

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOYER. As soon as possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PROTECTING AMERICANS FIGHTING TERRORISM ACT

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

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

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

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

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

#### SUPPLEMENTAL BILL PASSED FOR PEANUTS

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

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

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