

Health Inspection Service by \$23 million to fight invasive species; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 183 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to increase funding for Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service by \$500,000 to fight Bovine Tuberculosis; "no" on rollcall vote No. 184 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to prohibit funds from being used to implement the National Animal Identification System; "no" on rollcall vote No. 185 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to prohibit funds from being used to implement the Market Access Program, an agricultural export program; "no" on rollcall vote No. 186 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to reduce funding in the bill by 1 percent; "no" on rollcall vote No. 187 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to reduce funding for the Sugar Loan Program by 6 percent; "no" on rollcall vote No. 188 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to reduce funding for the Agriculture Research Services building and facilities account by \$65.3 million and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Services by \$16.7 million; "no" on rollcall vote No. 189 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to prohibit the use of funds for expenditures in contravention of the Immigration and Nationality Act; "no" on rollcall vote No. 190 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to strike \$229,000 in funding for dairy education in Iowa; "no" on rollcall vote No. 191 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to strike \$180,000 in funding for hydroponic tomato production in Ohio; "no" on rollcall vote No. 192 on an amendment to H.R. 5384 to strike \$100,000 in funding for the National Grape and Wine Initiative in California; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 193 on final passage of H.R. 5384—Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5384, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5384, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2349) "An Act to provide greater transparency in the legislative process," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LOTT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DODD, and Mr. INOUE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5427, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-479) on the resolution (H. Res. 832) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 832 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 832

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. 5427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 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. 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 except for section 102. 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 back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 832 is an open rule providing 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 consideration of H.R. 5427, The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2007. Under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph.

House Resolution 832 waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill except as specified in the resolution. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The House Rules Committee reported by voice vote an open rule for consideration of H.R. 5427, The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2007. The underlying bill provides over \$30 billion to the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation and several independent agencies.

The underlying bill provides nearly \$5 billion to support vigorous civil works programs that focus limited resources on completing high-priority projects. The Department of Energy constitutes the bulk of the bill with funding of over \$24.3 billion. Included in the Department of Energy's budget is over \$4 billion for the American Competitiveness Initiative to strengthen basic research by increasing funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

The bill also supports the Advanced Energy Initiative by increasing money for a variety of clean energy technologies including biomass, hydrogen, solar, wind, and clean coal.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also includes funding important many projects in my central Washington district. After getting the Bureau of Reclamation engaged in funding solutions for the depletion of the Odessa Subaquifer 2 years ago, I am pleased that this bill continues the effort to ensure the Federal Government keeps its commitment to the Columbia Basin farmers at risk of losing their water supply.

For the fifth straight year, I am pleased that the funds are provided to keep the study of additional water storage in the Yakima River Basin moving forward towards completion. 2007 is a critical year for this study and this gives the Bureau the funds needed to keep it on schedule to get the study done by 2008.

Having authored the law that created the study, I am dedicated to ensuring it stays on course. No storage has been built in this Yakima River Basin since

the mid-1930s. And after several serious droughts in the last 5 years, it is vital that this study provide answers on more storage.

Over \$24 million is provided for 2007 to ensure 1,000 Federal lab scientists and workers continue their important work at the Pacific Northwest National Lab. The funds are needed to transition the lab personnel into new lab buildings. Some lab buildings dating back to the mid-1940s are slated for demolition and cleanup due to radioactive contamination of the structures, soil and ground water. With coordination and planning, this transition can possibly be accomplished in a manner that could save the taxpayers over \$100 million.

Within the Department of Energy, the Office of Environmental Management is responsible for the cleanup at the Nation's nuclear sites. The largest and most contaminated of these sites is Hanford in my district. This bill provides needed Hanford cleanup funds for the River Corridor Closure project, the K Basins and other projects managed by the Richland Operations Office. An increase of \$20 million is provided for ground water contamination cleanup and technology development.

At Hanford's Office of River Protection, \$20 million is restored to the tank farm budget for the bulk vit demonstration project. This funding is necessary for DOE to confirm alternative treatments for millions of gallons of hazardous and radioactive tank waste.

