WELCOMING FRENCH PRESIDENT NICOLAS SARKOZY TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 379, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 379, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 1046]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—37

Baird
Berman
Blunt
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Buyer
Carson
Chandler
Clay
Cubin
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Feeney
Ferguson
Fossella
Gordon
Hastert
Hunter
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Keller
LaHood
Lofgren, Zoe
McMorris Rodgers
McNulty
Oberstar
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Royce
Saxton
Tancredo
Westmoreland
Yarmuth

□ 1948

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A resolution congratulating Nicolas Sarkozy on his election to the presidency of France and welcoming President Sarkozy on the occasion of his appearance before a Joint Meeting of Congress.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3043, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Pasco, Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 794.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 794 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3043, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The conference report also includes the House and Senate compromise on the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act.

The rule includes two additional provisions. The first provides that only the majority leader or his designee can move to proceed to consider H.R. 3688, the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act. It addresses a procedural motion under the trade act and is often adopted by the House, including three times during the last Congress alone. The second ensures that in the event that the Senate on a point of order strips out the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs provisions from this conference report, that the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education portion of the report will not be further delayed and, instead, sent immediately to the President for his signature.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying conference report. Of all the conference reports which Congress will consider, the vote on this one will be the most telling. It will be the most telling because Members will have an opportunity tonight to take an up-or-down vote on the needs of our children and Congress's commitment to America's veterans. Members are either for $5.1 billion in mandatory increased funding for veterans military benefits or they are not. They either support

$1.1 billion in increased funding for Pell Grants or they don't. We are either for restoring the President's $287 million cut in job-training programs for the unemployed or we are not.

Do you support $530 million in increased funding for VA hospitals and other medical facilities, or do you oppose the funding increase? What about Head Start? The conference report includes $154 million in increases in funding for this critical early childhood education program. Low-income energy assistance programs? There's a $250 million increase in funding for these programs, which ensure that millions of Americans are warm in the winter and cool in the summer.

How about the National Institutes of Health? The conference report increases funding for this vital agency by $1.1 billion so that America will continue to be the global leader in medical research and technology. Or Ryan White AIDS programs? There's an $85 million increase for them. I am especially appreciative of this increase because of the continued epidemic that HIV/AIDS poses throughout south Florida and particularly in the district that I am privileged to represent. All of these priorities and many more are funded in the underlying conference report on which Members will have an opportunity to cast a simple ''yes'' or ''no'' vote if this rule is approved.

Democrats promised, Madam Speaker, that we would govern differently than the previous majority, that our legislation would reflect not the ideological views of a few, but the priorities of the many. Moreover, we vowed to work in a bipartisan fashion. This is exactly what we did with this conference report, as indicated by the numerous Republican Senators spanning the ideological spectrum who signed the conference report.

Finally, we promised earmark reform, and that is what is done in this report. After Republicans spent 12 years increasing the number of earmarks to more than 14,000, Democrats cut the number of earmarks nearly in half in this conference report. Perhaps most importantly, we have made available for public viewing earmark disclosure statements, and any new earmarks placed in this conference report are clearly marked and in full accordance not only with the letter of the law but also its spirit. I am proud that we kept our promise for transparency and reform.

Madam Speaker, the importance of this conference report transcends partisan politics to address the disparities that exist in the competition to meet our human needs. The programs in the underlying legislation prioritize the livelihood of citizens from all walks of life and helps those individuals live at a standard that should be expected in the greatest Nation on Earth.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and namesake, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. Sadly, the Democrat leaders today are not taking care of the business of this country. They've failed to get their work done because, in my view, they would rather play political games than do the job that Congress and all of us are elected to do.

The new fiscal year, Madam Speaker, began 37 days ago, on October 1. Yet not one of the annual funding bills to fund the Federal Government has been signed into law. You have to go back 20 years to find a record this bad.

This rule would provide for the consideration of two separate appropriation bills that have been combined together by the Democrat leaders. The Veterans funding bill and funding for the Departments of Labor, Health and Education have been forced together in this conference report. These bills have nothing in common, or I should say the only thing they have in common is the fact that they are appropriation bills.

They do have one very, very important difference, the difference being callously exploited by the Democrat leaders. The difference is, Madam Speaker, the Veterans funding bill has the votes to pass this Congress and be signed into law, while the Labor, Health and Education spending bill will be vetoed because it increases spending by $10 billion over the President's request.

