

Balance," a song written quite a few years ago but most appropriate for today.

"I've been waiting for something to happen

For a week or a month or a year.

With the blood in the ink of the headlines

And the sound of the crowd in my ear
You might ask what it takes to remember

When you know that you've seen it before

Where a government lies to a people
And a country is drifting to war.

"And there's a shadow on the faces
Of the men who send the guns
To the wars that are fought in places
Where their business interests runs.

"On the radio talk shows and the TV
You hear one thing again and again
How the U.S.A. stands for freedom
And we come to the aid of a friend
But who are the ones that we call our friends,

These governments killing their own?

There are lives in the balance
There are people under fire

There are children at the cannons
And there is blood on the wire.

"There's a shadow on the faces
Of the men who fan the flames
Of the wars that are fought in places
Where we can't even say the names?

"I want to know who the men in the shadows are

I want to hear somebody asking them why.

They can be counted on to tell us who our enemies are,

But they're never the ones to fight or die.

And there are lives in the balance
There are people under fire

There are children at the cannons
And there is blood on the wire."

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard sentiments from the other side of the aisle about the vote that is going to take place today. I would like to throw a few facts on the table.

One, the President asked us 110 days ago for this support; 110 days. Nothing has changed with his request, the need for the support of the troops, from then until now, except we have gone through political exercises to try and limit the ability of the President and, more importantly, his commanders in the field, from doing what they think is best.

I have heard it said that we need a new policy. We have a new policy. I have heard it said, we need a new military commander. We have a new military commander. I have heard it said, we need new tactics. We have new tactics.

The problem is, as the President has presented this, as we put this into ef-

fect, all we hear is, no, no, no, and no. That is not a policy; that is a denial. That does not support the troops. Unfortunately, it makes it more difficult for them.

Let's remember as we vote to support our troops, we could have done this and should have done this 110 days ago.

SAD DAY FOR AMERICA

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day for our country. Once again, the President is going to be handed a blank check by the Republicans. Last year the Republicans took a lot longer than the Democrats on this side of the aisle to pass this supplemental. Every year they have given the President exactly what he wanted: a blank check.

This time we said to the President twice, we will give the money as long as you meet certain criteria, responsible criteria; and he said, no. He had to have it completely his way, running the war in the fifth year the way he ran it in the first year and the fourth year, without any kind of check, sending our brave troops into battle without the equipment they need. And if they come home injured, failing to care for them and providing for them what they need at home.

We tried to give our brave troops a 3.5 percent pay raise. The President said, no. He supports the troops but not financially, not physically and not in the ways that really matter.

So here we are approaching Memorial Day, and once again, we are leaving our troops unprotected while they have a political battle about this. And they can't go back to their districts and tell the truth.

I will vote against this supplemental because I am voting for the troops.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2206, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 438

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2206) making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chairman of

the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except that the Chair shall divide the question of adoption of the motion between the two House amendments.

SEC. 2. If both portions of the divided question specified in the first section of this resolution are adopted, the action of the House shall be engrossed as a single amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2206.

SEC. 3. During consideration of the motion to concur pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of such motion to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 4. (a) During consideration in the Committee of the Whole of a bill making supplemental appropriations for military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan for fiscal year 2008, before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider an amendment only proposing to add to the bill the text of H.R. 2451. Such amendment shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a bill making regular appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008.

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

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

I yield myself such time as I may consume and ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 438.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 438 provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, when my fellow Members of Congress and I speak and debate and cast our votes on this floor, we seek to reconcile our ideals with what is possible to achieve. We seek to do what is right in principle and necessary at any particular point in time, and pray that the two are one and the same.

That struggle has formed the foundation of the fight Democrats have waged since January, and it is the basis of what we are doing today.

This war was not challenged by the last Congress. It was supported by the last Congress. It was defended by the last Congress. Year after year, the Republican-led House kept this war alive.

□ 1030

But the public rightly lost faith in the war and those who would support it unquestionably. We all know what the result was.

The first opportunity the new majority had to change course in Iraq came with the first version of this bill. That legislation conditioned any future support for the conflict upon proof that our efforts were bearing some fruit. What is more, it would have ended the war by August 2008 at the very latest. Democrats, and some Republicans, united, and that bill was passed by the House.

Democrats in the Senate agreed, and the conference report that was sent to the President was even stronger. The same benchmarks were in place, but the war was to end 6 months sooner, by March of next year.

Our position was clear and unequivocal. For the first time since 2003, a majority of the United States Congress supported a new direction in Iraq, and it was a direction which would lead to an end to the war. The President vetoed that bill.

Our Constitution requires two-thirds of the Congress to overcome a veto. Two-thirds of the public stood squarely with the Democrats in this Chamber, and a handful of Republicans, who voted to overcome it. But what we needed was significant support from the other side of the aisle, and we did not get it.

Since then the President's made it clear that he will veto any legislation which even mentions the word "timeline," and so he left my fellow Democrats and me with a choice. Some would have us ignore his words and simply send him a new copy of our original bill. I certainly relate to those feelings.

But as appealing as this may seem, I do not believe that it would be right. The President and his allies in Congress have put our soldiers in harm's way, and Mr. Bush is willing to keep them there no matter how much they suffer.

If this Congress delayed funding by continuing to back a bill we cannot pass at this time, we would not force the President to end the war. All indications are that he would leave our soldiers in Iraq, and without adequate funding, they would have to do even more with even less.

The Democratic Party is the party that supports our soldiers. We're the party that fights for them to have proper equipment, training and rest. We're the party that demands that they be given a sensible strategy for

victory before going into battle. We're the party that demands that they receive proper medical care once they return.

