

the folks, we may not get finished, which is why we have structured rules. But certainly the gentleman is correct that that is the tradition. I would expect us to follow that tradition.

On supplementals, over the last 15 supplementals, I was looking around to see if I had it immediately in front of me, I don't, but on the last 15 supplementals there have been a variety. Seven of them were open, eight of them were less than open, some more structured than others.

I understand the gentleman's representation, and I certainly look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I think to make the gentleman's point, none of them were closed, and none of the wartime supplementals came in the fashion that this one did today, and I am disappointed with that.

What is the gentleman's sense on when the work that was stopped in the middle, right before a vote yesterday on the D.C. bill, when will we see that again?

Mr. HOYER. As soon as possible.

Mr. BLUNT. Do you think we will see it next week?

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that we will see it next week, although I would like to see it next week.

As the gentleman knows, I was very concerned and remain concerned about the interpretation of germaneness. And, frankly, that wouldn't have been a problem either had the minority been willing to offer the traditional motion, which was to recommit and have it immediately reported back to the floor. I will tell my friend we would have had a vote on that. I think you would have probably prevailed on the motion itself, and we would have prevailed on the bill. It would have carried that rider with it, of course. But the minority, frankly, from our perspective, chose to try to defeat the bill by not just making the motion to recommit to adopt the proposition that you offered, but sending it back to committee for that purpose, which was obviously not necessary, which leads me to believe, I want to tell you honestly, my friend, that this was a procedural device to kill the bill rather than let it come to a vote on its merits.

As the gentleman knows, I feel very strongly personally, others do as well, but I feel very strongly personally that we ought to extend a full voting franchise to the Representative who sits on this floor and represents 600,000 of our fellow Americans. The answer to your question is, I hope to bring that to the floor as soon as possible under conditions where we will protect ourselves from procedurally losing a bill which has the majority of votes on this floor.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for that response. On the issue of merit, I suggest that the use of the procedural availability to the minority wouldn't be nearly as necessary if this bill is meritorious and has a majority of votes on the floor to actually have a debate where the bill is amendable,

where there are substitutes available, where the other side of this debate has an opportunity to truly offer other ideas. And so far in this year we have not really seen an openness on any bill that was a bill that didn't pass in the last Congress on suspension to competition of real ideas and debate. I think that is what we saw on that bill. That is one of the reasons that that is one of the few alternatives we had to push back a bill that was not adequately debated, that has significant constitutional questions. We look forward to the bill being on the floor again.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the views. Although, as the gentleman knows, that bill was reported out of the Government Reform Committee chaired by a Republican, with a Republican majority, with a majority of Republicans voting for the bill to report it out of the committee in the last session. So while I understand your view, it is not as if we were taking up a bill that hadn't already been processed by your committee in the last Congress, reported out of that committee, and because obviously there is opposition to it on your side of the aisle, not brought to the floor.

I understand the gentleman's point; but very frankly, the only reason it has not passed, because it has the majority of votes on this floor, was because the motion that was made was not the traditional motion of adopting a proposition, in this case the gun control issue, and reporting it immediately back out with that amendment attached.

I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, but I can't feel too guilty about bringing to the floor a bill that was reported out of a Republican-chaired committee with a Republican majority.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate my friend's sense of that. But I would also say that if this bill has such broad support and such unquestioned merit, there shouldn't be any fear in having a full and open debate where the bill is amendable, where alternatives can be proposed, and where the only opportunity to slow this process down would not be to take advantage of the only possible rule available to us under a rule that was otherwise closed. That is my view of that.

I thank my friend for his comments. We look forward to the budget debate next week.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 26, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROTECTING AMERICANS FIGHTING TERRORISM ACT

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, ever since 9/11, law enforcement agencies have been telling the American people they should immediately report suspicious activities. This important step is one of the best ways we have to stop terrorism. Sadly, last week, Americans who were simply trying to protect themselves in their country have now found themselves subject to a lawsuit for reporting suspicious activity.

In a lawsuit filed against US Airways, 60 moms removed from planes in Minneapolis have named "John Does" as defendants. These are simply people who were watching suspicious activities and called to report those suspicious activities, and now they are going to be terrorized in our court system in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that is unconscionable, and so I am presenting the Protecting Americans Fighting Terrorism Act to keep people safe who report suspicious activity in this country to law enforcement officials to protect the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure to help us be able to police ourselves and report suspicious activity.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL BILL PASSED FOR PEANUTS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed a bill claiming to be the U.S. Troop Readiness Act that included billions in pork barrel spending unrelated to the needs of our troops. The funding restrictions included in the bill were so unpopular that the congressional leadership loaded a \$25 million bailout for spinach farmers, a \$74 million payment for peanut storage, and a \$283 million subsidy for milk producers, all to attract votes for the unpopular bill.

As USA Today stated: "Votes were won for peanuts, or to be more accurate, for peanut subsidies." The bill also declares all of this spending, for spinach, for milk and peanut subsidies, as emergency wartime supplemental appropriations.