Democrat leaders are using the veterans to try and force through their plan of higher spending. Veterans benefits and veterans health care should not be held hostage. More than 400 of the 435 House Members and over 90 of 100 Senators voted for the veterans spending bill. Yet, Democrat leaders have blocked passage of this bill to be sent to the President since September. For 2 months they have kept the veterans waiting.

Madam Speaker, the Democrat leaders know full well this combined spending bill won't be signed into law, but they have chosen to waste our time by having the Congress vote on it anyway. The American people have had enough of this Congress not completing its work and not being serious about the business of this country. The Democrat leaders, in my view, need to stop posturing, stop the game-playing and get serious about doing its job in Congress.

Our veterans, Madam Speaker, have already carried a heavy burden for our country. They shouldn't be used by the new majority to carry the burden of passing this agenda of higher spending.

□ 2000

Separate these two bills. Let Congress pass a clean funding bill for our veterans.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule that provides for the consideration of a combined conference report destined to be vetoed and sustained.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) from the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his diligent and fair leadership on the Rules Committee. Let me also thank Chairman OBEY for this bill and for your tireless efforts in crafting this legislation.

Our spending priorities do reflect our values as a country, and during this week, which some of you heard last night, this is National Bible Week. I think it is very important as we debate this bill to remember some of the statements and speeches that were made last night with regard to caring for the least of these.

I am pleased we were able to fund critical programs under the Department of Health and Human Services, programs like nurses education and the Ryan White CARE Act and the Minority AIDS Initiative. I look forward to working with our colleagues to try to increase funding for all of our AIDS initiatives in the coming year.

I also want to thank the committee for funding critical education programs. What are we saying to the American people when we pass legislation that funds education, like the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, TRIO, GEAR UP, Upward Bound, and programs that strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-serving universities. We are saying these are our priorities. These are the programs that we care about and want to see implemented which invest in our children's future.

Madam Speaker, much has been said and reported about the President's veto threat. What does this senseless veto threat say to the American people? It says that the President's priority is funding an occupation in Iraq as opposed to investing in the future of our country.

We are now spending $12 billion a month in Iraq. For the price of 1 month of our occupation in Iraq, we could be paying for 1.5 million children to go to Head Start for a whole year. We could hire 200,000 new school teachers for a year, and we could even insure 7 million of the 8.7 million children living in this country that do not have health care insurance for a whole year.

This is a fundamental question where we should spend our priorities. We actually could continue to spend our tax dollars on a war without end, or we could use our tax dollars to spend on our children, our schools, our communities and on our veterans who have valiantly sacrificed so much. They deserve an ''aye'' vote on this rule and the underlying conference report.

Let's remember this is National Bible Week and let us do what the Scriptures would dictate on this bill and support the rule and the bill for the least of these.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a valuable member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend from Washington.

Madam Speaker, my friend from Florida says that this new Democratic majority was determined to govern differently than previous majorities. He has succeeded in this regard, Madam Speaker: This is the latest the Congress has gone without sending a single appropriation bill to the President for his signature since 1987. I don't think that is what the Democratic majority had in mind when they said they would govern differently, but they have certainly done so.

So I rise to express my opposition to the rule and to the conference report that will serve no purpose other than to delay funding for veterans, for our troops and for their families.

The conference report before us includes both the Labor-HHS Education appropriation bill and the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriation bill. The President stands ready to sign the MilCon-VA bill into law. He could have done so already and made funding available for key veterans health and benefit programs and much-needed military construction projects.

But the majority has chosen to link that bill with a bloated Labor-HHS, Education bill, a measure which the President will veto. So this exercise today amounts to a waste of time and sends the wrong message to veterans and military personnel. Instead of honoring these men and women for their sacrifices and providing assistance to them today on the eve of Veterans Day, we are short-changing our veterans in the interest of political gamesmanship.

The majority's strategy was to couple these bills with the expectation that many Members of Congress would not have the political will to oppose funding for veterans even temporarily. We should not use our veterans as pawns and we should not insult their intelligence. Give our Nation's heroes more credit than that. Our veterans can see through this ruse. So can the American people, and they should be rightly outraged by it.

I have in my hand a statement taken from the Web page of the American Legion, our Nation's largest veterans organization. The American Legion says, ''Here we are again, the start of a new fiscal year and Congress still has not passed the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill.'' The American Legion goes on to ask the question: ''So what is the problem?'' And their answer is accurate: ''Politics.''

The American Legion goes on to denounce Congress' plans to hold VA funding hostage.

Another veterans organization, VetsForFreedom.org identifies this process for what it is: ''A cynical attempt to use veterans as a political shield for further wasteful government spending.'' VetsforFreedom goes on to say they call on Congress to pass clean bills for the Veterans Administration and the Department of Defense as quickly as possible.