We understand the mistaken judgment and obstinacy of the White House, and so we will not prevent any funding from coming forth from this Congress, an outcome which would permit the President to further add to the struggles that our troops endure every day.

Ultimately, of course, supporting the troops means ending the war entirely, and the legislation we bring to the floor today goes as far as is possible at this moment to achieving that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone listening to look at the victories that have been won here. The President previously said he would block any bill which contained benchmarks for the war, but now the only legislation the House will deliver to him contains no fewer than 18 benchmarks linking economic aid to improvements in the Iraqi situation.

Furthermore, the President and members of the Republican minority derided what they called "unrelated spending" during our first debate on this bill. They did so even though Democrats were seeking only to fill the gaps left by last year's failure to give us a budget.

But today we will pass a minimum wage increase. We will increase funding for military health care and for veterans' health care, and critically needed funding for agriculture disaster aid, children's health care, and recovery from Hurricane Katrina.

What is critical for all of our citizens to understand is that what is missing from this bill, a timeline to end the war, has been neither forgotten nor conceded by the Democrats in the Congress.

To the contrary, our path forward is clear. We will fight every day until the world's greatest deliberative body lives up to its billing and actually represents the will of the people it serves.

As I said before, at least two-thirds of the American people oppose the President's approach to Iraq and want this war brought to a close. It's time that two-thirds of this Congress wants the same. And we all know where the remaining votes have to come from.

Some days in Iraq are worse than others, but all days there are bloody. Four American soldiers died on Monday. Six more died on Tuesday. Three lost their lives yesterday. Three hundred twenty-one civilians have been anonymously murdered in Baghdad just this month, an average of 13 a day.

We must not be afraid to speak what is a simple truth. Every day that the Republican minority in this Congress stands by and empowers the President to perpetuate this war, they are saying the day's deaths in Iraq are acceptable. They're saying that those lives lost are part of a price they're willing to let others pay, other mothers, other fathers, other sisters, other brothers and other children, not theirs.

But they are alone. Official Pentagon assessments now speak of Iraq's "civil war," meaning the Pentagon itself has broken now from the White House. The generals on the ground are admitting that our whole approach to Iraq must change. That dialogue, even with insurgent groups the President swore he would never talk to, must replace the open-ended warfare, which means the surge has failed.

And, of course, the overwhelming majority of the American people are not willing to accept the sacrifices asked of our soldiers and Iraqi civilians not because of a lack of will, but because of an abundance of reason. They correctly see the war as it is being fought today has never and will never yield the intended results, that our soldiers have been given a mission that has failed them and the people of Iraq time and time again.

The Democrats in both Chambers of this Congress stand with them. A handful of principled Republicans stand with us as well, but not yet enough.

The American people will continue to demand that their voices be heard. They will continue to demand their Representatives no longer willfully ignore their wishes, and my fellow Democrats and I will continue to demand the same.

Together we will struggle until our collective ideals becomes one with what is possible to achieve and until this representative Congress actually represents its constituents and forces the President to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and I express my appreciation to my very good friend, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Rochester, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have to begin by saying how greatly saddened I am by the opening statement that was just delivered by the Chair of the Committee on Rules. Using the word "failure" to describe what has taken place in Iraq is, to me, as we head into this Memorial Day weekend, an extraordinarily sad message for our courageous men and women who are on the frontline in this struggle against global terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that we just got the news this morning of the death of Joseph Anzack who was one of the three troops in Iraq who was kidnapped, and as we think about this Memorial Day weekend, to say to those men and women who are there on the frontline that this is a failure, I believe, is a horrible, horrible message, and I'm greatly troubled that those words would emanate from the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it has taken the Democratic leadership four tries, and as my very good friend from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) said in his 1-

minute speech, more than 100 days since the President's request that they have finally agreed to vote on an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that gives our troops the funding they need without tying their hands and ensuring their defeat.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times my friend from Rochester, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, is saying that they have lost, saying that they have failed and saying that defeat is imminent, the passage of this funding bill will help very much to ensure that that is not the case.

I'm extremely proud that we have been able to hold the line on the disastrous proposal and this notion that somehow we have lost and we have failed in the struggle against terrorism. Unfortunately, though, at this point in the debate, we can't be totally certain about what it is exactly that we're agreeing upon, particularly in the case, Mr. Speaker, of the additional spending.

□ 1040

Now, let me explain why. For several years, there has been concern from both sides of the aisle about the lack of availability of the text of bills and conference reports. That concern has been raised by both Democrats and Republicans on a regular basis.

I would like to briefly, for our colleagues, outline a timeline for how this rule we are debating at this moment was produced. Last night, the Committee on Rules adjourned at roughly 8:45 p.m. after reporting the rule on lobbying reform, which we will be considering in a little while.

Then members of the Rules Committee patiently waited until 11 p.m., when we were notified the text of the supplemental agreement wouldn't be ready until the early morning hours and that the Rules Committee would hold an emergency meeting at 7 a.m.

The text of the Obey amendments were then circulated to the Rules Committee members at 5:39 this morning, just a few hours ago; 5:39 this morning, less than 1½ hours before we convened the Rules Committee. The text of the amendments were not posted publicly on the committee's Web site until around the time we actually met.

Now we are here considering the rule, which makes in order language which spends \$119,9999 billion, less than 4 hours after it was actually submitted.

I remember my very good friend from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER) regularly saying that we needed to be provided with 24 hours notice. This clearly is a far cry from what was promised at the beginning of this Congress.

This language may very well represent the agreement between the House, the Senate and the administration. However, there is no way for us to know this, because there has been no time to thoroughly read the language and verify.

