Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—160

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

DeFazio
Fudge
Granger
Green, Gene
Markey (CO)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1250

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 510 on the Agriculture appropriations bill, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly, but on behalf of my potato farmers who were not addressed by the amendment, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion to adjourn was rejected.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3081, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 617 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 617

Resolved, That at any time after 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. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, except as provided in section 2, no amendment shall be in order except: (1) the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution; and (2) the amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, 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 and except that an amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading. 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. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. 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. 2. After consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate, which shall be controlled by the proponent.

SEC. 3. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 3081, the Chair may reduce to two minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNYDER). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. All time yielded for consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 617.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 617 provides for consideration of H.R. 3081, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2010, under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration except those arising under clause 9 or clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The bill makes in order the amendment printed in part A of the committee report and the amendments printed in part B of the committee report accompanying this resolution. Each amendment is debatable for 10 minutes. Finally, the rule also provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that we will consider today, H.R. 3081, funds the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and related programs for fiscal year 2010.

This bipartisan bill reflects four key priorities: it protects our national security and combats terrorism; provides critical resources to meet global health and development challenges; ensures adequate oversight and accountability of our foreign assistance; and most importantly reforms and rebuilds America's diplomatic and development capacity.

In total, the bill provides $48.8 billion for fiscal year 2010. This is $3.2 billion less than the President's request, and $1.2 billion below the fiscal year 2009 enacted level including supplemental funding, a reasonable level of funding during these unprecedented fiscal times.

To protect national security and combat terrorism, the State-Foreign Operations appropriations bill provides $2.2 billion to Israel, provides $2.7 billion in assistance for Afghanistan and $1.5 billion for Pakistan, and it provides $1.8 billion total in economic and security assistance for Egypt and Jordan, two of our key allies in the Middle East.

It also requires a report on the status and progress of diplomatic efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and it continues a reporting requirement on bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran. Further, it prevents the Export-Import Bank from providing financing to any energy producers or refiners that contribute to Iran's refined petroleum resources.

The bill also continues to take aim at the war on drugs by setting aside $319 million for Mexico and Central America for counternarcotics and law enforcement programs. It also includes $520 million for Colombia to fight narcotics and criminal gangs and to promote alternatives to drug production.

The State-Foreign Operations bill makes great strides in increasing global health by providing funding increases for international HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, tuberculosis and malaria prevention, safe water and hygiene, and child and maternal health programs. These global health investments are critical, not just in saving lives overseas, but in protecting the health of countless Americans from disease.

The State-Foreign Operations bill also ensures that the United States continues to meet our moral and humanitarian obligations abroad. The bill provides funding for countries facing long-term development challenges, improving foreign agriculture and food security programs and helping countries struggling with food shortages, supporting basic education needs, helping displaced people around the world with food, water, shelter and other basic needs, and providing lifesaving assistance during worldwide natural disasters.

□ 1300

It also provides $450 million for the Peace Corps. This is $77 million above the President's request, which accelerates the President's commitment to expanding the Peace Corps, one of the most valuable programs our government can fund.

The lack of capacity in our civilian agencies has resulted in an increased reliance on American troops to carry out diplomatic missions. Besides placing an additional workload on our already overburdened troops and taking their focus away from their critical core missions, it is not in the best interests of our Nation to place diplomatic missions with our military.

Secretary Clinton, Secretary Gates, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all stressed the need to increase the capacity of the State Department and USAID. As such, the bill provides resources to hire 1,000 new State Department personnel and 300 new USAID personnel so our country can take the necessary steps to begin rebuilding and restoring our diplomatic capabilities that we shortchanged and underappreciated for far too long.

Finally, the bill also improves and continues the Democrats' commitment to oversight and accountability. It provides nearly $150 million for activities of the Inspector General of the Department of State and USAID, as well as for the Special Inspectors General for both Iraq and Afghanistan reconstruction. In addition, this bill reverses years of accounting gimmickry through supplemental appropriations. Instead, it provides upfront, honest and transparent accounting of the true costs of meeting our critical foreign policy and national security initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. In these tough economic times, it is also a fair bill. And, most importantly, this is a bipartisan bill that goes a long way towards restoring the strength and capabilities of the United States both here and abroad.

I commend the chairwoman, Mrs. LOWEY, for her admirable efforts in ensuring our needs are met, both here and abroad, and to ensure that the national security and foreign policy commitments of the United States remain strong for many days to come.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for the time.

I would like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER for their efforts on this important legislation. This bill provides almost $50 billion in funding for a number of U.S. government programs and activities, including the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, foreign economic and military assistance, contributions to international organizations, and international broadcasting programs.