Madam Speaker, we should be moving this legislation under regular order. It is true that Congresses in the past have used omnibus bills, but always as a last resort after first trying to follow regular established procedure. In this instance, the Democratic leadership did not even attempt to follow regular order. Instead, their first attempt to bring these conference reports to the floor amounts to an unprecedented departure from established procedure.

I very much regret the decision of the majority to link these two bills. The House passed its version of the MilCon bill in June by a vote of 409–2. The Senate passed its bill on September 6, 2 months ago, with a vote of 92–1 in favor of the bill. For 8 weeks, Chairman EDWARDS and I stood ready to conference these bills. We could have brought a bill to the floor weeks ago that would have passed overwhelmingly and been signed into law by the President.

Instead, after waiting 8 weeks, when we were finally given the green light to move forward with a conference, the members of our subcommittee were not appointed as conferees as is normally the case. The majority decided that the Labor-HHS conferees, most of whom did not attend MilCon-VA hearings or participate in our bill's creation, would be involved in deliberations on VA-specific provisions.

Mr. EDWARDS and I, as chairman and ranking member, have worked along with our Senate counterparts and our staffs to craft a compromise between the two versions of the MilCon-VA bill. The compromise before the House includes funding for numerous military construction projects that are vital to support the working environment and quality of life of our soldiers and their families.

We have included funding for base realignment and closure. We have included funding for initiatives to restation 70,000 troops and their families to Europe and Korea; projects necessary for increasing the active duty Army by 65,000 and the Marine Corps by 27,000; relocation of Marines from Okinawa to Japan; consolidating U.S. forces in South Korea; establishing enduring bases in Afghanistan and Djibouti; barracks and family housing projects; new medical facilities; and needed support facilities for our Guard and Reserve. And all of this on a bipartisan basis.

I was especially pleased to join Chairman EDWARDS in a very important quality of life initiative, funding much-needed child development centers.

With regard to the VA portions of the bill, the department is receiving the largest increase in the department's history, an increase of $4.8 billion over fiscal year 2007. This increase even exceeds the independent budget request submitted by the various veterans service organizations. The bulk of this increase is going to boost medical services at VA hospitals and clinics. In fiscal year 2008, it is estimated that the VA will treat 5.8 million patients, including 263,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans.

The conferees have produced a bipartisan conference report. It is a good work product. It continues the longstanding tradition of support and commitment for the men and women and their families who are serving our country and those who have served our country in the past.

It is unfortunate that these worthy projects are now joined with a bill that includes $10 billion in excessive spending on domestic programs.

Included in the Labor-HHS portion of the bill is a new duplicative program for the CDC for comprehensive sex education; a new grant-making initiative at the Department of Education targeting the creation of full-service community schools.

The only office at the Department of Labor the majority has seen fit to cut is the one responsible for union oversight. Apparently union accountability is unimportant to the majority, so they cut the labor management standards budget by 20 percent.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I mention these things to point out that there are legitimate differences surrounding the Labor-HHS bill. There are good reasons the President will veto Labor-HHS. But there are no good reasons for this bill to be linked with MilCon-VA. Vital funding for the VA and infrastructure for our troops could be in the pipeline within a matter of days, but the majority will simply not allow that. Instead, we are sacrificing veterans for the sake of a cheap, cheap political stunt. Our Nation's veterans deserve better. The American people deserve better.

Vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on the conference report.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, sometimes I think I am living here in la-la land. These people were in charge of the House; they were in charge of the Senate, and they were in charge of the White House. And they left us 11 appropriation measures that Mr. OBEY and his committee have had to deal with in trying to clean up their mess.

I would like to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the chairman of Military Construction and the VA Subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, there is a clear difference between the

Republican leadership's approach to veterans and the new Democratic Congress' leadership.

In the old Congress led by Republicans for 12 years, the Republican leadership fired the Republican chairman of the VA Committee in the House. Why? Because he put the interest of veterans above political loyalty, partisan loyalty, to the leadership that didn't want to fund our veterans adequately.

What is the difference? In the new Democratic Congress, Speaker PELOSI and our leadership have said that supporting veterans, honoring those who have honored us with their service in uniform, will be the highest of priorities in this Congress, and that is exactly what we have done and that is exactly what we are doing here tonight.

Let me respond to some of the comments of my Republican colleagues. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) said for 2 months Democrats have kept veterans waiting. I don't know where my colleague has been, but that is the last thing we have done. Perhaps my colleague would remember that the first thing we did was pass a continuing resolution for veterans funding for 2007 because the previously led Republican Congress last year failed completely to ever pass a VA-Military Construction appropriations bill.