Mr. Speaker, the largest component of Hanford's budget is the waste treatment plant. This project is critical to the Federal Government's obligation to uphold its legal cleanup commitments to the State of Washington. For well over a year this project has been undergoing extensive review by the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of Engineers, and GAO.

In addition, an independent group of the Nation's best and brightest nuclear and construction experts have been looking into the project's technical issues and estimates of the projects costs and schedule. These reviews are providing both recommendations and validations that will assist the Department of Energy in setting a path forward for this project.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, and expectation that DOE will provide a detailed plan for the waste treatment plant before Congress writes a final conference report on the energy and water appropriations act for this year. A final path forward from DOE is critical for making decisions on this project for next year and for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough the importance of Congress getting this information from DOE in a timely manner.

I also want to thank the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member for the time and attention they have dedicated to the waste treatment facility, specifically into pre-

paring a bill that enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the subcommittee and full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 832 is an open rule that gives all Members a chance to express their views on how our Nation should be prioritizing its spending. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today we consider the rule governing debate for the energy and water appropriations bill. The issues of energy and water are always important, but this year these issues are front and center of our national dialogue.

Over the past 9 months, the American people have seen the direct impact of water infrastructure on their day-to-day lives, from Hurricane Katrina's devastation of New Orleans and the gulf coast to the worst flooding the New England States have experienced in 70 years, and just this week NOAA announced the upcoming hurricane season will bring an increase in strong storms reaching land, category 3 and above.

In our communities, in our States, and every region of our country we are seeing the importance of flood protection. But we are also witnessing the growing strain on our already fragile water infrastructure. Yet even with this added pressure, our Nation's civil works programs do not see a corresponding increase in funding. These projects provide critical protections and we need to make investing in them a priority.

On repeated occasions you have heard me discuss the critical need to improve flood protection in my hometown of Sacramento.

□ 2130

In terms of lives and property, I recognize what is at stake. Sacramento has the dubious distinction of being the most at-risk river city in the Nation. I certainly understand the heightened concern that arrives with each rainfall. This year, our region has experienced an especially wet winter and wet spring. Each year we delay making these necessary investments is one more year of wondering what Mother Nature will bring.

Members of the committee attempted to make the most with its limited resources. They did improve on the President's budget. However, as Appropriations Committee Ranking Member OBEY and Energy and Water Subcommittee Ranking Member Visclosky rightly pointed out, we still need an additional \$250 million to protect vulnerable areas from flooding.

With these funds, the Army Corps of Engineers could speed up construction

on a number of flood protection projects across the country. Additionally, they would be able to provide some support to the operation and maintenance of completed projects, as well as restore the Corps' research and development program.

As a Nation, we are at a crossroads. We can continue in a defensive position, responding to Mother Nature's whims as in New Orleans and recent storms in the northeast, or we can take the offensive, working to strengthen and reinforce our Nation's water infrastructure.

In my view, we must seek out opportunities like this to be proactive and not reactive, as Congress is beginning to do in science and investing in renewable energy sources.

I was pleased that the committee increased funding from last year's level for the Department of Energy's Office of Science. This will fund basic energy research, nuclear physics, as well as biological and environmental sciences. A 15 percent increase is a good start, but if we truly want to reverse the trend of the past few years, we need to make a greater investment in science and research and development.

I was home in Sacramento this past weekend and everyone was talking about rising gas and energy prices. The net effect for working families is perhaps a shorter vacation and perhaps not eating out at a restaurant. Escalating energy prices threaten not only the quality of life and pocketbook of every American but the very stability of our national economy.

We must do more as a Nation to develop energy alternatives. I believe that America must modernize its energy policy to decrease this Nation's dependence on foreign sources of oil and preserve the environment. To accomplish this, Congress must develop a strategic and forward-looking energy plan that places a high priority on new research into renewable fuels and greater energy efficiency.

