

U.S. exports to India; and strengthening the Nuclear Suppliers Group, which are the group of countries that restrict nuclear proliferation throughout the world.

In addition, this conference report maintains Congressional oversight over the ongoing relationship of nuclear cooperation between U.S.-India. By implementing this legislation, we are furthering our critical nonproliferation objectives of advancing the IAEA's Additional Protocol by allowing the U.S. to become a party to this critical nonproliferation arrangement. We will enhance our nonproliferation policy and bolster our argument that the rest of the world should agree to this robust inspection regime.

In conclusion, I support the United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act of 2006 with my Amendment, and this conference report. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 5682 includes language implementing the "Additional Protocol" to the U.S. nuclear safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The other Body gave its advice and consent for the Additional Protocol in 2004, but without enactment passage of this implementing legislation the Additional Protocol cannot enter into force.

Following the 1991 Gulf War, IAEA member states took steps to strengthen the nuclear safeguards system. This led to the development of a model "Additional Protocol" to supplement safeguards agreements and amend verification arrangements. It is designed to improve the ability of the IAEA to detect clandestine nuclear weapons programs in non-nuclear-weapons states by providing the IAEA with increased information and expanded inspection access. As of March of 2006, 110 countries had signed additional protocols, including all the nuclear weapons states, and 78 countries have them in force.

The U.S. is not obligated to accept safeguards under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or the Additional Protocol. However, the U.S. already allows safeguards to be placed on certain facilities and materials under a voluntary agreement with the IAEA. This underscores our support for the Nonproliferation Treaty. The U.S. signing the Additional Protocol demonstrates that adherence will not commercially disadvantage non-nuclear-weapons states. Under both the voluntary agreement and the Additional Protocol, the U.S. maintains a national security exclusion and the right to manage IAEA access to facilities or information of direct national security significance.

Enactment of this implementing legislation provides the President with authority to permit IAEA inspectors, accompanied by U.S. representatives, access to certain facilities and to information on activities in the U.S. It also authorizes the Department of Commerce and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to develop implementing regulations and conduct training and trial inspections. Finally, the legislation sets forth procedures for the inspections, similar to those for the Chemical Weapons Convention, and establishes civil and criminal penalties for the failure of U.S. entities to provide such information.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will strengthen our Nation's ability to advance the cause of universal acceptance of increased safeguards

and for that reason I urge both Bodies to adopt the conference report and send it on to the President for his signature.

Among the many tributes to our beloved colleague, HENRY HYDE, this bill and what it can do for global nuclear security is among the most worthy.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend Chairman HYDE, Ranking Member LANTOS and their excellent staffs for their hard work on his legislation.

I'd like to offer special thanks for their efforts to ensure that the conference agreement retains a provision I suggested, which would halt nuclear cooperation if the Indian government exports sensitive technologies that violate the guidelines of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and Missile Technology Control Regime.

This conference agreement—and the underlying nuclear deal with India—are far from perfect. I believe the Administration could have and should have pressed for a much better deal.

But having said that, it's important to keep in mind that this agreement is a major improvement over the Administration's original legislative proposal.

That bill would have cut Congress out of the process and put the nuclear deal with India on auto-pilot.

Among other things, this agreement preserves the right of Congress to vote on the final nuclear cooperation agreement with India—which is still under negotiation—before it goes into effect.

While I wish this conference agreement included some stronger nonproliferation provisions—including an amendment on fissile material I offered on the floor—I intend to vote "yes" because I believe the U.S.-India relationship is extremely important, and rejecting the bill at this point would be a major setback.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this legislation and I do so because I believe this bill undermines the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), lacks sufficient safeguards to prevent India from continuing to produce nuclear weapons, and threatens the stability of the region.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that India is an important relationship for the United States to cultivate. India's booming economy, efforts to combat terrorism, and commitment to democracy means they will be a key strategic partner of ours for years to come. However, I do not believe the proper way to cultivate this relationship is by lifting the moratorium on nuclear trade with India.

We all know that India is not a signatory to the NPT, and yet we stand on the verge of rewarding a country operating outside the parameters of this vitally important treaty. This agreement loosens export control laws and clears the way to provide nuclear assistance. It does so without requiring India to limit its fissile material production and without establishing restrictions on the number of weapons they plan to produce. Also under the framework, 8 of India's 22 nuclear plants would be protected from inspection. These 8 plants just so happen to be the military facilities that will remain out of the purview of international inspection.