Unfortunately, as most Members must at this point, I shall have to pro-

ceed under an assumption. I must say that I am very concerned about the negative impact the ongoing surrender debate has had in Iraq, both in terms of the morale of our troops and our credibility with the Iraqi people. I am concerned about the impact that this delay in funding has had on our military as well.

But, ultimately, we have succeeded in ensuring that this body has the opportunity to fund our troops without simultaneously handing the terrorists a date certain for our surrender. While this process, this political process has played out, I talked a great deal about what the consequences would be if we were to abandon the Iraqis to the terrorists. And, of course, al Qaeda has taken responsibility for the murder of Mr. Anzack, whom I mentioned, Joseph Anzack.

They clearly are in the midst of their drive. We also are hoping very much that we can see this fledgling democracy take hold. That is why what we are going to be doing here, providing that necessary support, helps us in that quest, but there is no need to take my word in this matter. We are hearing repeatedly, repeatedly from our people on the ground, from the Iraqi leadership and from the Iraqi people, that withdrawing before our mission is complete would have terrible consequences.

Iraq's ambassador to the United Nations, Feisal Amin al-Istrabadi, has implored us not to leave. I would like to quote Iraq's ambassador to the United Nations. "We are at war together," he recently said. "We are allied at war together against a common enemy. We have one way forward: together."

In a recent interview with the New York Post, he talked about the troop surge and pointed to the progress that is being made because of it. At this critical juncture, Iraq's ambassador to the United Nations believes we should be redoubling our efforts and pressing forward, not debating a withdrawal at the precise moment that progress is being made.

Every Member of this body knew at the beginning of this process that the President would never sign a withdrawal bill. The President said it, and the President says what he means, and he means what he says.

Unfortunately, as Mr. LUNGREEN pointed out in his 1-minute speech earlier, the weeks and weeks of pointless debate on our surrender date have clearly taken their toll in Iraq. As Ambassador al-Istrabadi points out, and I quote, "It's been very painful to watch the political process in Washington, because it seems to have very little to do with Iraq." He says that al Qaeda has been following this debate closely. The ambassador says, "There are real enemies who are watching the debate, who understand what's happening here and who think they can affect the outcome of the debate."

He is baffled, as I am baffled, that the Democratic leadership could even consider playing right into the terrorists'

hands. How on earth could we even contemplate giving them what they want and turning the country and the region over to them?

I understand many Americans just want this war to be over. I want this war to be over, too. I would like nothing more. I would like nothing more than to be able to tell the people whom I am honored to represent here that their husbands and wives and sons and daughters and brothers and sisters are going to be coming home tomorrow.

The problem is that, even if we were to withdraw from Iraq, the war would not magically be over. We can pick up and go home. We can turn off our TV sets and ignore what is taking place over there. But the war will still go on. The terrorists will continue their battle for Iraq and for the region; only, this time, we would not be there to stop them.

We would not be there to train and strengthen the Iraqi Army and police forces or to help strengthen those democratic institutions.

I have to say that I am particularly proud of the work that our House Democracy Assistance Commission is doing. DAVID PRICE of North Carolina has chaired this effort, and we are hoping to be able to include Iraq's parliament as we work in consultation to help them build this fledgling democracy.

Before long, I have no doubt whatsoever that the war would make its way to our doorstep once again. We ignored a growing terrorist haven once before, and we suffered the worst attack on our soil because of it.

I was very proud during the decade of the 1980s to work with a number of our colleagues in providing the assistance to the Mujahedin who were fighting to liberate their country of Afghanistan from the Soviet Union. When that was over, we left and did virtually nothing to help build a democracy.

Did Afghanistan teach us anything? Did September 11 teach us nothing? Burying our heads in the sand is not an effective defense. The consequences of abandoning our mission in Iraq would be even graver than the consequences of ignoring the growing terrorist threat that took place during the decade of the 1990s in Afghanistan. This time, not only would the terrorists establish another safe haven from which to operate their global terror network, they would, and I quote, "erect a triumphant monument on the ruins of American power," as the American Enterprise Institute scholar Frederick Kagan said.

We simply cannot and will not strengthen the hands of terrorists who have made the destruction of America their number one priority. We cannot and will not abandon the Iraqis to be butchered by these terrorists in their midst. We cannot and will not abandon our mission just as real progress is starting to be made.

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

□ 1050

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) as much time as he may consume.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first address the gentleman's comments about process and time.

We have been negotiating with the Senate and with the White House since last Friday. At approximately 12:30 last night, the majority staff on the Appropriations Committee finally wrapped up our work in putting this package together. At about 1:00, we communicated what that package was to the minority staff on the Appropriations Committee. It couldn't have been communicated any earlier because it wasn't done until 12:30. One of the reasons it wasn't done is because as late as 10:00 last night, the White House was still squawking about individual provisions in the bill. And the last time I looked, the White House was in Republican hands.

Now, we have negotiated in good faith. I hate this agreement. I am going to vote against the major portion of this agreement even though I negotiated it, because I think that the White House is in a cloud somewhere in terms of understanding the realities in Iraq. But let's not get our nose out of joint about the way this package was put together.

We have tried in good faith to find a way to put the administration's request and their opponent's position on the floor on an equal footing to give everybody an opportunity to vote however they wanted on it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. OBEY. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we don't relish bringing a package to the floor that we don't like and that we are not going to vote for. But what I especially don't relish is the fact that, in the process of doing so, we are criticized by people on the minority side of the aisle who, when they were in charge, couldn't run a two-car funeral in terms of the budget.