Unfortunately, the programs this bill cut are the exact programs necessary to develop a national renewable energy portfolio for the 21st century. There are drastic reductions in funding for wind, solar and geothermal programs, some of the programs that must be grown if we are ever going to curb our reliance on oil. I am concerned that we are missing an opportunity to expand our energy alternatives.

As much as this Energy and Water Appropriations bill is about funding current needs, it is also about investing in the future. While I think the committee tried to the best of their abilities to do this, in the end, the tight funding constraints limited their ability to strike the necessary balance.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of the rule for the Energy and Water Appropriations Act.

I wish to commend Chairman HOBSON and the subcommittee for crafting in a very bipartisan way an excellent bill. This bill does contain funding for water and resource-related projects in my district and my State, and I think that it is very wise of them, but it also deals with one specific issue I wish to address this evening.

Chairman HOBSON has recognized in this bill the importance of having a very strong nuclear power program in the United States. As Americans continue to face the increasing costs of energy, nuclear power is an important part of our overall energy policy. Chairman HOBSON has craftily connected the concept of interim storage with reprocessing of fuel rods, recognizing that spent fuel rods really are not spent at all. The overwhelming majority of the rod is still fuel that is available, and through reprocessing of the spent fuel rods, we can not only create greater energy, but we will significantly reduce the problem of a waste stream.

During last year's debate, I engaged Chairman HOBSON on the floor in a colloquy on this issue. He said at that time: "I do not see any reason for the Secretary to consider making a private site, or a site on tribal land, into a DOE site for interim storage. My intent is for the Secretary to evaluate storage options at existing DOE sites."

I appreciate very much that his subcommittee has taken these words to heart and has crafted in this bill a process which ensures that the interim storage of nuclear waste will be done in conjunction with willing partners.

Specifically in this bill, there are some additional criteria for interim storage in the report language. It talks about the department, and it says they will "explore consolidation of spent fuel within States with high volumes of spent fuel. The Department should conduct a voluntary, competitive process to select interim storage sites."

The key word here obviously is the word "voluntary." Chairman HOBSON added this important phrase and clearly understands that it is far wiser and better to voluntarily work with States than to try to impose mandates on States. That not only protects the rights and positions of States in our Federal State, but it is clearly a wiser policy of choice.

This bill reinforces the statements and the commitments that the chairman has made on this issue, this year, last year and repeatedly in other venues, and I appreciate him doing that. State and local officials in my State, military in my State, environmental groups and citizens in my State are encouraged with these particular words.

Once again, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman HOBSON and the entire subcommittee, both

sides of the aisle, for protecting what I consider to be in an important way the citizens of my State and ensuring that State and local interests are paramount in this particular process. I think you have done a fine job, and I am proud to speak in favor of this particular bill and especially the rule which will put it before us.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding and her kind remarks and also at the outset would congratulate the gentleman from Washington for his leadership and dogged determination to follow through on very complicated issues relative to Hanford, not only on behalf of the constituents he represents in his district or the State of Washington, but to make sure that we in a timely fashion have a solution to a national problem, and I do respect the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water bill that will be before us tomorrow is an excellent bill, and Mr. HOBSON and the members of the subcommittee have done an exceptional job on it. I will be strongly supporting the bill. However, I rise now because it simply does not do enough, given the restricted allocation that the subcommittee had to deal with.

That is why I am asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule so that I may offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Development Appropriation bill. Last week, in the full Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY proposed an alternative set of 302(b) allocations that include \$1 billion more for the Energy and Water bill. My amendment would propose that the same increase to this bill be given and show how the Democratic Members of the House would allocate the additional spending.

Over 25 years ago, during the Carter administration, the country faced a major energy crisis. The Congress responded aggressively. Today, I believe our response is a faint shadow of what had been done previously. Today, our spending levels for research and development and demonstration for fossil fuels, renewable energy sources and conservation are about one-quarter of what they were then. The amendment would provide an additional \$750 million across these areas.

