

spending nearly \$600 million per day just in interest payments. This credit card Congress can no longer continue. We cannot spend our way out of our challenges. We have to be fiscally responsible in this country. We cannot spend our way out of these challenges. You don't do it in your family, but this Congress does. Every time we hear a challenge, all we hear about is the need for more spending.

Today we will consider a bill, a horse and burro bill, that will be nearly \$700 million in new spending—\$700 million in new spending to tackle horses and burros that are exploding their population in the West.

Please, Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues, we have to stop. We have to cut our spending.

#### NEW GI BILL

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, this past week my office held a seminar to help our Nation's veterans access the full range of benefits they have earned, including a 4-year college education. We invited local education and workforce experts to help our veterans determine their eligibility, fill out paperwork, and receive benefits under the new GI Bill for the 21st century.

Along with many others in the House, I was proud to cosponsor this new GI Bill when it passed last year. This critical bill will ensure that our returning servicemembers are part of our economic recovery. This bill covers everything from tuition to housing to books. And it is available to military veterans who have served since September 11, 2001.

In just a few weeks, the very first veterans to enroll in college under the new GI Bill will begin their first classes.

This is truly a landmark moment, and I wish the best of luck to all of our veterans who, through this program, will become scholars as well as heroes.

#### NATIONALIZED HEALTH CARE AND ILLEGALS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the nationalized health care bill will continue to allow illegals to get free medical services. Foreigners who are not authorized to be in the United States flood over our wide-open borders by the millions to get free universal health care. That bankrupts Federal and State health care safety nets set up for Americans.

It's very simple to understand to most people: our citizens are forced to pay medical bills for citizens of countries all around the world. These people in our country illegally use our hospital emergency rooms like it's their

primary care, and it doesn't cost them anything. And what our government doesn't pay, the hospitals are forced to pay. That drives up the cost of medical care and the cost of insurance for citizens and legal immigrants. Now those problems will just get worse under the new proposal.

The nationalized health care bill will force our citizens who cannot even pay for their own health care to pay billions of dollars a year for health care for millions of illegals. That's just wrong. Citizens and legal immigrants shouldn't be forced to pay for the health care of people illegally in the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

#### IMPACT OF HEALTH CARE CRISIS

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, during our last work period, I conducted a health care listening tour across my district to learn firsthand how the health care crisis is impacting working families.

I talked to Chris Davis, a single father who makes too much as an electrician to qualify for assistance but too little to afford coverage for his 7-year-old son. I listened to Bernice Romero, a fixed-income retiree who simply can't afford the rising premiums and out-of-pocket expenses to treat her debilitating carpal tunnel and knee problems.

Stories like these drive home the fact that we must do all we can to both extend coverage and contain costs in our health care system. This means preventing fraud, waste, and abuse within the system, utilizing prevention and wellness programs that save money, and promoting more efficient delivery of health care so that all regions of the country—rich, poor, urban, and rural—are on an even playing field.

We must address this issue head on, and the time to act is now.

#### GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, during the worst recession in a generation, Democrats propose a government takeover of health care that will lead to fewer jobs, higher taxes, and less health coverage.

Since the recession began, 6 million jobs have been lost, yet the Democrats' health care plan includes hundreds of billions of dollars in new tax hikes on small businesses, the engine of job creation in this country. Democrats propose more than \$800 billion in new tax hikes. According to economic modeling by the President's own chief economic adviser, the business tax hikes alone would destroy up to 4.7 million jobs.

Despite their claims of reform that it will reduce health care costs, CBO Director Elmendorf told Congress that the Democrats' proposed reform will only increase future Federal spending on health care.

House Republicans will oppose any plan that puts Washington bureaucrats between patients and the care they need. House Republicans have a plan for reform that expands access to affordable health care and gives families the freedom to choose the health care that fits their needs without imposing a job-killing tax hike on small businesses and working families.

#### NEW HEALTH CARE PLAN BENEFICIAL FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I am glad to report that two of our committees have already reported out the health care reform bill. CBO indicated that 97 percent of the non-elderly, in other words, those who are not on Medicare now, would be covered by the health reform plan that our committees are now considering. Small businesses would benefit greatly. There is a 50 percent tax credit for premiums that are paid by employers of small businesses.

So this legislation has the opportunity to allow small businesses to benefit significantly, to cover their employees, to cover 97 percent of Americans who are not covered currently by Medicare. And it is moving. We expect it will be out of committee by next week and on the House floor by the end of this month. And, finally, Americans will know that their guaranteed health coverage, reduced costs, and 97 percent of Americans not in Medicare will achieve health care coverage.

I am very happy about the fact that we're proceeding with this along the promise of President Obama.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1018, RESTORE OUR AMERICAN MUSTANGS ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 653 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 653

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1018) to amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to improve the management and long-term health of wild free-roaming horses and burros, 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. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The

bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of 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 Natural Resources; (2) the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Rahall of West Virginia or his designee, which shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; (3) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Hastings of Washington or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. All points of order against amendments specified in the first section of this resolution are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI.