In today's world, foreign assistance is as important to our national interest as it is ethical. I am pleased that the legislation recognizes our shared democratic values and our special friendship with Israel, and includes $2.2 billion in Foreign Military Financing programs, FMF assistance, for that great friend and ally.

Our aid to Israel is especially important as the ruthless tyranny in Iran threatens to wipe it off the face of the map and rockets continue to rain down on Israel from terrorist groups, whether they be Hamas or Hezbollah. Israel is a true friend and partner of the United States, and we must now, more than ever, show unwavering support for our friends, not only through this legislation, but through every other available means.

I am deeply concerned about the funding provided in this legislation to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Without determining that the agency does not have members of Hamas on its payroll, U.N. agencies such as that, for example, such as the so-called Human Rights Council, a club of tyrannies, do not deserve American taxpayer support, just like the useless embarrassment that is the Organization of American States.

Now, there are some good things, very good things in this legislation.

The legislation provides $165 million in Economic Support Funds, for example, for Haiti, to help the authorities consolidate democratic gains and promote development.

Since the recent devastating storms hit Haiti, I have called, first on the Bush administration and then on the Obama administration, to grant temporary protected status to Haitian nationals in the United States.

I visited Haiti last month, and my visit reinforced my belief that TPS for Haiti is well overdue. Again, I call on the Obama administration to finally grant TPS for Haitians. The Obama administration needs to stop dragging its feet on this important issue.

I wish to thank the Appropriations Committee for the $20 million in Economic Support Funds for pro-democracy activities in Cuba in this bill. Those funds will support efforts for a transition to democracy and freedom in the only totalitarian dictatorship in

the Western Hemisphere, through support for dissidents, human rights activists, independent librarians and others who risk their lives each day struggling for freedom in that enslaved island, the only country in the Western Hemisphere where free elections have been denied to its people for over 50 years.

The legislation includes $1.4 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, MCC. Assistance to foreign nations from the MCC is linked to greater responsibilities from those nations. The new responsibilities those developing nations accept in exchange for the funds ensure that the assistance we provide does not go to waste and has the greatest possible impact on those who need the help the most.

I have been a longtime supporter of the MCC. But last year I learned that one recipient country may not be keeping up their end of the bargain. APR Energy, a Florida company, has an ongoing contract dispute with Tanzania, which I understand Tanzania has failed to resolve. I urge the Tanzanian government to comply with both the contract with APR Energy and their MCC compact and expeditiously resolve the dispute with APR Energy pursuant to the law and the utmost transparency.

I have concerns with the increased funding levels in two areas of the bill, the United Nations Population Fund and international family planning. In the past, this United Nations fund has been found to support and participate in programs of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. While the international family planning money doesn't go directly to fund abortions, it will go to organizations that promote and provide advocacy for abortion.

I do not think this is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. Even though the majority on the Rules Committee last night rejected the Smith-Stupak amendment on this issue, I continue to hope that the issue will be addressed in conference.

I commend the committee, the Appropriations Committee, for recognizing many other important foreign policy priorities in the bill, $21 million for the American Institute in Taiwan, for example, and over $740 million for broadcasting through such important media outlets as the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and for Radio and TV Marti. I also commend the committee for maintaining the Greek language broadcasts in the Voice of America and also for wisely providing assistance to promote as much as possible the reconciliation to end the violence in Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the underlying legislation, I must oppose the rule by which the majority is bringing this bill to the floor. Last month, the majority set a dangerous precedent to limit debate on appropriations bills, debate that historically was almost always considered under open rules, open debate process. Today we are set to consider the sixth of 12 appropriations bills, and every bill considered so far has been considered under a structured rule that severely limits the ability of all Members of this House to introduce amendments and have them debated.

During yesterday's Rules Committee hearing, Appropriations Ranking Member LEWIS testified that there is still time to undo the majority's new precedent restricting the ability of Members to offer amendments on appropriations bills. He asked the majority to reconsider the use of structured rules on appropriations bills, to return to regular order, to historical order, to the tradition of an open debate process on appropriations bills. He even offered his services to persuade Members to not offer dilatory amendments which would hamper the ability of Congress to complete its appropriations work on time.

Rules Ranking Member DREIER and I also offered to help Ranking Member LEWIS rein in any errant Members, any Members who wished to prolong unnecessarily the appropriations process. I really hoped the majority on the Rules Committee would heed Mr. LEWIS' thoughtful suggestion and accept his offer to help move the process along if an open debate process was returned to. However, the majority once again blocked Members from both sides of the aisle from offering amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has simply not understood the damage, unnecessarily, that it is causing this House by closing debate on appropriations bills, by breaking two centuries of precedence. How myopic. How sad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the chairwoman of the committee, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and in support of H.R. 3081. This is a very good bill. It was drafted in a bipartisan manner, and it should enjoy the support of Members of both sides of the aisle.