Some examples of this increased investment in energy innovation are:

A doubling of funding for biofuels and biorefineries so that researchers can pursue the full range of biomass technologies and develop new ones;

Provide the Clean Coal Program with enough funding so that they can issue the next major solicitation of innovative proposals for making better use of this abundant domestic energy source;

To restore funding for petroleum, natural gas and geothermal technology

programs for which the administration and the bill provide virtually no funds;

Increase support for developing the full range of conservation technologies;

Weatherization for an additional 30,000 homes in the year 2007, next year, providing immediate energy savings;

The establishment of a DARPA-like program in DOE for advanced energy research projects to stimulate innovation that can change the paradigms for how we obtain and use energy, much as DARPA investments in networking help create the Internet.

Relative to our water infrastructure, Hurricane Katrina was a wake-up call, and while we are providing much funding for this stricken area, flood protection is needed in many other areas of our country. The amendment would also provide \$250 million more to accelerate needed improvements to flood control measures around the country. It would also increase operation and maintenance funding for two regions and partially restore the cuts to the R and D program for the Army Corps of Engineers.

Our country needs this \$1 billion increase to this year's investments to ensure our future safety and prosperity. Given that there will be additional needs in the future, I would not borrow the money for these investments from our children and grandchildren. So they must be paid for now, and to do that, the amendment would provide that those making in excess of \$1 million in 2007 give up 2.42 percent of the tax cuts provided to them since 2000. I think the country will miss these investments in our common good more than the most prosperous among us will miss two-tenths of their ample income.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that my proposal would have been made in order under the rule. I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that this amendment can be debated and voted upon by the full House.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, want to thank the ranking member for his kind words, and I also want to thank him and the chairman of the subcommittee a little broader because they have taken a great deal of interest in the Hanford project. Both of them have been out there at least once in the past several years, and other Members of the subcommittee have visited that, and I want to bring that to the House's attention because the one common denominator I hear when people go out and visit the Hanford site is, I had no idea it was that huge and that complex. I think that understanding helps us move forward.

But I do want to reiterate and I do hope the Department of Energy does come forward with their path before we finally get the final conference report. I think that it is important.

Having said that, on the Rules Committee, we did not make the gentleman's amendment in order because it

calls for raising taxes, and that is a province of the Ways and Means Committee, and obviously, they do want to keep that jurisdiction. We did not provide the waiver, and therefore, that amendment was not made in order.

I also mention, too, the amendment was offered during the markup in the full Appropriations Committee, and it was defeated by the Appropriations Committee.

So I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but I just wanted to make those observations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make some comments also that I appreciate Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for working with me on my project in Sacramento. That is much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think in general, within the spectacularly inadequate allocation provided the subcommittee, that Mr. HOBSON and Mr. VISCLOSKY have done a very credible job on this bill, and I especially appreciate the way Mr. HOBSON has approached this bill on a bipartisan basis.

Having said that, I would hope that Members would vote against the previous question on the rule. As Mr. VISCLOSKY pointed out, for the 25 years since Jimmy Carter left office, this country has been in a listless drift as far as energy policy is concerned. Energy conservation, energy research programs, have been funded at woefully low levels in comparison to where they were during the high point of Jimmy Carter's presidency.

The problem is that, after Carter left office, his successors, especially Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush, systematically shrank those budgets in real terms, and so today, we are paying the price in terms of scarce energy and high energy prices.

We have some choices to make. The Congress has already determined this year, the majority party has, that it is important this year to provide \$40 billion in supersized tax cuts to people who make over \$1 million a year.

□ 2145

In contrast, Mr. VISCLOSKY would offer an amendment which would scale back the size of those tax cuts by 2½ percent and use that money instead to make greater investments totaling \$1 billion more than the bill contains for flood control projects and especially for energy conservation and energy development programs.

If we had done that over the past 25 years, if we had simply kept up with what Jimmy Carter had asked us to do while he was President, we would be in a far more secure place as a Nation tonight and we would have a far more stable pricing system for energy, and we would be much further along the way toward protecting Mother Earth from the ravages of global warming.