□ 0915

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 653.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 653 provides for consideration of H.R. 1018, the Restore Our American Mustangs Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order a manager's amendment and a substitute amendment from the ranking member, my former Rules colleague, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The manager's amendment is debatable for 10 minutes, and the substitute is debatable for 30 minutes. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1018 is a bill that restores important protections for wild horses and burros. The bill received full consideration in the subcommittee and the full committee. Markups were held. Republican and Democratic amendments were offered

and accepted through the regular order.

Madam Speaker, this bill will reverse a misguided and controversial rider that was adopted as part of the fiscal year 2005 omnibus appropriations bill. The provision was slipped into the bill in the dead of night when the Republicans were in control, reversing long-standing Federal policy that protected wild horses from being sold at auctions and subsequently shipped to slaughter plants. Last summer, the Bureau of Land Management announced that it would consider killing as many as 30,000 healthy wild horses and burros in BLM holding centers across the United States.

The ROAM Act, H.R. 1018, introduced by Chairman RAHALL, will restore long-standing protections by prohibiting the sale and wholesale killing of wild horses and burros; prioritize cost effective on-the-range management, over-roundups, saving millions of tax dollars; facilitate the creation of sanctuaries for wild horses and burro populations on public lands; strengthen the BLM's wild horse and burro adoption program; and protect wildlife by requiring a thriving natural ecological balance on the range.

Madam Speaker, these wild animals are rounded up in huge numbers by BLM only to languish in holding pens, threatened with sale or slaughter. H.R. 1018 will minimize these stressful, inhumane roundups, and promote adoption for those horses and burros who are taken off the range, banning the sale of wild horses and burros by the BLM, as well as the transfer of these animals for the purpose of processing into commercial products.

Legislation similar to H.R. 1018 passed the House in 2007 by a landslide, bipartisan vote of 277-137. Unfortunately, this measure has never been signed into law. It is time we end this inhumane practice once and for all.

This bill is important for the protection of our Nation's wild horses and burros. I urge adoption of the rule and the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary time, and I'm looking forward to our having fun here this morning as he promised yesterday.

I am intrigued by my colleague saying that this is being done to correct something slipped into a bill in the middle of the night when the Republicans were in charge. It sounds like something very nefarious was done. This is sort of news to us. We didn't hear it in Rules yesterday, and I need to point out that there was something put in an appropriations bill in 2005, as my colleague says, but it certainly wasn't nefarious. And it's my understanding that our colleagues on the other side have modified that provision several times. So I don't think this is really trying to correct something that

Republicans did some time ago in the dead of the night.

But be that as it may, I think I need to point out that we are bringing this legislation at a time when more than 2 million Americans have lost their jobs since the Democrats' \$1 trillion stimulus bill became law and that it is somewhat of an insult to those people. We have a 9.5 percent unemployment rate and a budget deficit of more than \$1 trillion which is predicted to go to \$2 trillion before the end of the fiscal year.

Given those facts, it's a little unclear to know what exactly are the priorities of the Democrats in charge of this Congress. Small business and middle class families are struggling all across this country; yet, the Democrats in charge of Congress are poised to ask them to bankroll a \$700 million welfare program for wild horses. This is just another example of how out of touch Washington Democrats are.

If Democrats want to join Republicans in focusing on job creation, then we should be dealing with our American Energy Act which will create new jobs, bring down energy costs, and pave the way for a cleaner environment. And we should scrap this job-killing health care bill Speaker PELOSI is seeking to rush to a vote before the end of the month.

Now, what this bill is going to do that's underlying this rule, which I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote against, it will establish a horse census every 2 years. It provides for enhanced contraception and birth control for horses. It makes available an additional 19 million acres of public and private land for wild horses. It covers a \$5 million tab to repair damage done by horses to other property and mandates that government bureaucrats perform home inspections before Americans can adopt horses.

I hardly think this is what the American people expect us to be doing these days as they face the many challenges that they're facing.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Just in brief response to the gentlewoman's comments, as she knows, when the manager's bill is adopted, this bill will have no cost.

And in response to her question about what the Democratic priorities are, they are to create jobs, they are to pass an energy bill to create more jobs, and to deal with climate change. Our priorities include passing a health care bill that will lower the cost of health care for average Americans.

I don't know about in North Carolina, but I can tell you that in my district and everywhere I go around the country, people claim with great justification that they are paying too much for health care. She may represent a bunch of millionaires, but I think most of us don't.

The fact of the matter is health care costs are too high. We need to make it more affordable for the average family, for small businesses, and so that's what our priorities are.

I should say to the gentlelady as well that according to recovery.gov, in her State, jobs that were created or saved in North Carolina are 105,000 jobs.

I also submit into the RECORD, Madam Speaker, an editorial from the Knox News in support of this stimulus package as it relates to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, which includes, I understand, part of the gentlewoman's district.

[From the Knox News, Thursday, July 16, 2009]

EDITORIAL: SMOKIES STIMULUS: LET THE GOOD WORK BEGIN

It isn't exactly a birthday present, but no matter. The Great Smoky Mountains National Park can use the infusion of \$64 million in stimulus money for a variety of projects that have been needed in the park for years.

It's special that it will come in time to help those in East Tennessee and Western North Carolina celebrate the park's 75th anniversary. And it is significant that it is about eight times the amount the park usually receives for maintenance work.