In that bill, we increased veterans discretionary health care spending by $3.4 billion. But that wasn't enough, we did more.

In the Iraq war supplemental bill, we didn't keep veterans waiting; we worked hard to add an additional $1.8 billion to veterans discretionary spending. So $3.4 billion and $1.8 billion, that adds up to a $5.2 billion increase in VA discretionary and health care funding this year alone before this bill comes to the floor. That is a larger increase than any Republican House-led conference has ever reported under Republican leadership.

□ 2015

Now, some would say saying one thing and doing another is hypocrisy. Others might call it a double standard. I will be polite and respectful tonight. I'm going to call it politically convenient memory.

Our Republican colleagues are chastising us about being one month late in passing a VA appropriation bill, although they ignored the $5.2 billion we've already added for our veterans. They seem to forget, you know when the last time was under their leadership we passed a VA appropriation bill on time? Anybody remember? It was a long time ago. 1996. That was the last time, under Republican leadership, in this House we passed a VA appropriation bill on time.

Politically convenient memory. They're chastising us for being 1 month late this year? Seems that they forget, Madam Speaker, that in 2006 they didn't pass a bill at all.

They say we should separate the two bills, VA from Labor-HHS. Another problem of politically convenient memory loss. Out of the last 5 years, Madam Speaker, only once, only once under Republican leadership did they pass the VA appropriations bill as a freestanding bill. Saying one thing, doing another.

What Democrats are doing with this bill and what we've done this year is to work with our veterans service organizations to pass the largest increase in VA health care funding in the history of the veterans administration. That's a record we can be proud of and we can remember.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as I listened to the very distinguished chairman of the Military Quality of Life Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I've got to say that I was somewhat saddened at this constant finger-pointing: the Republicans did this in 1996 and we didn't know how to run the place and we didn't provide the funding that was necessary for veterans and all of this sort of stuff and we were late in doing these things.

The fascinating thing about this is that there's this brilliant document that came forward during last fall's campaign, and it was unveiled by the new Speaker of the House. It was called ''A New Direction for America.'' And in it, it talked about this new spirit of openness, the fact that we would have transparency and disclosure and accountability, the likes of which we had not seen in a long time, if ever.

Madam Speaker, I will tell you that we all know that we've gotten the exact opposite of that. I unveiled a few weeks ago, along with my colleagues Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. SESSIONS, an outline of what has happened in this year.

Well, this process that we're dealing with at this very moment is an example of the kind of arrogance that we have seen in trying to utilize veterans as a political pawn.

Now, the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), quoted the veterans publication in which they said very clearly, we can do something that will ensure that the resources necessary for our Nation's veterans are there. We can pass in a bipartisan way a military quality of life appropriations conference report. We can get it through both Houses of Congress, and we can get it to the President of the United States. And then we will have, albeit late, we will have been able to get the funding that is necessary.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't believe that there are Members of this institution who actually want to deprive our Nation's courageous veterans from having access to the quality health care and the other items that they need to have to address their concerns. I don't believe that anybody sincerely wants to do that.

But I will tell you this, we know full well that there has been game-playing in this process. In fact, all one needs to do is look at the rule. We know that rule XVIII in the Senate basically says that you cannot link up two appropriation bills. It's a scope violation, and it can't be done.

Madam Speaker, on October 31, 44 Members of the United States Senate signed a letter, and I'd like to include this letter in the RECORD at this point.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2007.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Majority Leader HARRY REID,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MAJORITY LEADER REID: We write this letter to request that federal funding for our nation's troops and veterans not be further delayed and held hostage for partisan purposes. Congress must promptly complete its work on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 Military Construction-Veterans Affairs (MilCon-VA) and Defense appropriations bills, and they should be sent to the President's desk as freestanding measures by Veterans Day.

It has been nearly two months since both Houses passed their respective FY 2008 MilCon-VA appropriations bills, and nearly one month has gone by since both chambers approved their FY 2008 Defense appropriations bills. Plenty of time has passed for these measures to go through conference and get signed into law. Yet to date, this Congress has still not sent a single appropriations bill to the President—a failure of accomplishment that has not happened in decades. Meanwhile, our brave soldiers are defending us overseas, taking the fight to the terrorists, and keeping our nation safe. Veterans continue waiting for increased funding, which the President already has signaled that he would approve and will lead to improved medical care and other benefits.