So I would hope that the House would vote against the previous question so that we would have an opportunity to resurrect the Visclosky amendment. I do believe that it is important to ask the question: What is more valuable to the country's future, stronger levees in our communities, stronger flood control projects, an energy policy that puts us ahead of the curve rather than at the mercy of OPEC, or an even easier Easy Street for the most well-off people in this society?

I think the choice is obvious.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend from California I have no more requests for time, so I will reserve my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I rise to oppose this rule, and I must express my very deep concern with the underlying bill.

Despite the very best efforts of many of my colleagues, this bill remains a broken promise on the most critical issues that we confront, specifically renewable energy. The gentleman from Indiana is absolutely correct, we need to do much more than we are doing in this bill on renewable energy.

Let me tell you why this is so critical, Mr. Speaker. This year, the Department of Defense will spend \$10 billion on its basic energy bill. Of that \$10 billion, \$4.7 billion will buy one thing: fuel for the Air Force planes. That \$4.7 billion is about what we are going to spend for the National Cancer Institute.

We need renewable energies, Mr. Speaker, not just for our environment, not just to bring gas prices down, but as a matter of national security. What could be more dysfunctional than having to borrow money from China in order to buy oil from our Persian Gulf adversaries in order to fuel airplanes to protect us from China and our Persian Gulf adversaries?

On renewable energies, this bill, as it is currently drafted, falls short. Last July, we passed an energy bill, and many of us printed press releases patting ourselves on the back for this sweeping new investment in renewable energy. Those press releases promised \$3.3 billion would be spent on renewable energies this year alone, \$3.3 billion authorized for research, development, and deployment of renewable energy. But when it comes time to actually sign the check, the check doesn't say \$3.3 billion, it says \$1.3 billion. That is \$2 billion short.

This is like No Child Left Behind all over again. You promise to pay high, you actually pay low. In this case, it is not Leave No Child Behind; it is Leave No Barrel of Oil Behind.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the argument can be made, and I respect the argument, that many renewable technologies did receive increases over last year. Many specific accounts for renewable energy, research and devel-

opment did receive increases over last year's levels. But only in Washington can a \$2 billion shortfall be called an increase.

Try that logic with your utility company. When the bill comes, try saying I know I was going to pay \$100, \$150, but what I really meant to say was, I am giving you \$15. No utility company would let you get away with it, and the Congress shouldn't allow that to be gotten away with.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom line. And if we are truly serious about ending our dependence on foreign oil and strengthening our military, we would not be shortchanging this bill. I hope that the gentleman's efforts prevail. I hope that this Congress will have an opportunity to put our money where our mouths are when it comes to renewable energy, not just as an environmental issue, not just to get gas prices down, but to make sure our military has the capabilities to defeat our enemies around the world.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I will be calling for a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that we can consider the Visclosky amendment that was rejected in the Rules Committee tonight on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the Visclosky amendment would provide \$250 million for a number of ongoing flood projects that are not funded in the bill. It also adds \$750 million for research into alternative sources of energy, such as coal, ethanol, and biodiesel, that would reduce or eliminate our dependence on foreign oil. The spending increase in the Visclosky amendment is offset by reducing by 2.4 percent the tax cut received by people earning more than \$1 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with two urgent national priorities. It puts our money where our mouth is when we say our country needs to diversify our energy supply, increase energy efficiency, and reduce our addiction to foreign oil. With the hurricane season approaching, it puts more resources into the major flood control projects that would protect our property and our lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for Members to know that a "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the energy and water appropriation bill under an open rule. But a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Visclosky amendment.

Vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the resolution.

This is a fair rule. It is an open rule and allows Members to come down to the floor and prioritize and reprioritize the spending under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Subcommittee.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MATSUI is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. ____, RULE FOR H.R. 5427 THE ENERGY & WATER APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2007

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Visclosky of Indiana or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2007 OFFERED BY MR. VIS-CLOSKY OF INDIANA

Page 2, line 20, strike "\$128,000,000" and insert "\$132,000,000".

Page 3, line 12, strike "\$1,947,171,000" and insert "\$2,175,171,000".

