Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—4

Carson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
King (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1317

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, due to the sudden circumstances regarding my mother's health, I will not be present during today's rollcall vote on the override of the Presidential veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 976). If I were present, I would vote "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The veto message and the bill will be referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour business and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A list of those bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We expect to consider H.R. 1483, the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Act; H.R. 1011, Virginia Ridge and Valley Act; H.R. 505, Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act; H.R. 3685, Employment Nondiscrimination Act; and H.R. 3867, Small Business Contracting Act. On Friday, there will be no votes in the House.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information. There are really a couple of bills I wanted to ask about that I wonder when and if they are going to be coming back. As the gentleman knows, we only have a few more weeks of legislation outside of what we might have to do on the appropriations bills.

Yesterday, I spoke on the floor, and others did, in opposition to the FISA bill, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act bill, that was on the floor yesterday. We quit in the middle of that debate. I am wondering if the gentleman has any information on when that bill may come back to the floor or if you have any information that it wouldn't be coming back.

I would yield.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We do expect the bill to come back to the floor, and it is under discussion as to when that will be.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. I would say that we would be interested in trying to continue to work to get a bill on the floor on this important issue that a broad base of Members of the House on both sides could support. And as we were able to talk about earlier today, I would hope that we would have a chance maybe to look at that bill one more time.

The other bill that got a lot of attention this week was the bill that was reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Armenian genocide, and I wonder if my friend has any sense of the status of that bill.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman. We are still looking at that bill, and we expect next week to have some announcements about it.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information. We are very interested in that bill.

On the bill that we just voted on, a vote that would have been pretty easy to predict, I believe, 2 weeks ago, I noticed just this week that the Governor of New York said that he would be willing to accept new language in that bill that would eliminate his State's ability to cover families at over 400 percent of the poverty level. I would suggest that that is one of the compromises that would really be helpful, if we could eliminate that level that appears to only initially apply to the State of New York. Last week, when Mr. HOYER and I discussed this, he suggested that if the veto was sustained, that his view was that we should have an opportunity to work together on a bill that could come to the House floor. And I am wondering if the gentleman has any information on how the majority intends to move forward now on that bill.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman. I can tell the gentleman that we are serious about extending coverage to 10 million children. I think that the issue you just raised is an issue that has been talked about quite a bit, especially in the media, for the last 2 or 3 days, and I suspect that that is one of the things that we would be taking a look at in order to try to bring some resolution to. I think, so long as we can maintain the intentions to cover 10 million children, everything else will be under discussion.

Mr. BLUNT. I would particularly think that that would be the topic I just raised, where families of four could make up to $83,000 a year and still have their children insured by taxpayers, would be one of the areas that, if we could deal with that issue, that would be a significant step on the bill, maybe not the only step necessary. But if we could now get in a situation where we could do what the vast majority of the House said they wanted to do just a few weeks ago when we definitely went on record saying we don't want this State Child Insurance Program to go out of existence but we want to do what we can to be sure that it is meeting the real goals of the program.

□ 1330

That would be helpful. And any efforts that we can collectively make to where we work together on this would be, I think, helpful in reaching a conclusion. And I think this too: unfortunately, I don't think many minds were changed in the last 2 weeks, and we lost 2 weeks that we could have been talking. But that's behind us now, and I'm hoping we move forward.

The other major topic that I wanted to ask a question about today to my friend was on appropriations. I've been asking every week since we started the new fiscal year, or approached the new fiscal year, when we were going to have some bills on the floor or to go to conference, rather, on bills. On the Military Quality of Life bill, the Senate Democrats have been named to the conference. The Senate Republicans have been named to the conference. The House Republicans have been named to the conference. And I'm wondering if the gentleman has any sense of when we might actually see something now begin to happen on these appropriations bills.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish I could give you some good sense of where we are with all of that. As you know, these discussions are taking place. The rules are a little bit different with the Senate than they are with us. We've done our work here on the House side. I would hope that those conference committees will get ready real soon. I'm sure that we'll take them up as soon as they are ready, and I hope that will be very soon. I have no sense as to when that will be. I'm very hopeful, like you are, I'm sure, that it will all be between now and November 16.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's view on that. I am hopeful. I think we've got a handful of bills that have been approved now by both the House and the Senate, bills reported over to the House from the Senate; and my view is that we're beyond the time when we should have been reaching some conclusions on these bills, and urge the majority to work with the minority and find a way to get these bills done.