I know that my colleagues on the other side would have preferred an open rule. However, there is much business that needs to be completed in the month of July, and I believe this rule will allow us to complete our work in an expeditious manner.

The rule makes in order a number of amendments from the minority, including one from the ranking member of my subcommittee and one from the ranking member of the full committee. I hope that Members on both sides will recognize the importance of this bill in protecting our national security and advancing our foreign policy.

There were necessary compromises on both sides that allowed this bill to come forward today, and I want to thank all the members of my subcommittee, Republicans and Democrats, for their contributions. Most especially, in closing, I want to thank my ranking member, KAY GRANGER. Unfortunately, she called me this morning, that because of health issues, she could not be with us. She was going to try to get here in time to cast the vote.

I personally want to make it clear to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, because of the bipartisan approach, this is a good bill. It's a strong bill, and we are proud to present it to you.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I join him in opposition to this rule. I think all of these deadlines that suddenly we have realized are there are not reasons to go away from the traditions of the House.

Like the gentleman, I applaud many of the efforts in the bill itself, certainly aid for our friend, Israel, the democracy, the pillar of democracy in the Middle East, and hopefully other countries in that area will rally around that example. Aid for Israel is important in this bill.

On the other hand, an amendment that I had that had 74 cosponsors as a bill in the last Congress that would limit funds transferred to any entity of the Palestinian Authority until the President certifies to the appropriate committees that the ruling Fatah Party has taken the clauses out of their constitution that called for the destruction of Israel would have added to this bill and would have added to this debate. It should have been allowed. I am disappointed it wasn't.

I am also concerned that we didn't allow the amendment that I offered on the Law of the Sea Treaty, that simply would have prevented funds in the bill from being used for a contribution to the Seabed Authority. That's an authority, a global entity, that would be responsible for collecting taxes on U.S. energy companies for deep seabed mining if the United States ratifies the Law of the Sea Treaty. Those are only two examples of many of the amendments that were offered that were rejected and that we should have found time to debate those and add them to the bill.

I oppose the rule.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the rule for the Fiscal Year 2010 State Department and Foreign Operations appropriations bill, H.R. 3081. I sincerely want to thank the chairwoman, NITA LOWEY, and her staff for their diligent work on this appropriations bill and for their efforts and their help in securing an additional $10 million for maternal health in the manager's amendment.

I sincerely thank the gentlelady for her support and for her work and for addressing one of the most serious issues facing women on this planet. The need to act to address the global maternal mortality rate and to save

mothers' lives is very clear, and the time to act is now.

The recent words of the First Lady of Sierra Leone are haunting, but all too true for too many women in the world and their families and their communities. She stated, ''We know too well that a pregnant woman in Kigali or Freetown has one foot in the grave,'' which is why many ''say goodbye to our mothers and sisters as they go into labor.''

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, pregnancy is a time when we should be welcoming life into the world, not saying goodbye. For every woman's death we fail to prevent by boosting investments in critical maternal health programs, we fail newborns who now face an increased risk of dying themselves. We fail the family, including children pulled from schools to support their families and pick up the duties of the now deceased mother, and we fail those communities by undermining economic development and poverty reduction efforts in the wider community.

This investment into maternal health will save lives. We can and must continue to do what we can to reduce the needless suffering of millions of women around the world from childbirth and pregnancy-related complications. Too much is at stake if we fail to deliver for these woman.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last night, Mr. STUPAK and I respectfully requested that an amendment reinstating the Mexico City Policy be made in order so that the full House would have the opportunity to vote up or down on this critically important issue.

This year's Foreign Ops Appropriations bill increases population control funding by a whopping 40 percent over the 2008 levels to a record $648 million. Our amendment would simply ensure that this huge allocation of taxpayer grant money not be awarded to foreign nongovernmental organizations that perform abortions on demand or lobby for abortion on demand in developing countries.

Today, most African and Latin countries protect the lives of their unborn children, and the real threat to those laws and policies are coming from the United States and European nongovernmental organizations and the money behind them.

Indeed, prior to January, Mr. Speaker, the pro-life Mexico City Policy guaranteed that unborn children in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere not be put at risk of death by the NGOs that we fund.

Every human life is precious, Mr. Speaker, and sacred and worthy of respect. No one, no one is expendable. Thus, family planning funds and the NGOs that they empower cannot be allowed to be the Trojan Horse for a global abortion industry.

On an encouraging note, Americans agree with our efforts to reinstate the Mexico City Policy. The Gallup Poll recently found by a margin of 2–1, 65 percent to 35 percent, Americans oppose President Obama's Executive order reversing the Mexico City Policy. They support his other Executive orders, but not that one.