The Administration maintains that nuclear proliferation and the fear that terrorist organizations could acquire nuclear weapons, is the greatest threat to our Nation's security. But Mr. Speaker, passing this legislation today to

allow the President to waive portions of the Atomic Energy Act will shred the NPT, the most successful agreement we have to guard against proliferation. If India, a nation operating their nuclear programs outside the NPT, can strike an agreement of this magnitude, allowing them this much flexibility and holding them to so few hard and fast standards, why would any other nation not currently party to the NPT wish to join?

Passing this legislation today sends the wrong signal. It makes very real the threat of an arms race between Pakistan and India, an already extremely fragile relationship between two long-time adversaries. Mr. Speaker, passing this legislation today is an enormous step backwards for global nonproliferation efforts and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the India Nuclear Bill. However, there seems to be something missing from the debate today. It's like the elephant in the room no one wants to talk about. Whatever happened to the United States' own commitment to nonproliferation?

When the House considered its own version, I tried to submit an amendment that was quite simple. It stated that until the President has implemented and observed all of our NPT obligations and revised its own policies relating to them, no nuclear-related item may be transferred to India.

Unfortunately, my amendment was not included.

And yet another closed rule from the Republican leadership precludes any compromise today.

As many of my colleagues have stated, this is not about the deal or our alliances with India. This is about how the Bush administration has made a mockery of the NPT and encouraged other countries to go around the treaty. Basically, the bill says that if a country ignores the NPT, the U.S. will cut a deal with them.

Where is our commitment to nonproliferation?

If anything, with this treaty the U.S. will contribute to global nuclear proliferation.

In a world that is becoming more—not less—violent by the day, we must face the facts: Until the U.S. lives up to its own nonproliferation, obligations, we can't possibly ask others to do so.

Today, I will vote against this misguided bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. LANTOS. 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.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1105, I

call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 102) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 102

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting "February 15, 2007".

SEC. 2. Section 102(c) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) Activities under the 'Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide' account."

SEC. 3. Section 114(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is amended by striking "and December 1, 2006," and inserting "December 1, 2006, January 1, 2007, February 1, 2007, and March 1, 2007,".

SEC. 4. Section 125 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is amended by striking "Partner Purchases" and inserting "Partnership Purchases and International Space Station/Multi-User System Support".

SEC. 5. Section 126 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "except that", and by inserting before the period at the end the following: "; and (2) amounts made available under section 101 for departments and agencies that have been apportioned pursuant to this section prior to November 17, 2006, may be at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate".

SEC. 6. Section 101 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is amended by striking "as of October 1, 2006" each place it appears in subsections (b) through (e) and inserting "as of November 15, 2006".

SEC. 7. The Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, div. B) is amended by adding after section 132 the following new sections:

"SEC. 133. (a) Section 44302(f)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this division for 'August 31, 2006, and may extend through December 31, 2006'.

"(b) Section 44303(b) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this division for 'December 31, 2006'.

"SEC. 134. The authority provided by H. Res. 135 (109th Congress), as adopted on March 14, 2005, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this division.

"SEC. 135. The rule referenced in section 126 of Public Law 109-54 shall continue in effect for the 2006-2007 winter use season through the date specified in section 106(3) of this division.

"SEC. 136. In addition to any other transfer authority of the Department of Veterans Affairs, up to \$683,970,000 of the funds made available to the Department by this division may be transferred to 'Veterans Health Administration—Medical Services' during the period covered by this division."

"SEC. 137. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division and notwithstanding section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31), the percent-

age adjustment scheduled to take effect under such section for 2007 shall not take effect until February 16, 2007."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Pursuant to House Resolution 1105, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I bring before the House a continuing resolution for fiscal year 2007. This CR, which is clean, runs through February 15, 2007. Only necessary technical anomalies are included.

This CR will fund the agencies in the nine remaining bills awaiting conference at the lower rate the House passed, Senate passed, or current fiscal year 2006 level.

We have been working closely with both leadership and Chairman COCHRAN on this CR to ensure that all essential functions of the government continue without interruption.

With regard to veterans medical care funding, the VA presently has approximately \$600 million left over from fiscal year 2006. However, should the VA need additional resources between now and February 15, we are providing the VA and the Secretary with the authority to transfer funds from within other Veterans Affairs accounts.

When we passed this CR the last time, my hope was it would provide a strong motivation for Congress to complete its work in regular order. I was hopeful that our colleagues in the Senate would complete their work on the floor so we could move the remaining individual conference reports before the end of this legislative session.