Page 6, line 10, strike "\$2,195,471,000" and insert "\$2,213,471,000".

Page 6, line 14, strike "\$297,043,000" and insert "\$306,043,000".

Page 7, line 3, strike "\$141,113,000" and insert "\$150,113,000".

Page 21, line 5, strike "\$2,025,527,000" and insert "\$2,525,527,000".

Page 21, line 6, before the period, insert the following: ", of which not less than \$150,000,000 shall be for funding new advanced energy research".

Page 22, line 1, strike "\$558,204,000" and insert "\$808,204,000".

Page 22, line 2, strike "\$54,000,000" and insert "\$80,000,000".

Page 22, line 13, strike "\$36,400,000" and insert "\$200,400,000".

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ____ In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2007, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of Public Law 107-16, Public Law 108-27 and Public Law 108-311 shall be reduced by 2.42 percent.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question, 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. MATSUI. 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.

REPUBLICAN TAX CUT MONOPOLY

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Republican-controlled Congress recently passed a tax bill which President Bush signed saying, "With this bill, we are sending the American people a clear message about our policy."

I couldn't agree more. This bill makes America's tax policy into a cruel game of Monopoly designed to make winners of the super-rich and losers of America's working middle class.

Under their tax scheme, working middle-class families get the chance card and don't fair so well under the Republican bill. They get about \$20. Not enough to fill their gas tanks. But trust fund millionaires with an average income of more than \$5 million draw the community chest card. They get \$82,000. Enough for a brand new limousine.

The President was right: the Republican tax bill does send a clear message about their policy: millionaires win, working middle-class families lose, and America needs new leadership.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHY WE ARE THERE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State was on the talk show circuit this past weekend and said something extraordinary about the reason we invaded Iraq. These are Secretary Rice's words: "I understand that Americans see violence on their screens. They continue to see Americans killed. But I would ask that people remember why we are there."

Secretary Rice continued: "We are there because having overthrown a brutal dictator who was a destabilizing force in the Middle East, we are trying to help the Iraqis create a stable foundation for democracy and a stable foundation for peace."

I would have liked to have seen Ms. Rice and the rest of the Bush national security team come before the Congress, the American people, and the world community with this argument in late 2002 and early 2003. My guess is they would have gotten roughly 25 votes in this body to authorize the President to go to war. Actually, they didn't get mine, or two-thirds of the Democrats; but they got enough votes to go to war.

But, of course, the Republicans were too smart for that. To make their case for war, they needed something that would scare the pants off everyone in this Congress and in this country. So we heard a lot of tall tales about aluminum tubes, uranium from Niger, and reconstituted nuclear weapons. Secretary Rice herself engaged in the ultimate fear mongering when she said, "We don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud."

When it came time to close the sale, they sent Ms. Rice's predecessor, Colin Powell, to the U.N., not to talk about how cruel Saddam Hussein had been to his own people, but to specifically outline the case, the phony case as it turned out, that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and posed a direct threat to our national security.

Dictators are undoubtedly bad and democracy is undoubtedly good, but can we afford to spend \$300 billion and march 2,500 Americans off to their deaths every time we spot a bad, undemocratic regime? Taken to its logical extreme, this policy would commit us to military occupations in every corner of the globe, something that, to say the least, we don't have the resources or the appetite to do.

Isn't there a better way to spread freedom? Of course there is.

We can and must have a robust democracy-promotion agenda that invests in the hopes of oppressed people, one that lifts their spirits instead of tearing down their countries.

The SMART Security plan that I have proposed includes an ambitious investment in democracy-building, the kind that would establish rule of law, civil society, a free press and independent judiciaries around the world.

Unfortunately, as I have discussed here many times over, the Bush administration is scaling back funding for exactly these kinds of efforts. Step number one is to bring our troops home. Now, for sure, right now. No permanent military bases, no designs on profiting from Iraqi oil.

Let us work with the global community to establish a multilateral security force that can keep Iraq stable in the short term. Let us lead the way in the U.N. toward establishing an international peace commission that can