Swift action on the MilCon-VA and Defense appropriations bills is not only fitting with Veterans Day coming in less than two weeks, but it also is one of our highest responsibilities as lawmakers. Our soldiers and veterans already have done so much for our country. The Democratic Congressional Leadership should not now cynically use them to shoulder a bloated ''minibus'' funding bill up Pennsylvania Avenue and wrest billions in excessive spending. Leading veterans groups have expressed strong concerns about such an approach. For months, the President has said that he would oppose it.

Our troops and veterans cannot afford unnecessary delay, and they rightfully expect Congress to put their interests ahead of politics. It therefore is irresponsible to attach VA and military funding measures onto a domestic spending bill which we know will get vetoed. Instead, we urge you to work with us in a bipartisan manner so we can quickly advance freestanding MilCon-VA and Defense appropriations bills for the President's signature.

It was addressed to Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader REID, and in it they said that they were not going to

stand for this attempt to play politics, partisan politics, with funding for our Nation's veterans.

And so we all know what is going to happen if this measure passes out of this House. The Senate has the ability and 44 Members have signed this letter saying that they are going to, in fact, raise a point of order to prevent it from proceeding.

Now, it was 2 months ago today, Madam Speaker, 2 months ago today that the Senate passed this appropriation bill; and, unfortunately, the attempt to get the resources necessary for our veterans is, in fact, being denied. I think that it is absolutely reprehensible that we would use them to try and pass a bill that we know the President of the United States has said he's going to veto.

So I suspect that just as we went through this debate on the State Children's Health Insurance Program measure, there will be some that say Republicans are voting against providing resources for our Nation's veterans, and it's the power of the majority here in the House. They can fashion things in such a way that that, in fact, can be described. They can characterize the vote that way.

The veterans of this country aren't going to buy it. The American people aren't going to buy it. They know that games are being played with this very important funding measure.

Madam Speaker, it is essential that we defeat this rule, make sure that we get a clean appropriation bill for our veterans to the President's desk just as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, it's awfully difficult to listen to lectures from people who left 11 appropriations measures on the table before the Democrats achieved the majority.

I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I'm going to speak not to what was, but what is today and what should be in the future.

I rise today in strong support of this conference agreement and the rule, especially the agreement's increased funding for both the NIH and the veterans health care system.

I have seen firsthand the amazing advancements in research that are brought about through NIH funding. The University of Iowa's per capita NIH research productivity is ranked sixth among public universities in this Nation. Their important work benefits both Iowa and the Nation.

Unfortunately, over the past 5 years funding for the NIH has fallen behind biomedical inflation, and we all suffer from these setbacks as advancements in treatment and cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and many other diseases are jeopardized. That's why I strongly support the increased funding for the NIH and other health care programs in this conference report today.

In recent years, important veterans health care funding has also fallen behind. I could not be more proud that this conference report also includes the single largest increase in veterans funding in the VA's 77-year history.

By providing $37.2 billion for VA hospitals and clinics, we will ensure that the VA has the resources and oversight necessary to ensure that veterans receive excellent health care, rehabilitation services, and system-wide support. This funding will also provide research into the treatment of traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder, two devastating conditions that Iraq and Afghanistan veterans face all too frequently and will into the future.

I strongly believe that bold action such as this conference report is necessary to address our Nation's and our veterans' health care needs. Today, we are taking an important step forward. We are telling America that we have our priorities right, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the conference report.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I was very sorry that my friend from Fort Lauderdale wouldn't yield to me, and I would be happy to yield to him in a moment as I respond to the statement that he made just when I completed mine.

He said that I was responsible for leaving 11 appropriations bills on the floor. He said that he got a lecture.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What I said was it was difficult to have lectures from people who left 11 appropriations measures. I did not refer to you.

Mr. DREIER. Well, I had just completed my statement, Madam Speaker, and the gentleman said getting lectures from people, and I'd given a 5- or 6-minute statement. So I don't know, maybe it was an exaggeration for me to infer that the gentleman was referring to what I said when, in fact, I had served on the Rules Committee in a leadership position in the past several Congresses. So maybe I was wrong in interpreting that he was referring to my statement.

But, Madam Speaker, let me say this: we know that the House of Representatives did, in fact, pass out those appropriations bills. We worked in a bipartisan way to make that happen. We had a friendly exchange with the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations in which we characterized the Senate as the enemy and the other party as merely the opposition.

The fact of the matter is we've had a real challenge in dealing with the Senate. We know that as we look at this measure we, in past Congresses, have, in fact, been successful at passing measures out of the House of Representatives.