I want the body to know that the Appropriations Committee has been strongly committed to bringing to this floor individual conference reports. That has not occurred. Each and every individual bill should have come to the floor and gone to conference with the Senate and been sent to the President. From the beginning of our process, Chairman COCHRAN and I pledged to pass funding bills in regular order. We also stated publicly we would not, I repeat, not, support an omnibus bill in any form.

The House Appropriations Committee passed each of the 11 subcommittee bills out of the full committee by June 30, and with the exception of the Labor-HHS bill, all of the bills off the House floor by the July 4 break.

Similarly, the Senate passed each of its bill out of the full committee to ensure timely consideration on the Senate floor.

The Appropriations Committee has remained committed to moving these bills individually and within the framework of the budget resolution.

My colleagues, the Appropriations Committee has kept its word. The

breakdown of regular order this cycle, indeed the failure to get our bills done, should be fairly placed at the feet of the departing Senate majority leader who failed to schedule floor time for the consideration of appropriations bills.

Senator COCHRAN and I were convinced that moving bills individually was the only way for us to get back to regular order. Lacking regular order, there is a tendency for the remaining bills to become Christmas trees and for spending to grow out of control, having individual Members do with a Christmas tree what they might. In our view, that is simply not acceptable.

Let me make one personal comment aside: my appropriations colleague, Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi, could not have been a better partner as we attempted to bringing regular order to the appropriations process. The Senator of Mississippi was poorly served by his own leadership.

I would prefer to return to Congress in January as chairman of the Appropriations Committee but look forward to working with the new chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Until then, I urge my colleagues to support this CR and I would like to close my remarks by wishing all of my friends a Merry Christmas and a happy new year.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution tonight is a blatant admission of abject failure by the most useless Congress in modern times. That we do not have a budget before us is certainly not the fault of the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

This House passed every single appropriation bill except the Labor-Health appropriation bill, before the July 4 recess.

The problem is that the budget resolution which defined what would be contained in those appropriation bills was so wildly unrealistic that moderate Republicans in this House rebelled and would not, for instance, agree to support the budget resolution until a promise was made that \$3 billion in additional funding would be found in order to correct some of the shortfalls in education and health and worker protection programs.

In addition, as the gentleman from California has said, when these bills went over to the other end of the Capitol, the United States Senate, they ran into the decision of the Republican majority leader to avoid having the Senate take votes on any controversial issues in the domestic portion of the budget.

As a result, we are here tonight with not a single dollar having been appropriated to any government program that has anything whatsoever to do with the domestic operations of this government. That is a disgraceful performance. And so we are left with the

choice of passing this continuing resolution or having the government shut down.

I want to contrast that with the condition that we left the government in when the Democrats lost the majority in 1994. In 1994 I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee and when we lost the election, we had still managed to complete every single appropriation before the end of the fiscal year. We did that because we had reached a bipartisan agreement between the then-majority Democrats and the then-minority Republicans on the allocation of appropriated dollars to each of the subcommittees. And it was that bipartisan cooperation which allowed us to pass every single bill in the allotted time.

Now we are here with Governors unable to plan, State legislatures unable to plan, mayors being unable to plan, families being unable to plan, because they do not know what the final disposition of the entire domestic budget is going to be.

And so now the Congress is going to leave town and when the Democrats assume control next January, we are going to have to pass 2 years of appropriation bills in 1 year. We will do our best to do that; but I must say to my majority party friends that I think that by this act of abdication, they have given up any right to criticize in any way whatever devices we have to use in order to dispose of the unfinished business of this Congress come next January.

□ 2115

We will do our best, but we have very few decent options. And I find it ironic, as the gentleman from California at least obliquely referenced, I find it ironic that the Senate majority leader found time to publicly diagnose Terri Schiavo's case from the Senate floor. I find it ironic that the majority leader in the Senate found the time to insert 40 pages of language into the defense bill last year indemnifying the entire pharmaceutical industry. He insisted on having that language inserted, although it had never been cleared by anyone in the conference and the conference had already finished its work before that was inserted. So he had plenty of time to do that, but he didn't manage to find the time to schedule the appropriation bills on the Senate floor, and as a result, we are here with this mess tonight.

The most fundamental obligation of the Congress under the Constitution of the United States is to decide what activities the government needs to engage in and to provide the financing for those activities. That is the purpose of appropriation bills. And when the Congress fails to pass that legislation, it fails in its principal obligation to the taxpayers.

