

provide real hope to millions of Americans who are suffering from debilitating diseases, such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, and cancer. All he has to do now is reconsider his threat to veto this promising legislation that has recently passed the House.

Here in the House we passed, in a bipartisan manner, during the first 100 hours of Congress, legislation that would increase the number of embryonic stem cells eligible for Federal funding. The Senate, in strong bipartisan passion, did exactly the same. Now it has arrived at the President's desk.

Last year the President vetoed stem cell legislation, the only issue he vetoed throughout his Presidency. We have a real opportunity finally to solve some of these debilitating diseases. There are 100 million Americans waiting for the President to say "yes." I urge him to reconsider.

A REALITY CHECK ON THE IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL AND WHEN THE FUNDS ARE NEEDED

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we keep on hearing all of these doomsday scenarios from the White House and our Republican colleagues about the emergency supplemental bill. It would be nice if they would listen to the President's own defense Secretary, who said this week that our timelines are already creating positive results in Iraq. Yet the President threatens to veto the bill and says that the money is needed immediately.

I think it's time for a reality check. Fact: the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service concluded last month that the Pentagon could maintain its wartime operations well into July with funds they have already been provided.

Another fact: As of today, it's only been 73 days since the President sent his funding request to the Capitol. Last year, the Republican-controlled Congress took 119 days to send the Iraq war supplemental to the President, and yet the President never attacked the Republican-controlled Congress for supposedly holding up funding for our troops.

President Bush should stop playing politics with this emergency funding bill so that we can finally move the war in Iraq in a new direction.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1495, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 319 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 319

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pur-

suant 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. 1495) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1495 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, this rule permits the House to consider the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

The structured rule makes in order six amendments. As yesterday's debate in the Rules Committee demonstrated, Members on both sides of the aisle are focused on getting this bill to conference and onto the President's desk, and this rule reflects that consensus.

Mr. Speaker, it has been well documented that our country has not had a WRDA bill in over 7 years. Seven years is perilously close to an entire generation passing without a national water resources policy being signed into law by a President.

The bill made in order under this rule authorizes nearly \$14 billion for the construction of more than 700 water resources development projects and studies by the Army Corps of Engineers for flood control, navigation, and environmental restoration.

Additionally, H.R. 1495 authorizes hurricane recovery activities along the gulf coast that would cost an estimated \$3 billion. Furthermore, the bill requires an external peer review for studies of projects that would cost more than \$50 million. The bill also coordinates environmental analyses and other permit processes among Federal and State agencies and authorizes environmental quality initiatives. In short, this bill today moves our country forward.

In my district of Sacramento, California, this WRDA bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation that will pass Congress this year. We have been waiting a long time for this bill. Sacramento is the most at-risk river city in this country for catastrophic flooding. Located at the confluence of the great Sacramento and American Rivers, the Sacramento floodplain contains over 165,000 homes, over 488,000 residents, 1,300 government facilities including the State capital, and businesses providing 200,000 jobs. It is the hub of a six-county regional economy that provides 800,000 jobs for 1.5 million people.

A major flood along the American River or the Sacramento River would cripple this economy, and cost upwards of \$35 billion in direct property damages and likely result in a significant loss of life.

Sacramento has had major floods throughout its history, the last major floods being in 1986 and 1997. We live with a constant threat of catastrophic flooding. In my district, we understand the need and urgency for an overarching water resources policy to protect our homes, businesses, and families. This bill, the projects and policies