The stimulus funding is expected to create up to 1,500 jobs inside and outside the park.

The money comes from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and the park officials hope to be able to award the first round of construction contracts by late next month, with work expected to begin after the Sept. 7 Labor Day holiday.

The Smokies Park is one of 380 national parks to receive funding from the stimulus package. And, as the most visited national park in the country, its share of the federal funding was greater than that for other parks.

For example, Yosemite National Park received \$4.5 million and the Grand Canyon National Park received \$10.8 million. Denali National Park in Alaska will get \$6.3 million.

The initial phase of construction will use \$7.5 million of the stimulus money to repave Cosby Campground, improve parking at the Sinks waterfalls area and upgrade 34 buildings and five comfort stations throughout the park.

The park already is using \$1.2 million of the federal money to hire temporary workers who will improve 32 miles of eroded horse trails in Tennessee and North Carolina and to restore more than 60 historic cemeteries.

During the first phase of construction, the Cosby campground will close for the season after the Labor Day holiday. It normally operates through October. The campground is scheduled to reopen as usual in March.

The work on the parking area at the Sinks will cause that site to close following Labor Day, with completion scheduled for May 2010.

The project also will include a handicapped accessible masonry platform overlooking the waterfalls.

A second phase of contracts funded by the stimulus money is expected to be awarded later in the fall; work on these projects will begin in the spring.

Park spokesman Bob Miller said in May that it was a coincidence that the stimulus money comes during the yearlong celebration of the Smokies' 75th anniversary. However, he added, "The park was created in large measure as an economic stimulus initiative, so it's timely that we're making

such a substantial investment in our infrastructure."

We hope those in the federal government, regardless of the impact of the stimulus money, realizes what those in this area have long understood. The Smokies Park is a national treasure—everyone's treasure—and its continued upkeep and improvement need to stay high on the government's to-do list.

So our priorities are pretty clear, and what we're trying to do right now is dig ourselves out of a ditch that her party and the Republican President George Bush dug our economy into. It turns out the ditch is much deeper than anybody had thought, and it's going to take us a little time to get out of it.

But through the stimulus package, through passing health care reform to lower health care costs on families and small businesses, through a climate change bill to create thousands and thousands of more green jobs, I think we've got to turn the corner, and I think that the President of the United States is leading us on the right track.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend is engaged in revisionist history again. We did have a good economy under President Bush. After he inherited a recession and after 9/11, things went south in our economy. The President asked the Congress to cut taxes. It was a Republican-controlled Congress. We had 54 straight months of job creation.

Then the Democrats took over the Congress in January of 2007—and we have charts to show it—all of the sudden the economy really went south. Things started going downhill when Democrats took control of the Congress and have been going downhill ever since. Now, we have a Democrat-controlled Congress and a Democrat in the White House, and things are really going badly.

I think that we can prove with historical facts, not revisionist history, that under the Republicans in the House and Senate and the Republican President that the economy was in pretty good shape.

I yield to my friend from Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity.

I am from Utah. Out West we actually deal with the horses and burros that we will be talking about and debating in this rule.

Now, for whatever reason, a variety of reasons, this emergency meeting had to happen yesterday. Somehow this legislation, which had passed out of committee in April, was suddenly at 2:20 yesterday called up in an emergency meeting and that the Rules Committee had to meet at 3:30 in the afternoon.

Now, I know it's normal and customary and regular that the rule vote generally goes down partisan lines, but I would urge my colleagues to reconsider this. There is no reason to rush this legislation through.

I tried to offer an amendment. That amendment was not heard in the Rules Committee despite it being delivered and given on time. Minor, minor amendment.

I still have underlying concerns about the overall bill. I would still vote against it, but I've got to be candid, I think there's some adjustments that could be made. And I'd like to take a moment here and just talk a little bit about the amendment that I was trying to make, and I would hope that my Democratic friends and colleagues would at least allow it to be heard. I think that's the American way, and I think there's a pattern here of terrible frustration, not being able to be heard on this floor about amendments that we, the people, are here to do.

The amendment I was simply trying to offer is that this board that's going to oversee the horses and burros is consisting of 12 people. We're trying to add a few more people to that board: two representatives from State grazing boards or equivalent State agencies who are not State employees; and we're trying to add two representatives of Indian tribes who manage wild horses and burros.

□ 0930

Now, if you're out West in a State like Utah and several of the other Western States, you have Indian tribes who have a vested interest in the management interest of the horse and burros. For the Democrats to actually deny us an opportunity to allow Native Americans to be represented on the board is just ridiculous. It shows the arrogance and the heavy-handedness of this Congress.

Time after time, we have offered amendments to appropriations that never get heard on this floor. I, too, was elected. I'm a freshman. I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up.

They tell us a lot in meetings that when we talk about rules and we talk about process, it's not that sexy and we're not going to win elections based on that sort of thing. But if we don't get the process right, we're not going to get the end result right.

To take a bill that, as introduced, has a \$700 million price tag to it, rush it through Rules in just over an hour, offer an amendment on time, then not being allowed to hear it where we're just simply trying to get, for instance, members of Native Americans to participate in the horse and burro bill, is just symptomatic of what is wrong and what is broken here in this process.