And I will say again that my friend referred to these lectures when, in fact, I began my remarks by pointing to the fact that we were promised a new day, and the fact is we're getting much, much worse. We're getting much worse than the behavior and the performance that my friend complained about of the past.

So, Madam Speaker, I've got to say that playing politics with our Nation's veterans is exactly what we're going through right now, and I think it's a very sad commentary. And I am gratified, I'm very gratified, that our Nation's veterans organizations are recognizing exactly what's happening, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Talk about a big day, a big day is the day that veterans get an additional $7 billion and don't have to stand in VA lines for months in order to receive their benefits.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Rules Committee (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee.

If a gentle breeze were to come into this room and dispel the fog of rhetoric that we've been listening to, we'd understand and return to the basic proposition that's quite simple, and that is, the budget of the United States Congress reflects the priorities of the United States Congress.

And what will be debated and the substance before the House is whether on the Labor-HHS budget we will appropriate and spend 2 percent more than was recommended by the President of the United States. What will be debated and decided by this House of Representatives is whether we will approve and spend 4 percent more for military construction in overdue services to our veterans. It comes to you from Chairs of subcommittees who are operating under the tight restrictions of pay-as-you-go budgeting that has been adopted by this new Congress after it had been abandoned by the previous Congresses.

So what do the American people have to judge us by what we do? It's this: first, we will pay for everything on a pay-as-you-go basis; second, when the President says that we're spending more than he recommended on Labor-HHS and for our veterans, we plead guilty. We're paying for it, but we're doing it because we believe it's overdue and it's right.

Think about the lack of investment that has occurred as a result of the clear priorities of the administration approved by previous Congresses: all Iraq all of the time and impoverishing our domestic programs, even as Americans are struggling to make ends meet.

The Labor-HHS budget does a couple of things that are very straightforward. It makes a fundamental commitment in the National Institutes of Health. It increases LIHEAP funding, Low Income Heating Assistance Program. Is it needed? Oil is at $93 a gallon on a barrel.

And on the veterans budget, this Congress has made a fundamental decision, and it's very simple again. The cost of the war must include the cost of caring for the warrior.

□ 2030

Yes, it's true, this VA budget is the highest increase that we have had in the history of the VA. Why? It's because it is absolutely necessary to meet the obligation we have to the men and women in uniform.

We will have an opportunity to vote yes or no. We will have an opportunity to state explicitly and be judged by the American people as to what our priorities are, and the priorities we have are to begin to renew our commitment to our veterans and to renew our commitment to basic science and investment in the people of this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, how much time on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both sides have 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

My friend from Vermont raised an issue on the issue of combining these bills and suggesting that they are paid for. If the pay-for that they are talking about is what was reflected in the budget document, then that will result over time in the largest tax increase on American citizens in the history of this country. If it is not the largest, it is the second largest.

We will reserve the debate on that, because we are talking about appropriation process tonight, but we will reserve that debate for later on this week when there will be a tax extender bill coming to the floor. We can more fully debate how these pay-fors work.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. FARR.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and in strong support of the underlying bills. I can't believe what I am hearing here tonight, that people are talking about this being a bloated bill, that it's a bill that games are being played. They talk about how much we love the veterans side of it, but we don't like the Health and Human Services side.

Ladies and gentlemen, you cannot have a veteran without having a family, without having a home.

This bill puts more money into the areas where the President cuts it. In an area where the oil is going to $100 a barrel, they oppose this bill because we give more money to LIHEAP for elderly people and people who have low incomes to heat their homes in this winter that is coming.

They cut the budget for special ed, the President cut. We put it back in. We put in money for autism. We put in money for people for research, for strokes, for cancer, for Parkinson's Disease. These things are related to veterans.

You can't stand a veteran alone. A veteran has a family. If that veteran's family needs some help, by God, it's the government's responsibility to provide for that good public education and that great institute of health. That's in this bill, education, health, labor, the essence of America, essential to having good veterans.

Vote for the rule and for the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I was compelled to come to the well of the House here because I have listened very carefully to how we are sacrificing our troops for political stunts. We have been told that this bill, somehow, is unclean. I would submit that our troops have fought for an American quality of life that is reflected in this bill.

As has been indicated, the National Institutes of Health is funded, Centers for Disease Control, substance abuse and mental health, Ryan White AIDS Programs, low-income heating energy programs, Healthy Start, Head Start, the Community Services Block Grant program, the Social Services Block Grant program, Child Care and Development Block Grant, all of these unclean programs like foster care and adoption assistance, the TRIO program, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, reading programs, school reform programs, programs that help our disabled and physically handicapped students, English language acquisition programs, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Perkins Loans, Pell Grants.