The gentleman claims that it has taken us too long to get here. The fact is, the gentleman's party was in control last year, and it took them 110 days to produce a supplemental that the administration requested. That is 10 days longer than it took us. And we had to spend the first 30 days of this session passing last year's budget because the gentleman's party couldn't get a single domestic appropriations bill through the House because of an internal Republican Party squabble between Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the House. So that ate up the first 30 days. And the rest of the time we have spent trying to convince the President to change his mind on the policy in Iraq.

And so we haven't exactly been doing nothing these last 110 days. We sent a

proposition to the President to try to force change in American policy in Iraq. He vetoed it. So if somebody is going to bellyache about the fact that the money isn't getting to the troops, we passed that. It was the President who vetoed it. It is the President's action that has delayed getting anything to anywhere.

We then sent a second package over, and the Senate couldn't pass that. And so that is when we faced the inevitability that we simply did not have the votes to force the President to change policy, and so we are now trying to produce a responsible alternative.

Let me also say, with respect to the argument that we are somehow playing into the hands of al Qaeda. Who played into the hands of al Qaeda? A fellow by the name of Bush. He lives in that big White House at the other end of the avenue. He is the guy who walked this country into a war he didn't have a clue about how to end, he didn't have a clue about the political realities in the region, he didn't have a clue about what was necessary militarily to pacify the country. He didn't have a clue about what this was going to do to our influence in the world. If anybody in this country has weakened our influence drastically and tragically in the Middle East third of the world, it is the occupant, the present occupant, of the White House and his Republican allies who continue to support this misguided policy on this misbegotten war.

So, I get a little tired of people who produced one mess after another. I get a little tired of people who have been wrong from the start on this war. They went after the wrong country. They didn't go after al Qaeda, they went after Iraq. Iraq didn't have anything to do with 9/11. The gentleman knows that, unless he has a faulty memory. Only DICK CHENEY is still trying to invent that connection, and his aim is about as bad as it is when he's got a shotgun in his hand.

So with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to produce change. We have been blocked in obtaining that change by the President. We are now trying to move ahead, on the only option we have available. And the gentleman's nose is out of joint because the action was completed last night too late to provide good notice. You know what? I didn't know about a third of this stuff in this package until I got it in the morning, because we made a number of changes in response to White House requests as late as 10:00 last night. I don't apologize for that. That is what negotiating is supposed to be.

You can't have it both ways. You can't squawk at us for being too late in bringing the bill to the floor, and then squawk at us for not giving you enough notice.

So, with all due respect, I will take a look at the record of the minority party last year when they were running the show and couldn't pass anything,

and I will compare theirs to our record any day of the week.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President or the Vice President.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and then I'm going to be yielding to one of my colleagues.

Let me say that at 7 o'clock this morning I praised the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY. He knows that I have the utmost respect for him and his work. He is very, very diligent, and a very, very thoughtful Member. And I have been privileged to serve with him for the last more than a quarter of a century, as we were counting upstairs some of our former colleagues who are long departed, Mr. Dabo, Mr. Conte, and others.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that, with all due respect to my friend, I am not bellyaching about the process itself. I am not bellyaching about what it is that got us here. I am simply pointing to a promise that was made to this institution; and that promise, Mr. Speaker, was that there would be 24 hours to review legislation before it is brought to the floor. And I will acknowledge that when we were in the majority, we did not always provide that 24 hours. But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Wisconsin, it is not about what we did, it is about what this new majority promised they were going to do. And that commitment was that after this laborious late-night negotiating process that included Members of the other body, the White House, and Members of this body into the night, that there would be a 24-hour opportunity for Members to look at a \$119.9 billion spending measure.

So I have to say that the process that led up to the creation of this is historically the process that does bring about bipartisan agreements. The gentleman is absolutely right, not everyone is happy with all the measures included in this bill. But the fact of the matter is we are where we are; we have gotten here under challenging circumstances. As I said, the Rules Committee adjourned at 8:45 last night. At 11 o'clock we were informed that we would have an emergency meeting at 7 o'clock this morning, and at 5:39 this morning it was made available to us.

□ 1100

And here we are just a few hours later considering it on the House floor. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping to go back to Los Angeles tomorrow morning, and I'd like to be able to do that. But I'm more than willing to help this majority comply with the promise that they made that on all major legislation, they would in fact provide the minority and, frankly, the majority Members with 24 hours to review the legislation.

And, finally, I just have to say that when we hear arguments that somehow

President Bush is playing into the hands of the terrorists and responsible for where we are, Mr. Speaker, September 11 of 2001 changed not only the United States but the world. The largest most important Nation in the history of mankind suffered an attack the likes of which we had never seen in our Nation's history. And so, taking on a multi-pronged approach, dealing with, as we have in both Afghanistan and in Iraq, and we all know that Iraq is the central front for al Qaeda, has been very important. You can raise issues like weapons of mass destruction and other items like that, but the fact of the matter is, we are where we are today. And I believe that it would be a horrendous mistake for us to take a retrograde step, which is exactly what those terrorists want.

And with that, I'm happy to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend from Sacramento, Mr. LUNGREN.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it's my time to yield time following your speech.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I was recognized, and I announced at the beginning—

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Nonetheless, I think we do alternate.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, was I out of order by yielding to my colleague?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who seeks time?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I seek time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I was in control of the time. I yielded myself such time as I may consume, and as I did that, I asked that I yield to my colleague from California.

But if, in fact, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules wishes to supersede that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, some might see this Iraq supplemental as a victory for President Bush in his never-ending quest to secure open-ended, unaccountable funding for his disastrous policy in Iraq. If so, it is a hollow victory.