Another Gallup Poll found that, for the first time, 51 percent to 42 percent, Americans are identifying as pro-life. Ultrasound technology—the window to the womb—is finally shattering the myth that an unborn child is somehow not a person.

Mr. Speaker, stripped of its many euphemisms, abortion is violence against children and often harms women emotionally and psychologically and physically. Abortion methods either dismember the fragile body of a baby to death or poisons the infant or chemically induces premature labor, leaving the immature child unable to cope with his or her new environment.

You know, in Congress we often speak and enact laws and policies designed to reduce infant mortality, and that's a wonderful and necessary goal. Can we not see or appreciate or understand that abortion is infant mortality?

An unborn child's immaturity and dependence should in no way mitigate, negate, or nullify an unborn child's inherent humanity. Human rights ought to be about inclusion, not exclusion, especially of the weakest and the most vulnerable.

Finally, can we not see or appreciate or understand that birth is an event and not the beginning of a child's life? And the stunning breakthroughs over the last three decades in treating unborn children who are diagnosed with diseases or disabilities only brings into sharp focus that the child in the womb must be regarded as a patient in need of benign and compassionate interventions. Not poison shots or razor-sharp curettes that kill, but medicines and procedures that cure.

The Mexico City Policy holds children harmless in our family planning programs throughout the world. Tragically, the rule before us precludes so much as a vote on the Mexico City Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that the right to life is the most fundamental human right issue on Earth. Unfortunately, abortion and the promotion of abortion is the only violation of that basic human right that has the audacity to call itself a right.

I therefore will be voting ''no'' on the rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. CARDOZA. The gentleman is very sincere, and I appreciate his friendship and his words. I would just make one correction, and that is when he speaks of a 40 percent increase in this bill, what we are doing in this bill is increasing the transparency from a situation where all the dollars that we're spending here were in the past few years put into supplemental bills and pretended like they didn't really count. We're taking that supplemental spending and putting it in a transparent process that we can all appreciate.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I'm sure it was unwitting, but my friend from the other side of the isle misspoke. Just to make very clear, the population account, the money that was allocated in FY 2008, was approximately $460 million. It is now at $648 million. That is approximately a 40 percent increase. And then other moneys potentially could be going to these foreign nongovernmental organizations that promote abortion as well, like Planned Parenthood, Marie Stopes International, and others. So we have a very serious problem. They are American surrogates in foreign countries. They speak for us. They certainly don't speak and act for millions of pro-life Americans.

Yes, do family planning. Our amendment would leave that in tact. It would not touch the amount of money for family planning. We ought argue that abortion is not family planning and has no legitimate place in any compassionate program of health care. It is the killing of an unborn child.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague for yielding.

You know, I think the American people would like to see us debate the issues that they're very concerned about on this floor, and there are many of these issues we're not going to be able to debate because of this closed rule.

I'd just like to cite a couple of amendments that I introduced that I think the American people, many of them, would really like to hear debated.

One of them was a sense of Congress bill or amendment that would expand the economic sanctions against Iran. Iran is a terrorist state developing nuclear weapons. A sense of Congress resolution saying we should put severe economic standards on them, sanctions on them, and get our allies to do it, is something that should have been debated and passed, because I think Americans are concerned about this terrorist state and they want us to stop their nuclear program and to put pressure on them.

Another amendment would have prohibited funds from being used to establish diplomatic or commercial ties in or with Iran until these changes are

made, until they stop their nuclear development program, which threatens the Middle East oil supplies, our energy supplies, and the whole world.

Finally, we had one that dealt with putting pressure on terrorist organizations until they recognize Israel's right to exist. I think all of us support Israel and we want to make sure Israel's right to exist is guaranteed. So why wouldn't we want to have an amendment on the floor which said that the organizations that are trying to destroy Israel should be put under extreme pressure to make sure that they recognize Israel's right to exist?

Finally, one of the things that really concerns me is the United Nations is going to spend almost $900,000 in legal fees for Benon Sevan. He is the man who ran the Oil-for-Food program, and it was a corrupt program. He was working with Saddam Hussein.

The man has fled the country. He has been charged with bribery and wire fraud, and the U.S. Federal and State prosecutors are looking for this guy, and they're using our taxpayer dollars to defend him, to help him with his legal fees.

What I said in this amendment is we should withhold the amount of money that would go for his legal fees from our commitment to the United Nations, and I think the American people would agree with that.

So I can't understand why the chairman and the members of the Rules Committee didn't make these in order. I hope in the future they will be a little more openminded about this, because the American people want these issues debated in the people's House.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I want to just rise to thank Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Ranking Member KAY GRANGER for their great work on this bill and focus particularly on this bill's commitment to global development issues.