I have deep concerns about this bill overall. I know there's a manager's amendment. I know there's a substitute amendment. But let's also understand in this bill that we're dealing with overpopulation here. There are over 30,000—some horses and burros that are incarcerated or being held, however you want to term it, out in the Western States predominantly.

You know, they talk about save our mustangs as if it's some endangered

species. It's not an endangered species. They are rampant everywhere, destroying the land, going onto private landholders' land and destroying their crops.

And now we're offering this \$700 million program and, you know what, to suggest that there's no cost to the manager's amendment I don't think is accurate. We're dealing with an overpopulation here with huge, huge price tags to it and a huge burden upon the rural Americans that live out West and have to deal with these horses.

I would encourage my colleagues to look deeply at this rule. Please, just because it's offered doesn't mean that it has to be approved. I appreciate the opportunity to stand here and share this with you today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague that I appreciate his comments, especially after our previous conversation.

He is complaining about the process, but if I'm understanding this correctly, the Resources Committee held a hearing on this bill. There was a full committee markup. The gentleman offered a similar amendment, I understand, that was rejected.

He sent an amendment up to the Rules Committee, which he did not testify on behalf of, which he is not required to. But if it was so important, I would have thought that he would have been up before the committee. And I would also say to my colleague that, to the best of my understanding, none of his Republican colleagues on the Rules Committee offered his amendment.

So I would just suggest in the future, if there is an important issue like that, that there be some more groundwork in advance to it.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I think that it's very interesting to observe that there was virtually no notice whatsoever that while we're in the midst of this crucial appropriations process that this bill was going to come forward.

One hour's notice was provided to the full membership of this institution. Mr. CHAFFETZ had an amendment. He hurriedly put this together, submitted the amendment. Of course he didn't come to testify.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman's observation. But my point was that not only did Mr. CHAFFETZ not appear before the Rules Committee, but no member of the minority party on the Rules Committee offered his amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume. As my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) was saying, we are supposedly in the midst of

an appropriations process, which is so time consuming and has to be so tightly controlled that we have not been allowed to offer amendments in an open process on the floor on the appropriations bills.

Yet, here we are today, handling a bill that obviously is not an emergency, obviously doesn't need to be dealt with now, and is only being put forward because the majority didn't have an excuse to keep us in town today, when people could be at home in the real world, meeting with their constituents, hearing what they have to say, and being able to learn more about the problems that are out there.

The Democrats in this House believe all the wisdom of the world is in Washington, D.C. We Republicans believe the wisdom of the world is out in our district, and that's where we ought to be spending more time, instead of here, creating problems for the American people.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to my very distinguished colleague and former attorney general, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule. You know, there's an expression around here: When we need filler on this floor to keep Members here for whatever reason, we bring up the dogs and the cats. Well, I guess we couldn't find one so we bring up the horses and the burros today.

Somehow, those who may never have seen a mustang, who may never have ridden a horse that has a mustang heritage, are the experts on this floor telling us what we ought to do. They're the experts that tell us when government does something, it's not going to cost us anything.

I'm sort of reminded of "Bidenomics." That's the new word used to describe the statements of the Vice President of the United States on economics.

He told a group yesterday, the AARP, that we have to spend more money. The Federal Government has to spend more money, the Vice President said, or else we're going to go bankrupt.

Now, let's understand what he said. Unless we spend more Federal money, we're going to go bankrupt. We've got news for the Vice President. We're already bankrupt. Bankrupt means you're taking in less than you're putting out.

And we just had a magnificent accomplishment in this administration this week. For the first time in the history of this Nation, we now have in a single year a deficit of \$1 trillion. Not a billion with a B, but a trillion with a T. This is extraordinary.

Yet, we have the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend, coming up and telling us once again: Don't worry; this bill we're bringing up here won't cost us any money.

We heard just a couple of months ago, or maybe it was a month ago, the President of the United States said, Pass my stimulus package and I guarantee you we won't have unemployment above 8 or 8.5 percent—8 percent, he said. I'm sorry. I want to make sure we're accurate here about what the President said.

He assured the American people that this stimulus package would stimulate the economy, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has just cited some statistics about all the jobs being created in North Carolina. I'm sure he's looking at the list now so he can get up and tell me how many jobs are being created in my home State of California. I'll be happy to debate that toe to toe any time. We're losing jobs in the State of California. They're losing jobs in this Nation. If the gentleman—well, I don't want to refer to the gentleman.

Let me put it this way. We have funny math here. The statistics that we have, the official statistics show that we are losing jobs at an alarming rate. We have an unemployment rate at the highest we've had in, I think, 26 years; yet we hear from the other side, Hooray for the stimulus package. It's creating jobs. And they will cite you State by State by State.

This is the only place I know where you can add up—well, you have a total number of losses of jobs, but they come to the floor and they will tell you how many jobs they're creating in each State. It's the only place I know where I guess you add up all those additions, but the net result is a subtraction.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Since my friend began speaking about State by State, he alluded to our State of California. The unemployment rate in California today is 11.5 percent.

