether they wanted to do this or not; and what we have done is impose upon the States, without any hearings or any discussion with them, from top down, an unfunded mandate requiring them to change their driver's license at our whim. So this is not that at all. We are, in fact, undoing what the 9/11 Commission said.

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

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

In closing, I would like to say that I believe we have had a good debate on the rule today. I believe the importance and timeliness of this legislation could not be more self-evident. This bill has been carefully crafted and worked in a way to ensure that our service men and women receive the best supplies and equipment when they go to war and that those supplies and equipment are replenished and replaced in a timely fashion.

Finally, I would ask Members to recall that this is a vote about our willingness to support our service men and women, not about other policy issues. The men and women serving our cause in Iraq ask for nothing more. In good conscience, we should give them nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 258—RULE ON CONFERENCE REPORT FOR H. R. 1268 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF ACT, 2005

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

“That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1268) making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, on behalf of the Committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 748.

SEC. 3. (a) A concurrent resolution specified in subsection (b) is hereby adopted.

(b) The concurrent resolution referred to in subsection (a) is a concurrent resolution

(1) which has no preamble;

(2) the title of which is as follows: “Providing for Corrections to the Enrollment of the Conference Report on the bill H.R. 1268”; and

(3) the text of which is as follows:

At the end of the (conference report) bill add the following new title:

TITLE —

SEC. 1. There is hereby created a select committee on the model of the Truman Committee to investigate the awarding and carrying out of contracts to conduct activities in Afghanistan and Iraq and to fight the war on terrorism (hereinafter referred to as the “select committee”).

SEC. 2. The select committee is to be composed of 15 members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker (of whom 7 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader), one of whom shall be designated as chairman from the majority party and one of whom shall be designated ranking member from the minority party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The select committee shall conduct an ongoing study and investigation of the awarding and carrying out of contracts by the Government to conduct activities in Afghanistan and Iraq and to fight the war on terrorism and make such recommendations

to the House as the select committee deems appropriate regarding the following matters:

- (1) bidding, contracting, and auditing standards in the issuance of Government contracts;
- (2) oversight procedures;
- (3) forms of payment and safeguards against money laundering;
- (4) accountability of contractors and Government officials involved in procurement;
- (5) penalties for violations of law and abuses in the awarding and carrying out of Government contracts;
- (6) subcontracting under large, comprehensive contracts;
- (7) inclusion and utilization of small businesses, through subcontracts or otherwise; and
- (8) such other matters as the select committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. (a) Quorum—One-third of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business except for the reporting of the results of its study and investigation (with its recommendations) or the authorization of subpoenas, which shall require a majority of the committee to be actually present, except that the select committee may designate a lesser number, but not less than two, as a quorum for the purpose of holding hearings to take testimony and receive evidence.

(b) POWERS.—For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the select committee may sit and act during the present Congress at any time and place within the United States or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and hold such hearings as it considers necessary and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, the furnishing of information by interrogatory, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other things and information of any kind as it deems necessary, including relevant classified materials.

(c) Issuance of Subpoenas—A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the select committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman or by any member designated by the select committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. Subpoenas shall be issued under the seal of the House and attested by the Clerk. The select committee may request investigations, reports, and other assistance from any agency of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government.

(d) Meetings—The chairman, or in his absence a member designated by the chairman, shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the select committee. All meetings and hearings of the select committee shall be conducted in open session, unless a majority of members of the select committee voting, there being in attendance the requisite number required for the purpose of hearings to take testimony, vote to close a meeting or hearing.

(e) Applicabilities of Rules of the House—The Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to standing committees shall govern the select committee where not inconsistent with this resolution.

(f) Written Committees Rules—The select committee shall adopt additional written rules, which shall be public, to govern its procedures, which shall not be inconsistent with this resolution or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. (a) Appointment of Staff—The select committee staff shall be appointed, and

may be removed, by the chairman and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the chairman.

(b) Powers of Ranking Minority Member—All staff provided to the minority party members of the select committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(c) Compensation—The chairman shall fix the compensation of all staff of the select committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff, within the budget approved for such purposes for the select committee.

(d) Reimbursement of Expenses—The select committee may reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the their functions for the select committee.

(e) Payment of Expenses—There shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the select committee. Such payments shall be made on vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration. Amounts made available under this subsection shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. The select committee shall from time to time report to the House the results of its study and investigation, with its recommendations. Any report made by the select committee when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House. Any report made by the select committee shall be referred to the committee or committees that have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the report.