I think in the Mil Qual Veterans area there was a substantial increase. There's been an increase every year for the last dozen years. But a substantial increase to the tune of like $18.5 million a day in benefits to veterans and military families; and every day we let that go by just complicates the delivery of those services. And I hope we can move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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 (Mr. CLAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Greg Lankler, Staff Assistant, Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am submitting this letter pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. On October 11, 2007, I received a grand jury subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District for California. After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, and based on the information currently available to me, I have determined that the ad testificandum aspect of that subpoena is not consistent with the rights and privileges of the House, and the duces tecum aspect of the subpoena seeks records that are not material and relevant.

Sincerely,

GREG LANKLER,
Staff Assistant.

INTERNET GAMBLING REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2007

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter a letter cowritten by my Maryland Attorney General which raises concerns about the impact that the Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007 would have on the power of the States to make and enforce their own gambling laws. In my view, the letter raises questions that merit the consideration of my colleagues.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2007.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK AND RANKING MEMBER BACHUS: We, the Attorneys General of our respective States, have grave concerns about H.R. 2046, the ''Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007.'' We believe that the bill would undermine States' traditional powers to make and enforce their own gambling laws.

On March 21, 2006, 49 NAAG members wrote to the leadership of Congress:

''We encourage the United States Congress to help combat the skirting of state gambling regulations by enacting legislation which would address Internet gambling, while at the same time ensuring that the authority to set overall gambling regulations and policy remains where it has traditionally been most effective: at the state level.''

Congress responded by enacting the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 (UIGEA), which has effectively driven many illicit gambling operators from the American marketplace.

But now, less than a year later, H.R. 2046 proposes to do the opposite, by replacing state regulations with a federal licensing program that would permit Internet gambling companies to do business with U.S. customers. The Department of the Treasury would alone decide who would receive federal licenses and whether the licensees were complying with their terms. This would represent the first time in history that the federal government would be responsible for issuing gambling licenses.

A federal license would supersede any state enforcement action, because §5387 in H.R. 2046 would grant an affirmative defense against and prosecution or enforcement action under and Federal or State law to any person who possesses a valid license and complies with the requirements of H.R. 2046. This divestment of state gambling enforcement power is sweeping and unprecedented.

The bill would legalize Internet gambling in each State, unless the Governor clearly specifies existing state restrictions barring Internet gambling in whole or in part. On that basis, a State may ''opt out'' of legalization for all Internet gambling or certain types of gambling. However, the opt-out for types of gambling does not clearly preserve the right of States to place conditions on legal types of gambling. Thus, for example, if the State permits poker in licensed card rooms, but only between 10 a.m. and midnight, and the amount wagered cannot exceed $100 per day and the participants must be 21 or older, the federal law might nevertheless allow 18-year-olds in that State to wager much larger amounts on poker around the clock.

Furthermore, the opt-outs may prove illusory. They will likely be challenged before the World Trade Organization. The World Trade Organization has already shown itself to be hostile to U.S. restrictions on Internet gambling. If it strikes down state opt-outs as unduly restrictive of trade, the way will be open to the greatest expansion of legalized gambling in American history and near total preemption of State laws restricting Internet gambling.

H.R. 2046 effectively nationalizes America's gambling laws on the Internet, ''harmonizing'' the law for the benefit of foreign gambling operations that were defying our laws for years, at least until UIGEA was enacted. We therefore oppose this proposal, and any other proposal that hinders the right of States to prohibit or regulate gambling by their residents.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS GANSLER,
Attorney General of Maryland.
BILL MCCOLLUM,
Attorney General of Florida.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor on House Resolution 106.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RON PRESCOTT

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Los Angeles Unified School District in California lost one of its most prestigious leaders. Ron Prescott died a week ago, and for over 30 years he represented the district in Sacramento, California, the capital.

Ron Prescott, over the years, was voted one of the top lobbyists for children. He was charismatic, he was diplomatic, but most of all, he was dedicated to the children of our State, and particularly the second largest school district.

Ron Prescott had a way of influencing you to do the right thing. When there were several attempts to break up the unified school district, it was Ron that saved our district.