I'd like to underscore a statement that he made earlier about the promise that was made. We have a \$1 trillion so-called economic stimulus bill. It was \$787 billion, but we all know with interest accrued that it will exceed \$1 trillion. And we were assured that if we passed that stimulus bill, the unemployment rate across this country would not exceed 8 percent.

Right now, tragically, on a nationwide basis, it is 9.5 percent. And yesterday, a report came forward from a wide range of economists indicating that the unemployment rate will, within the next few months, exceed 10 percent. The projection is 10.1 percent. As I said, in our State of California, which is suffering like it has not in modern history, we are facing an 11.5 percent unemployment rate.

This notion of the Vice President indicating that if we don't spend more we're going to go bankrupt is preposterous.

Last night, at the encouragement of my friend from Sacramento, I had a

telephone town hall meeting with literally thousands of my constituents, and the resounding message that came through from those constituents with whom I spoke is that we need to bring about a reduction rather than increase in the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If I might just respond to that, perhaps that's the reason why they're keeping us here. The Democratic leadership doesn't want us to go home and hear from the folks at home because somehow they want us to continue with that notion that we know best. Because we know best here. We realize that in this difficult issue of dealing with wild horses, mustangs, and burros, in our greater wisdom, we have decided that there's no reason to have representation on the Board that's going to control this by the Native Americans. Why would we think the Native Americans would have any interest in this, or any knowledge in this, when those of us in Washington inside the beltway have superior knowledge.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I thank him for his contribution.

Let me just say, Madam Speaker, that one of the things that I think that is important to look to is the beginning of the appropriations process about which my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, was speaking when she began her remarks.

We were told by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that we had critical legislation that had to be addressed before we complete our work by the 1st of August. We needed to get the appropriations process done. And there's a bipartisan consensus that article I, section 9 places on us the responsibility of getting that work done, and we did not in any way want to stand in the way of completing the appropriations process.

And so, today, having been told that we did not have time for an open amendment process, which has existed for only 220 years in this country, throughout the entire history of the Nation, the pattern of having an open amendment process, ensuring that Democrats and Republicans alike would have the opportunity to offer germane amendments to appropriations bills so that they could in fact, if they chose, try and do what our constituents at these town hall meetings continue to say, and that is reduce the size, scope, and reach of government, we have been denied an opportunity to offer those in the open amendment process. And what is it that we're doing? We're dealing with this wild horses and burros bill on the floor after being told there was not enough time.

Yesterday, we had the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) point to the fact that the day before we finished voting at 4 p.m. Yet, here we are, trying to responsibly legislate, and on Friday we're being kept here so that they can continue to work on the appropriations process in a closed way.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time, let me just underscore this. The gentleman mentioned the Constitution. The Constitution gives to the House of Representatives and the United States Senate the single greatest power that we have, which is the power of the purse. The power of the purse means the spending policy, the spending authority of the Federal Government resides in this body and that across the Rotunda. And when we're denied the opportunity to offer amendments, we're denied the opportunity to be able to represent our constituents as to how their money ought to be spent or how their money ought not to be spent, and that is the essential issue that we ought to talk about here.

We have been sent here by our constituents to represent them, and the most powerful tool that we've been given under the Constitution, the power of the purse, is being denied individual Members. This goes against a tradition that's over 200 years in this House, and we're doing it for the purposes of expediency, which is the very argument undercut by the fact that we're taking time here to deal with the question of horses and burros in the West.

□ 0945

Now horses and burros in the West are important. I want to tell you that. I am from the West. We understand it's important. But it certainly is not as important as the appropriations process. And the essential question in a democracy of what right do we have to take money involuntarily from people—that is the tax—if we then are not going to exercise our responsibility to represent them in the decisions as to how those tax dollars will be spent?

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

That was an interesting exchange. Unfortunately it didn't represent or reflect reality. The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, when Bill Clinton left the White House, he left George Bush with an enormous surplus. George Bush took that surplus and frittered it away on wars that were not paid for and \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts that drove us deeper into debt. The economy spiraled down. My friends on the other side basically turned their backs on what was happening to average people all across this country. And in November of 2008 the American people spoke; and what they made clear is this: That my friends on the other side of the aisle, my Repub-

lican friends, do not know best. At every level of government, they were rejected, they were turned out of office because people were sick and tired of their policies that, they believed, drove this economy into a deep ditch. What people want are answers. They don't want the same old, same old. They don't want more tax cuts for the rich. They don't want more indifference toward middle-class working families or total indifference toward those who are struggling in poverty. They want us to try to fix this economy.

My friends take delight in trying to poke holes in the policies of President Obama, saying, Well, you know, he promised that we would create X amount of jobs. We are falling short of that. Well, it turns out that this ditch that they dug is deeper than many of us thought. But by most standards, most economists are actually seeing that things are beginning to turn—maybe slower than we would like, but they are beginning to turn. We need to continue these policies. We need to help working families in this country. We need to fix health care. We need to lower costs for families. People are paying too much for health care in this country. They're tired of the past Congresses that were more interested in pleasing insurance companies than they were in helping average families. They want us to deal with global climate change and to try to help pave the way for new jobs in the area of green technologies. So we're going to move forward.