SEC. 6. None of the unobligated or unexpended funds available for public affairs activities within the Office of the Secretary of Defense under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be obligated or expanded until the requirements to transmit reports under section 9010 and 9012 of P.L. 108-287 are met.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 196, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Nussle
Akin	Gillmor	Osborne
Alexander	Gingrey	Otter
Bachus	Gohmert	Oxley
Baker	Goode	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Pence
Barton (TX)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Green (WI)	Petri
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pickering
Biggert	Hall	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harris	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Pombo
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Blunt	Hayes	Price (GA)
Boehlert	Hayworth	Price (OH)
Boehner	Hefley	Putnam
Bonilla	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bonner	Herger	Ramstad
Bono	Hobson	Regula
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Boustany	Hostettler	Reichert
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Renzi
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	Keller	Saxton
Cantor	Kelly	Schwarz (MI)
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Carter	King (IA)	Sessions
Castle	King (NY)	Shadegg
Chabot	Kingston	Shaw
Chocoma	Kirk	Shays
Coble	Kline	Sherwood
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Conaway	Kolbe	Shuster
Cox	Kuhl (NY)	Simmons
Crenshaw	LaHood	Simpson
Cubin	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Sodrel
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Stearns
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Sweeney
DeLay	Lungren, Daniel	Tancredo
Dent	E.	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Mack	Terry
Drake	Manzullo	Thomas
Dreier	Marchant	Thornberry
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McCotter	Tiberi
Emerson	McCrery	Tiberti
English (PA)	McHenry	Turner
Everett	McHugh	Upton
Feeney	McKeon	Walden (OR)
Ferguson	McMorris	Walsh
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Mica	Wamp
Flake	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Miller (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Weller
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Fossella	Murphy	Whitfield
Fox	Musgrave	Wicker
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Galleghy	Ney	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Northup	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Nunes	

NAYS—196

Abercrombie	Boucher	Cramer
Ackerman	Boyd	Crowley
Allen	Brady (PA)	Cuellar
Andrews	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Baca	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Baird	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Baldwin	Cardin	Davis (FL)
Barrow	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Bean	Carnahan	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Carson	DeFazio
Berkley	Case	DeGette
Berman	Chandler	Delahunt
Berry	Cleaver	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Dicks
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Dingell
Blumenauer	Cooper	Doggett
Boren	Costa	Doyle
Boswell	Costello	Edwards

Emanuel	Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Maloney	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	Markey	Rush
Etheridge	Marshall	Ryan (OH)
Evans	Matheson	Sabo
Farr	Matsui	Salazar
Fattah	McCarthy	Sanchez, Linda
Filner	McCollum (MN)	T.
Ford	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Frank (MA)	McGovern	Sanders
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Schakowsky
Green, Al	McKinney	Schiff
Green, Gene	McNulty	Schwartz (PA)
Grijalva	Meehan	Scott (GA)
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Scott (VA)
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Sherman
Herseth	Menendez	Skelton
Higgins	Michaud	Slaughter
Hinchee	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	McDonald	Snyder
Holden	Miller (NC)	Spratt
Holt	Miller, George	Stark
Honda	Mollohan	Strickland
Hooley	Moore (KS)	Stupak
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Tanner
Inslie	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Israel	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Tierney
Jefferson	Oberstar	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Udall (CO)
Kanjorski	Olver	Udall (NM)
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Kildee	Owens	Velázquez
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pallone	Vislosky
Kind	Pascrell	Wasserman
Kucinich	Pastor	Schultz
Langevin	Payne	Waters
Lantos	Pelosi	Watson
Larsen (WA)	Peterson (MN)	Watt
Leach	Pomeroy	Waxman
Lee	Price (NC)	Weiner
Levin	Rahall	Wexler
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Woolsey
Lipinski	Reyes	Wu
Lofgren, Zoe	Ross	Wynn
Lowey	Rothman	

NOT VOTING—13

Brown (OH)	Gordon	Larson (CT)
Capps	Hyde	Platts
Clay	Istook	Solis
Diaz-Balart, L.	Jones (OH)	
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kaptur	

□ 1157

Messrs. WYNN, HOYER and PALLONE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I seek recognition on a question of personal privilege pursuant to rule IX of the rules of the House. I have placed at the desk the documentation on which this question is based.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). On the basis of House Report 109-51 and certain media coverage thereof, the gentleman may rise to a question of personal privilege under rule IX.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 1 hour.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.