So I simply want to say that Senator BYRD and I expect to have an announcement next week on how we will attempt to deal with the leftovers from this congressional session.

But I would simply ask one thing of my friends on the majority side of the aisle: Please spare me. Don't have the gall to go to the American public 2 years from now and ask once again to be put in charge of handling the Nation's budget when the decision has been made at the highest levels of the Republican Party tonight to walk away from our collective responsibility to pass this legislation before we adjourn.

The President is entitled to have his new budget considered anew. He is entitled to have the decks wiped clean so that he can start fresh; and with all due respect, I think we are also entitled to be able to start fresh so that come January, we can consider the President's new budget and not have to turn to last year's problems. We are not going to be given that opportunity, and the President isn't going to be given that opportunity. That is a shame. But at this point we have no choice but to support this resolution.

I do want to say one thing. Speaking of unfinished business, I am pleased to see that this resolution at this point does contain the suspension of the congressional COLA until such time as the minimum wage is increased. I know the distinguished minority leader, Ms. PELOSI, had asked that that be done. This resolution does not complete the linkage, but it does suspend that COLA until February 17, I believe the date is, which gives us an opportunity to pass the minimum wage bill in January before it goes into effect. I hope we meet that obligation so that we can see to it that as Congress receives its COLA, the lowest-paid workers in this country also get a benefit.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has done such an extraordinary job in trying to bring fairness and coherence in this process. Unfortunately, he will soon be in the business to do so, although carrying the burden that he has to get out from under.

I first want to join him in saying that I am glad to see we finally recognize the incongruity of pay raises for ourselves and no minimum wage increase. Many of us tried to argue that on logical grounds and on moral grounds. It is interesting to see that the loss of 30 seats apparently succeeded, where morality and logic was less persuasive. But I will take it any way I can get it.

Then I also want to congratulate my colleagues on the other side for their consistency because they end this Congress governing in the same way in which they carried on for 2 years: frankly, incompetently, without re-

spect for democratic procedures, and with a willingness to inflict harm on the most vulnerable members of our society.

Earlier today we voted on packages of things that in a Democratic legislature, for example, Iraq, we would not have had all lumped together. Members who opposed some and supported others would have had a chance to say so. Today we got have one continuing resolution, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, we have no choice but to vote "yes" so that the government does not stop acting.

But let us take a look at what they have done. I have a particular responsibility in my committee for housing. The one housing program that the Republican Party has not undone is the section 8 program. But we have today a resolution that substantially and deliberately provides fewer dollars for the section 8 program than the housing authorities of this country need to meet their existing commitments. This is a budget that goes into, what, January of this current fiscal year. Months will have gone by in this current fiscal year, and you are funding section 8 at significantly less than your president asked for for this fiscal year, significantly less than is needed to meet commitments. And in January housing authorities will be faced with dilemmas. They may be told by HUD that they cannot continue to service what they are now doing.

There is section 8 project-based assistance you put forward in a bill here which is \$636 million below what your President asked for just to meet existing commitments. And housing authorities that have jurisdiction over projects which house elderly people and disabled people may be in turmoil and there will be uncertainty. We will probably be able come to their rescue; but why should we have to? Why should we create, Mr. Speaker, you and your colleagues, a situation in which this difficulty exists and we have to come to the rescue? Why such little regard for the poorest people in this country, the most vulnerable? Why are they going to be treated this way, as pawns, so you can avoid having to make difficult decisions, Mr. Speaker?