I should also tell my friends, and as they know, that as we debate this bill, there are committees meeting, there are briefings going on on a whole number of issues from health care to the economic recovery. I'm sorry that they don't want to stay around and do that work, but that's what they were elected to do. We're going to stay here, and we're going to do the people's work until it is done.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just would like to say again to my colleague from Massachusetts that he keeps saying that the Republicans dug a deeper ditch than they expected to have. I just want to point out again that at the end of the Republicans' being in the majority in the Congress at the end of 2006, the economy was growing. We had 54 straight months of job growth. The Democrats took over in January of 2007, and that's when the economy started getting in trouble. They dug the ditch. We didn't dig the ditch.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, I would just like to point out to the gentlelady from North Carolina, who has been a constant critic of the stimulus package, that some \$8 billion of that total is earmarked specifically for North Carolina. Some



of the money that has already been spent, Madam Speaker, and has been used to be able to prevent the firing of teachers. Without receiving that money, States and communities would end up firing hundreds and hundreds of teachers, which would mean that class sizes would increase and in some cases even double, denying our kids the kind of quality education that we want them to have. Some of that money went to help shore up our law enforcement, our police officers, our firefighters. So to the best of my knowledge, the people of North Carolina haven't said, Don't give us the relief. Don't give us the aid. We need help because, quite frankly, this economy is in such bad shape—and I will repeat—because of the policies of the Republican administration that held the White House for 8 years, that basically turned its back on average working people in this country. We are trying to fix the mess that they created, and we're going to do that.

I would now like to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do have the honor and responsibility of chairing our House Committee on Natural Resources. The gentleman from Washington, DOC HASTINGS, a former Member of the Rules Committee, is my ranking member. His amendment was made in order under this rule.

Some allusions have been made on the minority side this morning that there are important issues facing our country, but here we are debating horses and burros because we couldn't find a cats and dogs bill. Well, we take seriously our responsibility on the House Natural Resources Committee as stewards of our public lands. We take seriously our responsibility to all creatures of this great land of ours, whether they be cats, dogs, wild horses, burros, sea otters, turtles, bees, birds. You name it, they appropriately come under our jurisdiction, and they are important responsibilities that the American people value. These are creatures that God has endowed our great country with, that have no vast lobbyists here in Washington representing them; but they represent good old American family values. They represent recreational pursuits. They represent a quality of time that our families can spend enjoying with these creatures that God has so richly bestowed this country with.

So for the other side to say that with all these important issues before our country—and they are important issues, and this Congress is addressing them because we on the majority side as well as this administration can, indeed, walk and chew gum at the same time. We are addressing those issues.

As the minority knows, since they were once in a position of leadership, we are supposed to be here 5 days a week, working on behalf of our con-

stituents. Our constituents, for the most part, work at least 5 days a week, if not 7 days a week. At least in my district, many of them go to work before the sun comes up. They don't go home and see their families until the sun has gone down. They work a full 8- if not 12-hour day; and yet the minority side is noted for their offering motions to adjourn after we come in at 10 o'clock in the morning. They want to go home at 10:10 a.m. I know this is inside Beltway, inside baseball talk; but the American people want to see Congress do its job. They recognize the many issues that face our country, and they recognize that Congress should be able to walk and chew gum at the same time, just like this administration is doing in a very appropriate way.

So we are addressing issues that affect the American people at the same time that we're addressing the issues that affect their daily lives. I think that that's what they want us to do, and they want us to do it in a bipartisan way. So we should not be up here trying to make fun of the matter that we're addressing of wild horses and burros legislation on a Friday because we know that work is being done while we are still discussing this legislation. The committees are meeting, the appropriations committees. The other committees are marking up health care reform, a very important issue. We know here amongst ourselves that if it were not for us having votes here on the floor of the House today, where would Members of Congress be? Some would be in their congressional districts, some would be out around the country doing things that Members do when we have weekends off. So this is an appropriate use of Congress' time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there is so much to say in so little time. I don't think that Republicans need a lecture on how we should be spending our time and whether we should be in Washington 5 days a week. There is an old saying that nobody is safe as long as the Congress or the legislature is in session, and I think most Americans believe that. Being here in Washington is not necessarily meaning that Congress is being productive, and I think that is the point that we have made over and over again. Again, I will say, the wisdom of the world is not here in Washington; and I think with what's been happening, particularly in the last 6 months, the American people have found that out. I am going to be very interested to see how long our colleagues on the other side continue to defend their actions and the action of this administration as the year goes by.

In terms of looking after all God's creatures, I am a person—and my husband is—who are both owned by a dog and a cat. They live in our house. We have farmed all our lives. We have raised horses. We are very, very fond of animals. We give a lot of money to organizations that look after animals. In fact, there is one organization out West

that keeps animals until they die a natural death. We feel very strongly about that. So questioning my feeling about how we should treat all of God's creatures is not going to go very far with me. This is also a group of people that wants to provide government-funded abortions and kill unborn babies at the same time we're talking about saving horses and spending money on that. That argument doesn't go very far with me.