I would submit to you that those Marines and the Army, our soldiers are out there fighting for precisely these kinds of programs. This is a brilliant, brilliant joining of priorities.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to CHET EDWARDS from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, some of my Republican colleagues now say this bill is about politics.

Let me respond, not with my words, let me respond using the words of the Disabled American Veterans, the DAV, in their press release issued today. The Disabled American Veterans, DAV, is commending lawmakers for approving a conference report that will provide the largest increase in funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs in its history.

DAV now calls on Congress and the administration to support this important legislation and to enact it by Veterans Day. David Gorman, the Washington D.C. Headquarters executive director of DAV went on to say, and I quote, ''This increase in veterans health care and other programs is especially welcome news at a time when our Nation is at war.''

My Republican colleagues said we promised a new day under Democratic leadership. We have done that. We did promise a new day for veterans. After years of veterans health care and other programs struggling just to try to come close to keeping up with inflation, we have authored the largest increase in VA discretionary budget funding and health care funding in history.

The most important step we took in that journey and in that new direction was on March 29 of this year. We passed the 2008 budget resolution which authorized that largest increase in history for veterans health care and other benefits programs.

Unfortunately, not one Republican, not one Republican in this House voted for that historic budget resolution that is now doing so much for our Nation's veterans.

The same Republicans who railed tonight about our being 30 days late seem to fail to point out we have already increased veterans health care and other funding levels by $5.2 billion. A lot better record. It is certainly a new direction compared to last year, and the same colleagues who are complaining tonight didn't pass the veterans bill.

One last point, Republican colleagues are saying, because the President threatened to veto this bill that includes such great funding, important funding for our veterans, we ought to stop in our tracks. If I had done that as chairman of the VA Military Construction Subcommittee several months ago, our veterans would have lost $3.7 billion, because at that time, and as late as August 27, the same administration wanted to veto this bill, said they didn't need a dime more than the President asked for. That would have taken $3.7 billion out of VA health care, VA benefits, adding new VA caseworkers. We are in a new direction. That direction is good for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, made precisely my point, and he made the point that we have been saying on this side. He made the point that my friend from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) said. He talked about the benefits of the veterans funding bill.

Mr. WICKER spent a great deal of time as ranking member saying how he worked hand in hand in a bipartisan basis, and all we are saying is that we know that bill has the votes to pass the Congress and be signed into law. I thank the gentleman for making the point, because that's the point we are making.

All we are saying is by linking these two bills together, you are going to prolong it because it's going to be vetoed. I will be offering later on a motion to defeat the previous question so we can separate that. I hope the gentleman will vote with us because now we can pass this bill that he extolled in such a very good way.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, my friend from Texas, with whom I have worked closely and for whom I have the greatest regard, mentions proudly and properly this, the largest increase in veterans spending in history.

I have to say that it does come on top of record spending increases for veterans over the past 12 years. So, I take a second place to no one in my support and in defending our stewardship of the Veterans Administration over the past 12 years.

My friend quoted the DAV organization. I am sure they support this bill. I am also sure, just like the American Legion and the Vets for Freedom, that they don't want it delayed as this process will do, and that's why I urge a defeat of the previous question and of the rule.

My friend says that not one Republican Member voted for the budget resolution. The budget resolution provided great funding for the veterans, but it also included the largest tax increase in the history of this country, and that's why Republicans voted against the budget resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have to say that I am disappointed, as I mentioned and others have mentioned, that the Democrat leadership refuses to let the House consider the veterans spending bill, funding bill, separate from funding from the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

This rule provides for the consideration of one conference report that combines two separate spending bills that will be vetoed by the President, and that veto will be sustained. I believe Members of this House should have an opportunity to vote separately on these two distinct measures.

Therefore, I will be asking my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that I can amend the rule and allow a separate vote on each of the spending measures.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can separate this issue and vote ''no'' on the rule if we do not prevail on our previous question so that the Congress can pass a clean funding bill for our veterans.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

What we have heard from members of the minority regarding their opposition to American priorities is nothing new. After all, it was their manufactured obstructionism in this body and the other that delayed this bill and has continued to delay the remaining appropriations bills from being signed into law.

Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle announced that they would oppose this conference report long before it was ever written. The President, using his misdirected, ill-conceived and ideologically driven policies as justification, has been threatening to veto this bill for literally months.