So I just want to echo what the gentleman from Wisconsin said about the inappropriateness of this. I do want to point out in particular what happens here. And let me say to those Members on the other side who supported this rule and supported this approach, I will predict now, Mr. Speaker, that many of them will be hearing from the housing authorities and from section 8 residents in January complaining of the uncertainty, complaining of the difficulty. You will have no justification in claiming that it wasn't your fault, those of you who voted to send this procedure. So please be ready to explain to people in January why you so callously, Mr. Speaker, disregarded once again the interests of the poorest people in the country.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to congratulate the gentleman from California for doing his dead-level best to fulfill his duties in getting all of these bills through, even though he received precious little cooperation from many other key players on Capitol Hill. I would simply point out that it is not his fault that the budget resolution which was adopted by the majority party was so highly unrealistic that, in the end, the majority party in this House could not convince their Senate brethren to vote for the same legislation that was required by that budget resolution. And I want to simply say that I think the Record demonstrates that both of us on both sides of the aisle did everything that we could procedurally to get these bills through the House. We reached time agreements on amendment after amendment, on bill after bill. Sometimes time agreements were so tight that Members were significantly angered by how little time they had to debate these bills. But even though we often opposed the content of the bills, we worked together to move them because we recognized that we had a responsibility to make decisions and to finish the job, whether we won or lost. Unfortunately, the gentleman did not have enough allies on his side of the aisle, and so we are stuck with this leftover mess. We will do our best in January and February to clean it up, but it is not going to be a very pleasant couple of months.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed SAFETEA-LU—the legislation that reauthorizes the Federal surface transportation programs—in 2005, it recognized the need to significantly increase Federal investment for highway, highway safety, and transit programs. In fact, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, SAFETEA-LU, increased the overall investment in surface transportation programs by more than 40 percent, with a significant part of that increase guaranteed to take effect in fiscal year 2007.

Earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 5576, the Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, TTHUD, appropriations bill, which meets SAFETEA-LU's funding guarantees. It provides an increase of \$3.4 billion for the Federal-aid highway programs and an additional \$474 million for the transit programs over the fiscal year 2006 SAFETEA-LU funding levels.

It is now more than 2 months since the start of fiscal year 2007, and the Republican-led Congress has not enacted the TTHUD appropriations bill. Instead, H.J. Res. 102 provides funding for the highway, highway safety, and transit programs through February 15, 2007. The resolution funds these programs at the fiscal year 2006 level. Thus, all of the highway and transit investment increases guaranteed by SAFETEA-LU are put on hold. If this approach is continued and the continuing resolution is extended through fiscal year 2007, SAFETEA-LU's guaranteed highway funding will be cut by \$3.4 billion and its transit investment slashed by \$474 million.

Under a long-term continuing resolution, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, FMCSA, safety programs will be funded at substantially lower levels than guaranteed in SAFETEA-LU. NHTSA stands to lose up to \$21.7 million. At a time when more than 43,000 people are dying in roadway crashes each year, we simply cannot afford to shortchange an agency tasked with making our roadways safer. Likewise, FMCSA could lose almost \$27 million that would be spent on motor carrier safety programs and grants. It is essential that we properly fund these critical programs.

The highway, highway safety, and transit programs differ from most other Federal programs in that they are supported by user fees. Motorists who drive on our highways pay the fees when they pump gas. They willingly pay the fees because they rely on a commitment by the Federal Government to use the money so collected to finance our highway and transit programs. In other words, users have already paid for the investments authorized in SAFETEA-LU and funded in the House-passed TTHUD appropriations bill. However, the Republican-led Congress's failure to enact this legislation in a timely manner will shortchange funding for critical transportation projects.

Transportation projects are usually high-cost undertakings that take several years to complete. Certainty in funding—especially Federal funding—is critical to their success. Relying on short-term, stopgap measures, such as continuing resolutions, does not provide the certainty that State departments of transportation need to plan for their construction projects in the upcoming season. And for northern-tier States, where construction seasons are short, delays in providing adequate Federal funding can severely disrupt their process for contract bidding, directly affecting next year's construction season.

Continuing resolutions also provide great uncertainty for transit programs. The Federal Transit Administration, FTA, has delayed the release of transit formula apportionments and other new grants until a final TTHUD appropriations act is enacted. The continuing resolution, coupled with FTA's policy, is resulting in many transit agencies being unable to advance badly needed transit projects.

According to the Federal Reserve, housing construction is currently very weak throughout the country. Congress should do everything within its power to ensure that transportation infrastructure investment is not disrupted through congressional inaction, placing an additional burden on this sector of the economy. Hundreds of our small businesses and thousands of our workers could be put at risk as a result. I urge Congress to fulfill its responsibilities in passing appropriations acts and to honor the funding guarantees established in SAFETEA-LU.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and pursuant to House Resolution 1105, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. 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.

PROVIDING FOR PRINTING OF REVISED RULES AND MANUAL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1107) providing for the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Tenth Congress, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1107

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Tenth Congress be printed as a House document, and that three thousand additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which nine hundred copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 503) and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 503

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, December 8, 2006, or Saturday, December 9, 2006, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned sine die, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution; and that when the Senate adjourns on any day from Friday, December 8, 2006, through Wednesday, December 13, 2006, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its