We can debate why and when our Iraq policy turned into the disaster that plays out every day in Baghdad and Dyala. But that debate really doesn't matter anymore, because the President's policy is a failure. And no amount of funding, with or without conditions, can fix it. The only thing that matters now is when and how we end this disaster, and when we bring our uniformed men and women safely home to their families and communities.

Our troops did their job. They achieved their mission. They ended the brutal reign of Saddam Hussein, and confirmed for the world that there never were any weapons of mass destruction.

They weren't sent to Iraq to take a bullet on behalf of the sectarian religious factions hellbent on civil war.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental only postpones the inevitable. After hundreds of billions of dollars; after more than 3,400 soldiers, marines, sailors and airmen have lost their lives; after nearly 1,000 U.S. defense contractors have been killed; after more than 25,000 uniformed men and women have been wounded or maimed; after tens of thousands of American veterans returning from Iraq will be suffering from the trauma they experienced in combat for the rest of their lives; after hundreds of thousands of Iraqi men, women and children have been killed and millions more have been traumatized by the violence and horror that now marks Iraqi daily life; after the destruction of towns, villages, communities, neighborhoods and infrastructure, we still come back to the same place, the same stark question.

Mr. Speaker, how and when is this war and our military occupation of Iraq going to end?

The Middle East is going up in flames. Al Qaeda and other terrorist networks remain strong and intact. Their recruitment is growing. Meanwhile, America's standing in the world has never been lower.

I ask each of my colleagues, when and how are we going to get out of Iraq? When will each of us be able to tell the families in our districts that their sons and daughters, fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, will finally be coming home?

Mr. Speaker, unbelievably, the President doesn't even want his own policy priorities tied to a time line for removing our troops in Iraq. He wants no accountability on the readiness of our troops, or whether they are adequately trained and equipped. Just show me the money. That's all he wants.

Mr. Speaker, I simply can't support it. And I will vote against this blank check of a supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude with a few words about the rule. This is not a satisfactory conclusion to the weeks-long debate over funding the war. But the sad reality is that the Senate is too timid and the President too irrational. There was no one with whom the House could forge a genuine compromise to hold the President accountable for the lives he is willing to sacrifice and the money he seeks and move us closer to bringing our troops home. And we do not have the votes in this House, sadly, to override a veto.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman OBEY for their persistence and their courage in trying to end this tragic war.

The rule before us ensures that we do not walk away from this debate or the decision to remove our troops from Iraq. Under this rule, the House must vote on removing our troops from Iraq before any further supplemental funding can be approved for the war.

So let's be clear. Those of us who oppose this war will be back again and again and again and again until this war is ended.

Mr. Speaker, from the White House to our military field commanders, everyone, including the Republican leader of this House, has said that September is the tipping point. Well, we will vote, and we will vote in September. And we will decide, and I pray that we will then bring our troops home.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentlelady from New York has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that, I'm happy to yield 5½ minutes to my very good friend from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we sit here and listen to this debate, both on this rule and on the 1-minutes that went before us, one thing is passing strange. I heard my friends on the other side of the aisle complain or lament that the problem with this bill is that it does not hold the President in check. We're dealing with a wartime supplemental. I thought the purpose of that is to hold the enemy in check, not hold the President of the United States in check.

I heard another Member of the other side of the aisle say, Republicans now, you understand, you own this war. Are we trying to make a political statement, or are we trying to help our troops? Are we trying to do some political dance, or are we trying to stand behind our troops?

I heard from the other side of the aisle, you Republicans are continuing this war. The enemy is continuing this war. Have we lost sight on what it is we're supposed to be talking about here? Have we lost sight on what it is that our troops are thinking about? Is this something where we define somebody other than the enemy on the field as the enemy?

We now have heard from the distinguished lady from New York that the surge has failed. She has joined others, including those in the other body from that side of the aisle, who have made the determination, not that this policy will fail, not that it cannot succeed, but they have now declared, as she has said, that the surge has failed. Perhaps she should talk to General Petraeus. Perhaps she should talk to our military leaders in the field. I don't question her sincerity, but I would suggest that perhaps General Petraeus has a better idea about what the circumstances on the ground are. Has he declared victory? No. Has he said he believes that victory is achievable? Yes. Has he told that to our troops time and time again? Yes. Has he quoted the gentlelady from New York to say to our troops, as I send you out on this mission, understand that the surge has already failed? No, he has not. No, he has not.

We hear repeated on this floor, we need a change in mission. We need a

change in policy. We need a change in leadership.

□ 1110

You have a new Secretary of Defense. You have a new military commander. You have a new mission on the field. And yet as it begins to unfold, what do you say? What do we hear said on this floor by those who ask for those things? Not, let's see if it works, the President has listened to us, we have the best of the best, the best warrior leader we have in our country who has come up with this plan, who has put his imprimatur on this plan, who tells us and tells the troops this plan is a plan for victory.

But no. What do we hear? "The surge has failed," we hear uttered on this floor. "The surge has failed." If you believe it has failed, then why have we been fooling around with all of these other things? Why don't you just have an up-or-down vote, get us off this funding completely, tell the troops the only thing to do is to take them home?

But what have we heard from the other side? They say, we don't have the votes to do that, so we are going to have death by a thousand cuts. That is why it has taken us 110 days plus, because of the strategy to somehow do by indirection what the Constitution won't allow you to do by direction.

We have heard it again and again and again from the other side of the aisle. Their dictionary begins with "F" and the word "fail," and it ends with the word "lost." You will not find in their lexicon the words "victory" and "win." You will find only "failure" and "loss." And not that we will fail, but we have heard the pronouncement from the majority on this floor today we have already lost. That is the message they are sending by their vote today, and they have told us what it is with an exclamation point.