I'm the chair of the Terrorism Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and have been working very, very closely with our military as we attempt to combat terrorism and violent extremist groups throughout the globe. Certainly, there is a big military component to that.

What we have increasingly learned in the military and elsewhere is that we will never win that battle and that fight if we are not equally committed to global development.

We have seen a major commitment in this bill on the central focus in our efforts right now, which is in Pakistan and Afghanistan. I applaud that effort. But also understand that this bill recognizes that it is broader than just Pakistan and Afghanistan. Throughout the Middle East, throughout Africa, throughout Southeast Asia, failed and failing states are a major contributor to instability and the rise of violent extremist groups. Getting our global development policy right is critical to stopping that effort. This bill makes that commitment.

I also want to say that this is not just a matter of more money. It is a matter of improving the quality of our global development, of coordinating it, of figuring out what works and making sure that our programs are more efficient and more effectively delivered.

On that point, I also support the committee and support the Foreign Relations Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee as well for putting pressure on the administration to make fundamental changes in the way we do global development, to make sure that it is better coordinated, more effective, and works better.

We have a lot of work to do on this front, but this appropriation bill reflects the priority of global development policy, funding it and supporting it, if we are ever to be triumphant in our efforts to stop violent extremist groups and reduce instability throughout the globe.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK).

Mr. MACK. I would like to thank my colleague for yielding time.

I rise today to speak against the rule for this bill, a rule that shuts out our ability to offer amendments on the floor is an unprecedented abuse of the rules and debate on appropriation bills.

Why is the majority so afraid to hear what we have to say? Why is the majority so afraid of what we might have to offer? Isn't this the place to have debate, real debate, on the important issues that are facing the United States and the citizens of the United States? If you can't have the debate here on the floor of the House, where can you have it?

This is where we should be debating the issues, and changing the rules and the process does the people of this country a disservice.

If I were able to offer an amendment to the Foreign Ops bill, I would offer an amendment that would make sure that aid to Honduras is not cut off. Mr. Speaker, the administration has cut funding to the people of Honduras because some have claimed that a military coup has occurred in Honduras. Instead of being responsible on the matter, the administration has gotten itself involved with the likes of Chavez, Morales, Ortega, and too quickly reacted in a knee-jerk fashion.

To cut the aid, be it humanitarian, military, or what have you, is the wrong thing to do, and if I were able to offer an amendment, I would have fought hard to make sure that aid to Honduras was not cut.

This process makes a mockery of our democratic system, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this rule and support an open process, but also support the people of Honduras.

□ 1330

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

Mr. PERRIELLO. I rise to express my support for the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations.

For the first time in a long time, we have a President with a balanced foreign policy focused on smart power that balances might and right.

Having worked in Afghanistan, I know firsthand the importance of diplomacy and the rule of law. Our success internationally depends on both the full funding and support of our military and of our diplomatic corps. Every crisis averted through good diplomacy, multinational cooperation and economic development reduces the burden on our military and our military families.

This bill also includes support language for the City of Hope project. This project is managed by the nonprofit Teamwork Ministries International based in my district in Martinsville, Virginia. Their work to help educate, nourish and train future leaders of Africa is a worthy investment to bring hope to communities and to nations around the globe. This project is a great example of dedicated yet humble Americans putting their values into action, being the face of the greatest of all nations to those who are suffering the most. I thank the team at the City of Hope project, and I thank the chairman for this great step forward for our country's security and its greatest values.

This project is making a difference in the lives of children who have been orphaned as a result of the HIV/AIDS crisis affecting Tanzania and other countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Duke University, the University of Virginia, Campbell University, Howard University, St. Mary's University of Tanzania, and Teamwork Ministries International are working together to advance the City of Hope project.

The HIV/AIDS epidemic has left millions of African children alone, homeless, and without hope. UNICEF estimates there are over 12 million orphaned children in sub-Saharan Africa, and over 1.5 million in Tanzania alone. In some communities, the majority of adults have either died or are infected with HIV/AIDS, and their children carry the burden of raising the family. These children are at a high risk of being misused and exploited at the work place as they try to earn a living to support their siblings. Many of these children wander into towns, live on the streets, and resort to stealing in order to survive. Others are kidnapped and sold as slaves.

The City of Hope is a revolutionary concept, of building facilities and initiating assistance programs not only to provide living quarters, health care, clean drinking water, food and education for children, but also to help educate and train future leaders of Africa. It is an innovative way of bringing transformation to those in despair, and bringing hope to communities and to nations.