What the difference is between our colleagues on the other side and us is that we don't believe in growing government. These are not the things the Federal Government should be about. The Federal Government should confine itself to the very narrow set of issues laid out for us in the Constitution. We should adhere to the 10th Amendment which says that if it isn't mentioned in the Constitution, then it's a province of the States; and that's what we should be doing. So I thought my colleague promised me fun today, but you brought up some issues where you've gone to meddling.

I now yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina. I represent a district that's 70,000 square miles. Over half of it is already under Federal ownership and control. I wouldn't necessarily say good management because it's also home to lots of issues involving poor forest management, catastrophic fires, lots of degradation of the habitat and lack of management over the years. One of the things that troubles me about this legislation is that we're going to spend potentially \$700 million overall—I've heard figures as high as that—to apparently buy 19 million acres of land perhaps. And if it is, indeed, those levels, all that land, when the government buys it, comes off the tax rolls. I have got communities with 20 percent unemployment where the government owns 70 percent of the counties. They've shut down activity on the forests, and the Federal Government is trying to shut down activity out on the range land and destroy things like cattle ranching and some of the great economic ways of the West.

This legislation comes along and apparently is going to have us borrow another \$700 million from somebody—probably the Chinese or whatever government decides they want to buy more of our debt, \$700 million, almost \$1 billion—so that we can go acquire more land as a government and take it off the tax rolls to deal with this issue. I just find it really disturbing. You are going to put a lot of people out of work in the rural West. This is not well-thought-out legislation. But speaking to the rule, we seem in this Congress, under Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat leadership, to have gone into not just tax-and-spend but gag-and-spend. I'll be asking soon to bring up a privileged resolution that I brought to this floor yesterday to allow us the opportunity to offer up amendments.

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

□ 1000

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. WALDEN. To be able to offer up amendments on appropriations bills as historically Members of this House were always able to do until just recently when we have seen a historic and unprecedented gagging of Members of the Republican Party by Members of the Democratic Party when we have tried to offer up alternatives, positive alternatives, suggestions, ways to protect freedom of speech and freedom of religion and to cut back on this outrageous deficit spending.

I guess those must be tough votes for the majority. They don't want to take them because they won't even allow our amendments to be debated on this House floor and considered.

So I'm sorry we have gotten into the gag-and-spend rules-making process around here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I find it ironic that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to talk about fiscal responsibility and they are worried about the deficit. Where were they for 8 years when George Bush took this economy and drove it straight into a ditch? He inherited a surplus from President Clinton, and he squandered it. And nobody, virtually nobody, on the other side of the aisle spoke about the fact that Republican economic policies are responsible for this economic crisis. This President inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression. We need to dig ourselves out of this ditch. And we are going to do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield our colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) 2 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

In response to this point, I have stood here on this floor for hours and hours over several years listening to many, many Members of the Democrat Party, then the minority in Congress, plead that if they would just get the majority, give them the gavels, that the economy of this country would be brought back on track again. That happened in January of 2007. And it happened prior to any economic decline that anyone can describe on any flow chart that they can bring.

So they claimed that they would fix the economy if they could just have the majorities. They won the majorities partly on that claim, and the economy went south, and it really tanked in the anticipation of the President we have today. And it is getting worse. So I don't think that point can be made empirically.

I came here to rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition to this rule for a number of reasons. I wanted to support the gentleman from Utah's statement about not having an oppor-

tunity, a legitimate opportunity, to make his case before the Rules Committee. And it is clear that that didn't happen. In a 1-hour window, he got an amendment in and filed. That was great staff work. But we have other things to do here other than sit outside the door of the hole in the wall on the third floor.

This process has got to change. We need to bring it to the floor where the American people can see what is actually being talked about in almost legislative code here.

I also want to point out that this legislation is not legislation that comes here because it is well thought out or needed by the American people. This is driven by HSUS, the Human Society of the United States. They have hundreds of millions of dollars, and they have an agenda. They are seeking to take meat off the plates of the American people and all around the globe. So we just dance to this tune in this Congress because they say so.

Nobody came from my district and said, what are we going to do about too many horses? HSUS contributed to this problem by helping to block the harvesting of horses for human consumption. And now we have what will accumulate to be 1 million extra horses in the United States. And barely do they get that over with and they come back to us and say now we need 700 billion American-taxpayer-borrowed dollars to take over more public lands in order to put more horses. This will only continue. Those horses are eating 1 billion gallons of my ethanol every year.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I want to respond to my friend from Massachusetts. He talks about deficits, and where were we? Let me point out to this gentleman, the highest deficit under George W. Bush's administration was in 2004, and that was right after we built up our forces to go into Afghanistan and Iraq.

It was slightly over \$400 billion. Under your first watch, your first watch as the majority in this Congress, the deficit was \$460 billion. This year it is projected to be \$1.8 trillion. And here we are today on the floor talking about a bill to expand that deficit another \$700 million.

Boy, talk about—well, I can't say the word. But talk about less than truthfulness. It certainly comes from the other side of the aisle on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If anyone on the other side of the aisle wants to defend the same-old-same-old policies of George Bush, then go ahead and do it. But the fact of the matter is that in November, 2008, the American people spoke overwhelmingly against and rejected those policies. The economic policies of the Republican Party and of George Bush drove this country into a ditch, and we are trying to dig ourselves out of it.