Troops in the field, we sent you on a mission that is a mission to fail, and it has already failed. What a terrible message to send to our troops. We should reject that notion. We should support our troops. We should support this funding. And we should stop trying to play the "gotcha" game here on the floor of this House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Perhaps my good friend from California has not heard the news. The Pentagon has now said that we are indeed enmeshed in a civil war and we now have a plan B. What we are going to do now is deal with insurgents so that we can try to pacify them and get pockets of peace somewhere, here and there in Iraq, never mind the Iraqi Government we have been holding up all this time.

This may be news to him, but as far as I am concerned, the Pentagon has really called it straight, and I consider it a break with what the White House has been telling us.

We know the President said time and again he would never negotiate with

any insurgents. Well, that was yesterday.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it saddens me that once again I have to remind my colleagues of the current emergency occurring in my district and throughout many counties in the rural West all because the Federal Government has violated its promise to America's forested communities.

Here I have the front page of the May 17 edition of the Grants Pass Daily Courier in Josephine County. Notice the photo. It is a banner that says "Sheriff Out of Service." "Service jobs slash 42 sheriff's deputies, 28 juvenile correctional officers among those laid off. Medical rescue help may be delayed."

The last 3 years Congressman DEFAZIO and I have been warning the Congress that these are the things that are going to happen out in our part of the world if we don't fix for the long term the county payments issue. In Jackson County, the most populated area of my district, all 15 public libraries have closed.

Now, the underlying bill has a 1-year fix for this. It is an emergency bridge, and for that we are indeed thankful and appreciative. But the problem continues. The 1 year does not give enough assurance to the financially strapped rural communities to restore the hundreds of jobs and countless public safety services that have already been compromised by Congress's failure to have a long-term solution. As the Medford Mail Tribune editorialized today, "Josephine County has laid off 42 sheriff's deputies, ended patrols, and virtually shut down its jail. Curry County," in Congressman DEFAZIO's district, "which has lost 68 percent of its general fund, also has no sheriff's patrols and has asked the National Guard to provide security for coastal residents. Jackson County closed its libraries and plans to lay off nine sheriff's deputies, road workers, and other employees for a total of 172 positions.

"There are those in Washington, D.C.," the paper writes, "who will paint the 1-year extension as a great day for rural counties. Meanwhile, back here in Mudville, there is little joy."

So I sent to the Rules Committee this morning two amendments that would have extended the emergency funding for years, not months. The first amendment was identical to that passed by a 75-22 vote in the Senate with complete offsets for a 5-year extension. The second amendment I submitted would have extended the emergency funding in the emergency supplemental bill for 2 years, not 1, without

increasing the overall cost of the bill or changing the funding distribution formula. Unfortunately, both of those amendments were denied along party lines.

The work to secure a long-term extension and reauthorization of these funds must continue. I will not give up. I will not quit. I will not rest. The Congress will be forced to address this issue over and over and over again until we reach agreement on a long-term solution for the forested counties and keep the government's commitment.

My good friend and colleague Congressman DEFAZIO and I sent a letter, which I would like to put in the RECORD, on May 17 to the emergency supplemental conferees, which was signed by more than 90 Members of our Congress, 74 of which were the Democrat Party, asking that a 5-year solution be included in the emergency supplemental. Many conversations with Speaker PELOSI and Leader BOEHNER have made them aware of this emergency, as has a recent Presidential meeting that I had with Senator WYDEN. We appreciate all the support for seeking a long-term solution and will be relying on all of us to get this done.

My colleagues, though, we cannot wait any longer. More to the point, the people of America's forested communities cannot wait any longer. We need to act for a long-term solution.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2007.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JERRY LEWIS,

Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,

Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBEY, CHAIRMAN BYRD, CONGRESSMAN LEWIS AND SENATOR COCHRAN: As you conference on the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for FY 2007 (Supplemental) to fund vital government programs, we urge you to support the Senate passed language to reauthorize and fully fund the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-393) and the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program (PILT). The Senate language was passed by an overwhelming vote, and identifies offsets.

P.L. 106-393 expired at the end of September 2006 endangering the loss of payments to over 600 counties and 4400 school districts in 39 states. In addition to reauthorizing the Secure Rural Schools program, the Senate passed language would further benefit these rural communities by fully funding, for the first time, the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program, which provides general funds to 49 states. Rural communities have relied on these programs to provide stable funding for rural schools, health care, law enforcement and other critical programs.

The elimination of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act would default on the 100 year old federal

commitment to our rural communities that depend on these payments to keep their communities strong and stable. Fully funding PILT, for the first time ever, would provide much needed economic stability for the rural communities that support our public lands.

Please support the Senate passed reauthorization language of P.L. 106-393 and full funding for PILT.