Through construction of campuses for orphans in Tanzania providing clean drinking water, residential facilities, schools, and health care facilities, the City of Hope project will provide safe havens for children in the region. A

principal objective is to provide training in leadership skills and in microenterprise, especially agribusiness and sustainable farming, and environmentally beneficial land-use practices. This approach is intended to provide economic opportunities for future leaders in an area in which 80 percent of the economy is agricultural.

Teamwork Ministries is benefiting from the commitment of skilled professionals in such areas as medicine, nursing, nutrition and health, sustainable agricultural practices, and design of "green buildings" to conserve energy. The government of Tanzania is assigning doctors and medical staff to the City of Hope project, and Duke University School of Nursing, the University of Virginia, Campbell University, Howard University, and St. Mary's University of Tanzania are all offering their expertise.

In 2009, the first City of Hope campus in the northern Tanzanian community of Ntagatcha will be home to 300 orphaned children and will provide employment and health care to benefit adults in the local community. Teamwork Ministries' objective is to replicate the City of Hope model elsewhere, to serve communities in which the need is greatest. With adequate funding and support in the years ahead, Teamwork Ministries' goal is to establish up to 100 Cities of Hope throughout Tanzania and other sub-Saharan African countries.

I want to thank the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee Chair, Congresswoman LOWEY, and my colleague Congressman DAVID PRICE, a member of the Appropriations Committee, for their support of the City of Hope project. I believe this project, which has strong support in my Congressional District, will be a worthwhile expenditure of USAID funding.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend from Florida. I rise in opposition to the rule. I think at a time when so many controversial decisions are being made in foreign policy, we should have free and open debate. I continue my concerns about the lack of free and open debate.

At the same time, I am going to support the underlying bill, but not without deep concerns. I have concerns about the spending in the bill. I have concerns about the administration's policy in about every country except Canada, and I have some reservations even in their policy with Canada. But at the end of the day, and as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) said, for those of us who spent our entire lives working on the pro-life movement, to be forced into choices with this Mexico City policy combined with family planning is terrible.

But at the end of the day, I stand with Israel and the funding for Israel. We will have votes on other issues, but this is really our only vote of importance to supporting our friends in Israel.

Without this military funding to help provide superiority and technology in developing their military capability to keep their military superiority over neighbors who would wipe them from the face of the Earth the second they don't have that superiority, they very possibly might not survive. I have concerns about this administration's policy on Israel. It seems to me we are doing a lot of bullying of a government elected there. They elect different parties, they have different positions, and ultimately they have to make their decisions on what is best for them to survive. They are the best example of democracy in the region. They elect governments that make the different decisions, and we stand with them because we believe it is in our best interest and our obligation to stand with Israel, even if we may disagree with certain policies.

So I even have concerns about the administration's policies regarding Israel; but at the same time, fundamentally, this is our Israel vote. Because I recognize the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel, because I understand their forced diaspora and their persecution around the world, and I understand why Israel was recreated and reestablished in 1948. And I understand the anti-Semitism and rising anti-Semitism around the world, and I understand the anger and commitment to the destruction of their very nation. I think it is important with all of the other difficult issues that we show bipartisan support in this way to our friends in Israel who are in tough straits right now.

So it is reluctantly that I will vote for the bill, but I will vote for the bill and oppose the rule.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks to my colleagues, Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER, for their tireless work over the years to make safe drinking water and basic sanitation more accessible to the world's poor.

In recent years, we have strengthened the United States commitment to this cause not only by increasing the amount of moneys for safe water and drinking water and sanitation, but also making sure that these moneys are appropriately spent in the proper countries, in line with the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

The continual increase in funding has allowed USAID to hire new technical staff with drinking water and sanitation expertise, to leverage host government involvement, to increase matching funds available to NGOs, and to conduct a range of tested and pilot approaches to increase water and sanitation coverage in individual host countries. It is essential that we continue on this upward trajectory, and I applaud Congresswoman LOWEY for making an additional $25 million available for this effort.

Water and sanitation have increasingly played a major role in how individuals interact with one another and how governments govern. Today, approximately 1 billion people lack access to safe drinking water, and an estimated 2.6 billion people live in environments where they do not have access to proper toilet facilities and human waste cannot be properly disposed of.

Chronic water scarcity has fueled instability and hinders economic and social development. In such places as Zimbabwe, Mexico and Gaza, the lack of access to safe drinking water has had detrimental ramifications for the people who live there. For example, over 1.6 million people die every year from easily preventable diseases, and 90 percent of the children are under 5.

I certainly commend Congresswoman LOWEY, and I would like to say that is why Congressman BLUMENAUER and I introduced the Paul Simon bill, and I urge its support.