I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) 10 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman from Massachusetts has over 15 minutes, and he doesn't even want to engage in a colloquy with somebody here that is willing to stand up and at least engage.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it appears as though we are beginning to touch a nerve on the part of our colleagues because we are presenting the facts, and they can't handle them.

We know that this economy is in terrible shape. All they can do is continue to blame President Bush. As one of my colleagues said, they asked for a chance to be in charge. They have been given a chance to be in charge. And what have they done? They have increased the debt to every American in this country in the first 6 months of this year by \$9,342.83. We do face the greatest economic problem we have had in 25 years, not since the Great Depression.

Madam Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule because we don't need to be dealing with this issue now. We should be dealing with the American people who are hurting and continuing to lose jobs under the policies of Speaker PELOSI and the Bush administration.

I am asking my colleagues to vote no on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule making in order an amendment by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah which was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

This amendment reconfigures the Joint Advisory Board to ensure representation by affected Indian tribes and State grazing boards. It also ensures that all members of the advisory board have expertise in wildlife management, rangeland management, animal husbandry or natural resources management and requires that the board members reside in a State in which wild free-roaming horses and burros are currently located.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 653 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after consideration of the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in section 4 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Chaffetz of Utah or his designee. Such amendment shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 5 is as follows: Section 8, strike paragraph (2) (page 17, lines 4 through 11) and insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) by striking 'Governments' and all that follows through 'management,' and inserting 'Governments shall include two representatives of the livestock industry; two representatives from State grazing boards (or equivalent State agency) who are not State employees; two representatives of the environmental community; two representatives

of the animal protection community; two representatives of Indian tribes who manage wild horses or burros; and four scientists. All advisory board members must have expertise in wildlife management, rangeland management, animal husbandry or natural resources management and must reside in States comprising the current range of wild free-roaming horses and burros.”; and”.

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. 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.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we are here today because we are doing the work of the American people. And we are doing what the American people asked us to do.

As we debate this bill on the floor, there are major markups in the Education and Labor Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee on health care. There are also hearings and markups going on on two major appropriations bills. So there is a lot of work going on here, a lot of important work, of trying to dig ourselves out of this mess that this President inherited.

It is interesting, again, to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about fiscal management and about the need to control deficits and debts when they voted for tax cuts for rich people that weren't off-set. They voted for wars that weren't paid for. And there was silence. And the economy got worse and worse and worse. On November 2008, the American people said, enough, we need to change course.

The American people want us to deal with health care. The Party of No says, no, can't do health care. They are trying to scare people, again, away from a national health care reform bill that will control and lower the cost of health care for average Americans.

People want us to deal with the issue of climate change and creating green jobs. And the Party of No says, no, we can't do that. They don't want us to deal with that issue. No, no, no, no.

Well, the reality is the American people want us to deal with the issues of law enforcement, with the issues of immigration and with a whole number of issues. And the Party of No says no. They vote against everything. They are against everything. So here we are. We are dealing with this issue today.

I think this is a commonsense bill. The chairman of the Resources Committee explained that there was a hearing and there was a markup at full committee. I would urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

Mr. McGOVERN. 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. FOXX. Madam 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.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of privileges of the House

and offer the resolution previously noticed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Walden, submitted an amendment to the Committee on Rules to H.R. 3170, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act;

Whereas the said gentleman's amendment would have protected the free speech rights of broadcasters and American citizens by prohibiting funds made available in the Act from being used to implement the Fairness Doctrine and certain broadcast localism regulations,

Whereas a similar amendment was adopted by the House in 2007 during consideration of H.R. 2829, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2008 by a vote of 309 yeas and 115 nays, and became law, but the Democratic leadership allowed the provision to expire;

Whereas the gentleman's amendment complied with all applicable Rules of the House for amendments to appropriations measures and would have been in order under an open amendment process; but regrettably the House Democratic leadership has dramatically and historically reduced the opportunity for free speech on this Floor, and

Whereas the Speaker, Mrs. Pelosi, the Democratic leadership, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Obey, prevented the House from voting on the amendment by excluding it from the list of amendments made in order under the rule for the bill: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That H. Res. 644, the rule to accompany H.R. 3170, be amended to allow the gentleman from Oregon's amendment be considered and voted on in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oregon wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged for immediate consideration?

Mr. WALDEN. Yes, Madam Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WALDEN. I appreciate that, Madam Speaker. Rule IX is intended to allow a Member to raise questions which, and I quote, “those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; and those affecting the rights of Members, individually, in their representative capacity.”

So I pose the question, What is more fundamental to the rights of Members of this House than the ability to represent their constituents and affect legislation brought to this floor?

The Democratic majority, under Speaker PELOSI, has unilaterally ended a 220-year tradition of allowing any Member to amend a spending bill. When my constituents sent me to Congress, they didn't send me here to just push the buttons using this card in a voting terminal. They wanted me to exercise all of the abilities granted to a Member of Congress. And the rule which this House passed yesterday by only a handful of votes, after arm twisting by the majority, denies me and every other Member the opportunity to fully represent their constituents.