Shame on them. Shame on them for refusing to support the malnourished and the sick. Shame on them for voting against providing energy assistance or for low-income families. Shame on them for voting against making it more affordable for kids to attend college and obtain an early childhood education. Shame on them for not supporting increased funding for military housing.

Shame on them for passing measures and not funding them. Shame on them for opposing increased funding for veterans health care. Shame on them for voting to send our troops into harm's way but refusing to take care of them and their families when they got home. There is no smoke and mirrors here; there is no required reading between the lines and nuancing. This is a vote about priorities. Today's vote on this conference report will be the most telling of them all.

I ask my colleagues and vigorously urge them to support this rule and the underlying conference report.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, the bill under consideration today represents the core of what the American people send us here to do. It invests in children's health and encourages our young people to serve their communities. It helps people train for the workplace and provides funding for crucial education programs. It represents the best of what government by the people can do.

That is why I am pleased to support the rule and the underlying legislation, Madam Speaker. I am particularly encouraged by the investments it makes in children's health and in national service.

Today's appropriations package fully funds the National Children's Study. This Study is a perfect example of the kinds of long-term health initiatives that the government is perfectly positioned to lead.

It will examine 100,000 children from before birth to age 21. The data generated by the Children's Study will help us develop cures for diseases like autism, asthma, childhood obesity, and diabetes.

The Children's Study is the first of its kind, Madam Speaker. But we do not have to wait decades for the Study to change lives. In just a few short years, it will begin generating useful data on premature birth, common birth defects, and prenatal links to autism.

I am pleased that today's appropriations package invests so wisely in the National Children's Study, and I urge all my colleagues to support it as a result.

Madam Speaker, the conferees also recognized the importance of our National Service Programs. Over the last few years, service members have provided humanitarian and educational assistance to the victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. More recently, they have offered their services to help calm the wildfires that have devastated my home State of California.

I am pleased that the conferees appropriated high funding levels to help sustain and grow our service programs. National Civilian Community Corps received over $24 million in funding. Currently, there are only three of these campuses in our Nation, and I am glad that this funding will help build two new campuses.

I am also pleased to see that the other important programs—like Learn and Serve America, Volunteers in Service to America and AmeriCorps State and National programs—all received high levels of funding. These National Service Programs are essential to the health of our communities and Nation.

Madam Speaker, today's legislation is about making our priorities clear. Protecting children's health and encouraging national service are not choices we have as Members of Congress. They are responsibilities. I am pleased that today's legislation fulfills our collective responsibilities as representatives of the people.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 794

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of section 1, insert ''It shall be in order for a separate vote to be had upon demand on that portion of the conference report consisting of Division B.''.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on

the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.)

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 183, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 1047]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Baird
Blunt
Boozman
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Buyer
Carson
Chandler
Cubin
Feeney
Ferguson
Fossella
Gordon
Gutierrez
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
LaHood
McCrery
McNulty
Oberstar
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rogers (MI)
Tancredo
Westmoreland
Wilson (OH)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

□ 2108

Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. CHABOT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 182, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 1048]

YEAS—216

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren

Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—182

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—34

Baird
Blunt
Boozman
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Buyer
Carson
Chandler
Cubin
Feeney
Ferguson
Fossella
Giffords
Gordon
Gutierrez
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
LaHood
McCrery
McNulty
Oberstar
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Tancredo
Tiberi
Westmoreland
Wilson (OH)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2115

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, November 6, 2007, I could not be present for rollcall votes 1047 and 1048 due to a previous commitment to district related business.

Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: "yea" on rollcall vote 1047 and "yea" on rollcall vote 1048.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1429, IMPROVING HEAD START ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. SARBANES, SESTAK, LOEBSACK, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. MCKEON, CASTLE, FORTUO, BISHOP of Utah, KELLER of Florida, WILSON of South Carolina, BOUSTANY, and HELLER of Nevada.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3688, UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–432) on the resolution (H. Res. 801) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3688) to implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3355, HOMEOWNERS' DEFENSE ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–433) on the resolution (H. Res. 802) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3355) to ensure the availability and affordability of homeowners' insurance coverage for catastrophic events, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3222, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. MURTHA submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3222) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 110–434)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3222) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.
Sec. 2. References.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 2008

Title I—Military Personnel
Title II—Operation and Maintenance
Title III—Procurement
Title IV—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation
Title V—Revolving and Management Funds
Title VI—Other Department of Defense Programs
Title VII—Related Agencies
Title VIII—General Provisions

DIVISION B—FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 2008

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to "this Act" contained in any division of this Act shall be treated as referencing only to the provisions of that division.