The lack of access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation affects everything from how food is grown and prepared to the ability of girls and young women to attend school. Water and sanitation is an obvious issue of health but also one of dignity, physical safety and development.

In 2002, the world's leaders gathered together and pledged to halve the proportion, by 2015, of people who lack access to clean water and basic sanitation. The U.S. Congress took this pledge and passed the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005. We made the pledge to bring safe and affordable drinking water to the world's poor. Since its enactment in 2005, the U.S. has been able to bring inexpensive potable water to millions of people. While some parts of the world are on track to halve the percent of people who lack access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation, some regions like Africa are behind schedule. That is why Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER and I introduced the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2009. This bill is calling for the U.S. Government to elevate the pledge we made in 2002 to a diplomatic and policy priority. It would create offices within the Department of State and USAID and would increase the level of U.S. Government cooperation with local and NGO partners. Most importantly, it would bring first-time access to safe drinking water to an additional 100 million people.

As we, in Congress, debate the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Act which will rebuild our diplomatic and development activities, strengthen national security and combat terrorism and address global HIV/AIDS, let us not forget that safe drinking water and sanitation are key to the achievement of these other goals. I thank Chairwoman LOWEY for recognizing this crucial fact and increasing our commitment an additional $25 million to $335 million.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CARDOZA for the time.

I want to begin my comments by congratulating Chairwoman NITA LOWEY

for drafting the bill before us today. I also want to thank Ranking Member GRANGER for working with the majority, and I also want to recognize both the majority and minority subcommittee staff for their professionalism and tireless work in producing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support of H.R. 3081, the State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations bill. There are few things that we do on an annual basis that are more important and crucial to the success of U.S. foreign policy than passing this bill.

U.S. foreign policy can only be successful if we make crucial investments in the three D's: defense, diplomacy, and development. Ideally, all three, defense, diplomacy and development, should be considered equal legs of the same stool. However, this is currently not the case. This year we are going to spend somewhere north of $500 billion for defense. This bill, diplomacy and development, only totals $48 billion.

Despite the fact that the allocation for this bill is $3.2 billion below the President's request, and $1.2 billion below the comparable fiscal year 2009 level, this is a well-written and measured bill, taking into account the concerns of both the majority and the minority. However, I am worried about some of the amendments that have been made in order by the rule that would eviscerate some of the vital programs in this bill in the name of fiscal discipline.

I am worried, Mr. Speaker, because yesterday in the developing world nearly 15,000 to 20,000 people died of extreme poverty. Today in the developing world, 15,000 to 20,000 people will die of extreme poverty. Tomorrow in the developing world, 15,000 to 20,000 people will die of extreme poverty.

Extreme poverty, like malnutrition and disease, are claiming tens of thousands of lives every day, despite the fact that we know how to save many of these lives. The bill before us has the real potential to reverse these facts. Look at what has been done to date with our foreign aid: smallpox eradication began in the 1960s; control of river blindness in the 1970s; increased child immunizations in the 1980s; initiatives to fight Guinea worm, trachoma and leprosy in the 1990s; and the effort to end polio in this decade. Measurable results produced with the dollars in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out some of the highlights of this measure. This bill improves our diplomatic capabilities by funding 1,000 new foreign service professionals and improves our development capabilities by funding 300 new USAID personnel.

This bill provides funds for both our multilateral and bilateral peacekeeping operations. The bill provides increases for global health programs that fight the scourge of HIV, TB and malaria. The bill provides increases for development assistance programs. Some of these funds are educating children and providing clean drinking water and sanitation around the world.

The bill provides $224 million for Liberia, a shining example of a post-conflict country that is now on the road to recovery instead of becoming a potential failed state and a potential haven for terrorists.

Now, I understand that some of the Members plan to offer amendments to cut key increases in programs in this bill; but this is penny wise and pound foolish. Again, for our foreign policy to be successful, we can't just use sticks; we also have to use carrots. We need to invest in diplomacy and development the same way we do defense.

I am sure some will defend their amendments by saying in tough economic times we don't need to spend one dime overseas. These arguments also are shortsighted. The money we spend on development and humanitarian programs overseas is an investment in more stability, more security, and more sustainability. It is an investment in our long-term national security interests. It is an investment in a safer, freer, and more democratic world.

Not only is there a strong rational reason to support this bill and oppose all of the amendments to cut these vital programs; there is a moral one as well. When we were debating the fiscal year 2008 Foreign Operations bill, Chairman FRANK WOLF, former ranking member, said it best when he said, ''I believe this bill has the potential to do a lot of good, and I want to say that this bill will help save a lot of lives not only here but around the world. This is the work of the Lord,'' FRANK WOLF said. ''This bill,'' he said, ''is really to feed the poor, the hungry, the naked, the sick. Almost a better title of this bill,'' FRANK WOLF said, ''would be the Matthew 25 bill.''