Sincerely,

Peter DeFazio, Don Young, Chris Van Hollen, Charles Wilson, Leonard Boswell, G.K. Butterfield, Pete Stark, Earl Pomeroy, Jon Porter, Timothy J. Walz; Eddie Bernice Johnson, Neil Abercrombie, Collin Peterson, Peter Welch, Carol Shea-Porter, Rick Boucher, Shelly Moore Capito, Lois Capps, John Conyers, Henry Cuellar;

Lincoln Davis, John Doolittle, Gabrielle Giffords, Raúl Grijalva, Baron Hill, Steve Kagen, Ron Kind, Dan Lungren, Jim Matheson, Jim Marshall;

Michael Michaud, Brad Miller, Grace Napolitano, Devin Nunes, Solomon Ortiz, Ted Poe, Vic Snyder, John Spratt, Gene Taylor, Bennie G. Thompson;

Buck McKeon, James L. Oberstar, Ed Perlmutter, Nick Rahall, David G. Reichert, John T. Salazar, Cathy McMorris Rogers, Steve Pearce, George P. Radanovich, Rick Renzi;

Mike Ross, Bill Sali, Bob Filner, Louie Gohmert, Doc Hastings, Wally Herger, Jay Inslee, Rick Larson, Doris O. Matsui, Barney Frank;

Phil Hare, Alcee L. Hastings, Darlene Hooley, Sheila Jackson Lee, David Loebsack, Jim McDermott, Michael Arcuri, Brian Baird, Shelley Berkley, Bruce L. Braley;

Dennis Cardoza, Lincoln Davis, Jo Ann Emerson, Joe Baca, Joe Barton, Earl Blumenauer, Corrine Brown, Donna M. Christian-Christensen, Diana DeGette, Bob Etheridge;

Linda Sánchez, Mike Simpson, Betty Sutton, Mike Thompson, Greg Walden, David Wu, Heath Shuler, Bart Stupak, Ellen Tauscher, Mark Udall, Maxine Waters, Members of Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say, in response to the comments from the gentleman, that given what he prefers to see in this bill on this subject, we are very lucky to have the 1-year fix at all because the White House opposed not only the long-term fix, but the short-term fix as well.

I would also point out that it was last year's Congress that allowed the program to expire in the first place and never managed to get around to finding the offsets that would have enabled the committee to provide this package long term.

So I recognize the legitimacy of the gentleman's concern, but I want to point out that I think that given the resistance of the White House to anything except money for the Iraqi operation and a tiny portion of our obligation for Katrina, with those two exceptions, the White House resisted every single effort made by us to deal with any problem, whether it was Western schools, whether it was kids getting knocked off health-care rolls, or whether it was the need to provide

more veterans' health care. They fought it all.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's work on this issue, and I realize that the last Congress did not get it done. I complained about that at the time and tried everything I could to get it reauthorized.

It passed out of the Resources Committee, as you know, and then did not make any progress in either Chamber.

It has been a very difficult, uphill battle across the board to educate all of our Members about how we have got to solve this problem. If you remember the Kim family, who were tragically lost in Josephine County last year and Mr. Kim was later found dead, it is that county that just eliminated all sheriff's patrols.

So I am not here to point blame at anybody. You have been terrific in helping us in this 1-year extension. I am just saying thank you, but the big job remains because this problem does not go away.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I just wish the administration would give us as much help in solving American problems as they have given us heat for not supporting their multibillion-dollar on-the-installment-plan request for Iraq.

□ 1120

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my very good friend from Rochester how many speakers she has remaining and then how much time is remaining on each side.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one other besides myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 8 minutes and the gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I will reserve the balance of my time, then.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we cannot, we should not, and we must not give President George Bush a blank check to squander the lives of our children and the dollars of our constituents in Iraq. We should not give him a blank check today, we should not give him a blank check next week, and we should not give him a blank check ever. The days of giving him a blank check to make repeated incompetent decisions in Iraq must be stopped and they should be stopped today by voting "no" on this supplemental.

And the inspiration for doing that should come from our proud men who are serving in Iraq. I heard a story a few weeks ago about a fellow who had his buddy shot by a sniper, he was

being shot up by automatic weapons fire, and his buddy ran out into the field of fire to rescue his friend. We should look at our duty today as rescuing our children, brothers, sisters, husbands and wives in Iraq. And if we take hostile political fire in doing so, so be it. That tiny act of standing up to George Bush does not end up in the same league of courage of those who are serving in Iraq who take real hostile fire, that need to be rescued from the incompetence of the executive branch of the United States Government. And it is solely the power of the U.S. Congress to do that.

The people who established this institution had a very wise knowledge. They knew someday there could be a President who might make bad decisions on occasion, who might make bad decisions in the course of a war, and that is why in article I, section 8, they vested in the U.S. Congress the power of the purse to be used in exactly these circumstances, to rein in a rogue President who cannot seem to understand the reality on the ground in Iraq and has a hallucinatory policy that is exposing our children to harm. This power in section 8, the power of the purse, is one that is designed by the framers of democracy for exactly these circumstances. And the reason the framers put the power of the purse to rein in a rogue President is because they understood that this is the institution closer to the American people. This is the People's House.

And I know there's a lot of problems that none of us are geniuses on in Iraq, but there is one thing we know: In difficult times in America, there is one will, one sense of absolute genius that all of us should follow, and that is the will of the American people, the joint, commonsense consensus. From the cornfields of the Midwest to the coastlines, there is a common consensus that we need a change in policy in Iraq, and the only way we will get it, the only way that common sense of the American people will be followed is to vote "no" on this today. We can be united in understanding that. And when we do so, we will follow the Congresses of the past who on at least five occasions have used the constitutional power of the purse to insist on a change.

And I will say this. In the Constitution, this organization here is given the power to declare war. And we also have the power to end a war. Presidents do not have the authority to fight wars in perpetuity. There is no way that Congress would ever give that authority. And today using the power of the purse, a constitutional tool, we should stand up for the will of the American people and fulfill our rescue mission for our sons and daughters in Iraq and vote "no" on this supplemental bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that my friend from Rochester is just going to close the debate on her side.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am.

Mr. DREIER. Then I will yield myself the balance of the time on our side. How much time is that, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Six minutes, sir.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Let me begin by saying that I do have the utmost respect for the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations and, of course, for my Chair, the gentlewoman from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER). And I understand that there is great sincerity on their part in this quest here and I understand there is a desire to ensure that we have a process that works. I will just make a couple of comments on process here and some concerns that I have and then I have some other remarks on the overall issue of the war.