This bill passed \$23 billion over budget. It only passed by four votes. Calculating a pork-to-vote ratio, that means that the Congress spent over \$5 billion in pork spending per vote just to win passage for this legislation. And it is only March. How much more will the taxpayer be charged to pass other unpopular bills?

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

#### REMEMBERING CALDWELL COUNTY SHERIFF GARY CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Today, I rise with a heavy heart. Recently a good friend of mine, Sheriff Gary Clark of Caldwell County, passed from this Earth.

Caldwell County lost a true leader and public servant, and many of us lost a dear and beloved friend when Sheriff Clark went home to be with his Lord after a brief, but valiant, fight against cancer.

Those of us who knew and loved Gary grieve the loss of his friendship. We are also grateful to know that he is no longer in pain and no longer suffering.

Sheriff Clark cared deeply for the needs of families and relentlessly pursued drug dealers and criminals in Caldwell County. He made a career of that.

It was Sheriff Clark's passion for fighting against the scourge of methamphetamine and drugs that brought the White House drug czar to Caldwell County. His progressive innovative vision for law enforcement will create enormous benefits for years to come, not just in Caldwell County, but across western North Carolina.

Caldwell County lost a hero and heaven gained a treasure. My prayers are with his family and with his friends in this time of loss. He lived a determined life, a proud life. And the legacy he leaves continues on because the good a man does lives long after he is gone.

Mr. Speaker, we mourn the loss of Gary Clark, a great public servant and leader in North Carolina, a true law enforcement leader and a hero to those of us from western North Carolina.

□ 1315

#### THE FUTURE FOR CONGRESS AND IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of Ohio). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a very solemn day for our Nation. The House just voted to pass a bill that will continue to fund the ongoing occupation of Iraq. I know all too well how my colleagues anguished over their decision, but we must be clear what this vote means.

The supplemental, the largest in the history of our country, will pay for the President's escalation, an escalation that he calls a surge that we voted against just a few weeks ago.

It will include benchmarks and requirements that the administration can waive with the bat of an eye; and, most importantly, it could keep our troops on the ground for another year and a half at least.

Let's remember that the public did not elect Democrats to bring our troops home in 2008. They elected us to bring them home now.

I am truly and sincerely sad to say that as we debate the future of our troops, our troops are being targeted by terrorists, are being wounded by IEDs, and the most tragic and heart-breaking part of all, they are dying, and they are killing.

The American public knows the simple truth, Mr. Speaker: You can't be against the occupation and vote for this supplemental of at least \$100 billion. The Democrats were elected in November because the American people want us, are expecting us, and are demanding of us that we bring our troops home as soon as possible. They do not trust the administration to do the right thing. They want us to hold the administration accountable.

We must stand up to an administration that has lied to get us into this war and will keep lying to keep us in it. It is sad when a Nation cannot trust its Commander in Chief to put the lives of the troops above his political legacy. But in that position, a Congress must take real and enforceable steps to bring an end to the occupation.

I have come to this spot over 195 times to speak about the unmitigated disaster that is Iraq. This is my moral obligation and that of our country.

To those who are watching and wondering about the future of our Iraq policy, I say: I will not stop, I will not rest, and I will not back down in my fight until every single last soldier and marine is home safe with his or her family.

This fight is far from over. Over the next several months, we will revisit this issue many, many times. I will work with my colleagues to make each measure stronger and each measure more effective and to bring our troops home to their families earlier rather

than later. It is with their families that they belong. Today will be marked in history. I know that the future of our standing in the world and the future of Iraq depends on us being bold and brave and taking the actions that will bring our troops home.

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

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

#### DEPORTING AFTER SIXTH OFFENSE FIVE TOO MANY

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, according to a memo that was just released from the U.S. Justice Department from 2005 and reported in the Houston Chronicle today, it reveals procedure and criteria for arresting, detaining, prosecuting and deporting illegals that come into the United States.

It is a very interesting memo. Apparently the Department of Justice did not want to make this memo public for some time. Now we understand why. According to this memo, Texas prosecutors along the Texas-Mexico border generally do not prosecute illegals until the sixth offense. In other words, they have to come over, get caught; come over, get caught; come over, get caught; come over, get caught; come over, get caught, and the sixth time our Federal Government decides, okay, we get the message, we are going to prosecute you for your sixth illegal entry into the United States.

So we don't prosecute them the first time like most Americans would want. And, of course, the illegals on the other side of the border from whatever country they come from know this is our procedure.

According to this Department of Justice memo, it says because of a "lack of resources and bed space to detain and prosecute every illegal entry violator," we are not able to prosecute them the first time.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. This is bad American policy. According to the border agents who work on the Texas-Mexico border and throughout the South, they arrest 1 million illegals a year coming into the United States; and we are telling them you have to work six times harder because the first time just doesn't count.

According to T.J. Bonner, the head of the Border Patrol Association, he said: "It's devastating on morale. Our agents are risking their lives out there, and then they're told, Sorry, that doesn't meet the criteria," and they must be released.