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker, and to look closely at some of these amendments because some of these amendments would cut the Lord's work by 5 percent across the board. Others would cut the Lord's work by $1.2 billion. And other amendments, Mr. Speaker, eviscerate programs that are designed to help the poorest amongst the poor. Support this bill; support this rule; and support this measure.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate again my gratitude both to Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER of this appropriations subcommittee, and all of the members of the subcommittee. They have done great work.

When Chairwoman LOWEY appeared yesterday in the Rules Committee, it was really remarkable how on a bipartisan basis she received the commendation and admiration of all of us, and, quite frankly, I think in representation of the entire House. So I thank her.

And she has a wonderful ranking member, KAY GRANGER, who also works extremely diligently in a way that has made the House also admire her deeply.

I think we have had a good debate on the underlying legislation. I think it is most unfortunate that the tradition of two centuries of open debate on appropriations bills has been broken by the majority. And so, Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question on this rule so that we can amend the rule and allow an open rule.

The rule that the majority has brought forth today will only cement the dangerous and unnecessary precedent that it has already set. So let's have an open rule. Let's revert to tradition. Let's return to an open process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I urge all of my colleagues, and I am sure many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with us, that this unnecessary lessening of the House, this diminishing of each of the Members' rights is most unfortunate. And so we should return, as Ranking Member LEWIS said before the Rules Committee last evening, let's return. There is still time, let's return to the tradition of two centuries and have an open rule.

□ 1345

And we pledge, as Ranking Member LEWIS did last night before the Rules Committee, full cooperation, consistent with that tradition, after debate has begun on these appropriations bills that still remain to be considered, to work out unanimous consent agreements to limit time and allow the process to be finished in a timely way. So let's return to that tradition of two centuries and preserve the rights of each of the Members of this House.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question in order to return to those two centuries of tradition, to return to open rules on appropriations bills.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida for his words.

I concede that it is quite unfortunate that we stand here today, where we stand today, with regard to what has transpired over the past few weeks. It is not the way we want things to operate in the people's house, it's not the way my friends on the other side want to operate either.

A trust and agreement have been breached. Republicans have chosen not to be able to come to an agreement from our very first appropriation bill. There was a marker laid down with dilatory tactics which could have prevented us from tending to the people's business. While Democrats have continued choosing to try and legislate

and move forward and do what the voters and those who elected us to do, we have seen that there has been continuing obstructionist tactics.

The State-Foreign Ops appropriations bill gets to the heart of our national security interests, and it is one of the most important appropriations bills we consider each year. This bill has no place for obstructionism and partisan politics. That has to stop at the water's edge. We simply cannot risk the people's business coming to a screeching halt on such a critical national security measure.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of this institution, we must put aside our political differences and find the common ground. But until that time, we must also do what's necessary to continue doing the people's business and ensure that nothing stands in the way of providing for the safety and security of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the State-Foreign Ops Appropriations bill funds the United States' diplomatic and development priorities. It is a cornerstone of our national security. It is critical that we send a strong, united message to the world about the United States' foreign policy commitments, about our priorities, about supporting this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule and on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 617 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike the resolved clause and all that follows and insert the following:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill hack to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall he considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the 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 on January 20, 2009, Barack Obama was inaugurated as President of the United States, and the outstanding public debt of the United States stood at $10.627 trillion;

Whereas on January 20, 2009, in the President's Inaugural Address, he stated, ''[T]hose of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account, to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.'';

Whereas on February 17, 2009, the President signed into public law H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009;

Whereas the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 included $575 billion of new spending and $212 billion of revenue reductions for a total deficit impact of $787 billion;

Whereas the borrowing necessary to finance the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 will cost an additional $300 billion;

Whereas on February 26, 2009, the President unveiled his budget blueprint for FY 2010;

Whereas the President's budget for FY 2010 proposes the eleven highest annual deficits in U.S. history;

Whereas the President's budget for FY 2010 proposes to increase the national debt to $23.1 trillion by FY 2019, more than doubling it from current levels;

Whereas on March 11, 2009, the President signed into public law H.R. 1105, the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 constitutes nine of the twelve appropriations bills for FY 2009 which had not been enacted before the start of the fiscal year;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 spends $19.1 billion more than the request of President Bush;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 spends $19.0 billion more than simply extending the continuing resolution for FY 2009;

Whereas on April 1, 2009, the House considered H. Con. Res. 85, Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010;

Whereas the Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010, H. Con. Res. 85, proposes the six highest annual deficits in U.S. history;

Whereas the Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010, H. Con. Res. 85, proposes to increase the national debt to