We have gone through, as we know, four incarnations of this attempt and now 110 days that has really prevented us from making sure that we have had an opportunity to get the funding necessary for our troops. Through that process, Democrats and Republicans alike have regularly said they don't want to do anything to prevent funding from getting to our troops. And I respect that. Again, Members on both sides of the aisle have pointed that out, Mr. Speaker. But we all know that from the outset, the President made it clear that he was going to veto anything that established an artificial timeline which he, and I agree with him, concluded would be a prescription for admitting defeat. And so he was very strong on that and unwavering.

So we've gotten to the point where we are at this moment, and that point is we have a 213-page package that is before us. My good friend from Wisconsin said that I was bellyaching about the process, and I will say again to my colleagues, I'm not complaining about what took place in the hours leading up to the consideration of this package. This is my 27th year here and I understand that negotiations among the Senate, the House and the White House are challenging and can often go into the night. The only point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that as we look at this process of having this 213-page measure before us, we were promised by the new majority that we would be given 24 hours before consideration of major legislation here on the House floor. And, as I said, and I am really somewhat confused on this because, I would say to my friend from Wisconsin, I look at the time stamp on this. The time stamp on the measure that we are voting on is 9:38 p.m. last night. Yet he said that he was negotiating into the night, 1 o'clock in the morning. I mean, I didn't follow all of the incarnations of this, but I do know that we received this at 5:39 this morning, and that was less than an hour and a half before the Rules Committee was scheduled to convene at its 7 a.m. meeting this morning. And then we had it made public at about the time our group con-

vened, the Rules Committee convened. And so that does concern me.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be urging my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that I may amend the rule to allow Members to offer motions to strike earmarks which are undoubtedly going to come to the attention of Members the longer that this agreement is available.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment and extraneous material be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, finally, we are going into this Memorial Day weekend. I have the honor of participating in seven Memorial Day events on Monday in southern California, and I will be meeting with family members.

Just yesterday, I met with the mother of a young man, Mr. Colnot, who lost his life over a year ago in Iraq. She said to me just yesterday afternoon, "It is absolutely essential that we complete our mission."

I have regularly pointed to another one of my constituents whose son paid the ultimate price. A man called Ed Blacksmith's son, J.P., died over 2 years ago, 2½ years ago, on the famous November battle of Fallujah.

□ 1130

And repeatedly Mr. Blacksmith has said to me, "You must complete this mission or my son, J.P., will have died in vain."

So, Mr. Speaker, as we go into this Memorial Day weekend, I thank God that we are going to pass this measure that will be providing the essential support for our troops, so that General David Petraeus and the new leadership, with a new strategy to deal with uncertainty, will have the hope of victory. There is no guaranteed success, but there is a hope for victory because this is a struggle which is going to continue on and on and on as long as there are people out there who are going to try to do us in, to kill us, and to change our way of life.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so that I can offer my amendment. And if by chance we are not successful on that, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule because of the unfair process that we have. But if in fact the rule does proceed, I urge everyone, in a bipartisan way, to support the very important measure that will allow us to support our troops and allow them to complete their mission.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Chair of the committee (Mr. OBEY) to respond.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interfere with the gentlelady's time,

but I just wanted to bring something to the attention of the gentleman from California.

He mentioned that the time stamp on the proposition he received was 6:31 p.m. last night. That was one of only two packages. That time stamp refers to the time at which the legislative counsel got this copy to the staff. The staff still had to read it, to check it out, to make certain it did what it was supposed to do. And that was on the easiest package, that was on the President's package. And everybody knows what the President's request was and what the Warner amendment is.

The time stamp on the other package is 9:30 p.m. last night. What that means is that you have over 200 pages, which we got from legislative counsel, and the staff had to read every page of that to make certain, again, that it did what it was intended to do, and to make sure that, among other things, it reflected the changes that had been demanded by the White House at the same time.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that if in fact we were going to see compliance with this 24-hour request, the 9:38 time stamp that is on this measure, the 6:30 time stamp that is on the other, the domestic spending measure would have in fact allowed us to consider this measure on the floor on Friday, which is really what should have happened as we proceeded with that.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will yield 30 seconds to Mr. OBEY to respond.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the gentleman has criticized us for taking too much time to bring this to the floor, and he is now suggesting that we delay it. That is like falling off both sides of the same horse at the same time.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentlewoman will yield.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will yield 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, all I'm saying is that we were promised a 24-hour opportunity for Members of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties to have a chance to review this measure. And I believe that having gone 110 days, that allowing for a review with potential earmarks and other items in here is the responsible thing to do because that is the promise that was made to this institution at the beginning of the 110th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 438 OFFERED BY REP.
DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after conclusion of the period of debate on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment, it shall be in order for any Member to offer a motion to strike any provision of the amendment numbered one in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution, which is asserted that would specifically benefit an entity, State, locality, or Congressional district. Any such motion shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amend-

ment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2317, LOBBYING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2007 AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2316, HONEST LEADERSHIP AND OPEN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 437 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 437

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2317) to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require registered lobbyists to file quarterly reports on contributions bundled for certain recipients, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2316) to provide more rigorous requirements with respect to disclosure and

enforcement of lobbying laws and regulations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. During consideration of H.R. 2317 or H.R. 2316 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of either bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 4. Subparagraph (3)(Q) of clause 5(a) of rule XXV is amended to read as follows:

"(Q) Free attendance at an event permitted under subparagraph (4)."

□ 1140

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.