

Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hersteth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
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
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeke (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
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
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
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
McCotter
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Townes
Payne
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bean
Bono
Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Everett
Hill
Jindal
Kucinich
LaHood
Mack
Oberstar
Paul
Udall (NM)
Watt
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 2103

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 3773, RE-STORE ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3773, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross-references, punctuation, and indentation, and to make other technical and conforming changes as necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3043.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 30 seconds. Madam Speaker, I think we have an understanding that the other side will have two statements; we will have one. We do not expect to take anywhere near the full hour.

I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Speaker, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take a lot of time since this is the sixth time this year that I have spoken on this legislation, twice in committee and now four times on the floor of this House.

I would like to thank Chairman OBEY and to thank his staff for the good, solid work product that they have delivered. I have enjoyed our work together this year, and as I said before, this bill, the people's bill, is a thoughtful piece of legislation.

If Congress does not override the President's veto, I will look forward to working with the chairman to negotiate a good bill that can be enacted. If the veto is sustained, I would hope that all parties, the White House and both houses of Congress, will come together quickly and work in good faith to complete the appropriations process in a timely manner.

There is no good reason why we can't compromise this bill. In times past, people in this body of good faith have overcome differences far greater than we have tonight.

If the proposal is to split the difference, to reduce the amount of spending above the President's request by \$11 billion, I would advise the President to take "yes" for an answer.

Let's go home for Thanksgiving, thank God for all the blessings that He has bestowed upon this country, and pray for wisdom and good sense, and come back and get our work done in December.

I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I had planned to make a 10-minute, maybe even a 20-minute speech this evening expressing my concerns about the Labor-HHS conference report. However, given the late hour and Members' desire to join their families for the Thanksgiving Day holiday, I will submit my written statement for the RECORD.

As I do so, Madam Speaker, I am reminded of the words of my friend Will Rogers, whose statue stands outside the door of this very Chamber. He said, "Never miss a good chance to shut up."

With that, I urge a vote to sustain the President's veto, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, here we are on November 15th and only two appropriations bills have been sent to the President—only one of which was enacted. I must confess that I find it quite ironic that the majority party spent the better part of the beginning of this year criticizing Republicans for not getting our work done in a

timely fashion when now those same critics find themselves in an identical, or perhaps even worse, situation.

For those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee, this will be the sixth time we have voted on this bill this year. Six times! It is the fourth time the full House will have voted on it.

The fiscal year 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies bill reflects a fundamental difference in opinion on the level of funding necessary to support the Federal government's role in education, health, and workforce programs. Regardless of that disagreement, House Republicans agree that many of the programs funded in this bill are vitally important. The majority party would have the public believe otherwise.

The recent rhetoric we have heard with respect to the president's veto of this bill diminishes all that we do as elected officials, and it does not serve this Congress or our country well. It is targeted at raw, base emotions rather than fact. It is intended to mislead the American people. It is, in short, intended for political gain.

The primary difference between the parties on this bill is that Republicans believe we must balance the benefits of these worthwhile programs with the fact that the American taxpayer must pay for them.

The vetoed bill that we are being asked to consider today is nearly \$10 billion over the President's budget request and \$6 billion over the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. It represents roughly half of the \$22 billion the majority party in this Congress wants to spend over what the president requested.

When Labor-HHS Chairman Neil Smith—a Democrat—presented his bill in 1994, it totaled \$65 billion. If you had predicted in 1994 that the very same bill—which largely covers the same agencies today as it did then—would increase by \$85 billion over the next 13 years, the Chairman of the full Committee—who happened to be DAVID OBEY—probably would not have believed it.

Let's put that into perspective. In 1994 the Defense bill spent \$242 billion. The Defense bill signed just this week spends \$459 billion. That is an 89 percent increase over thirteen years for a function that is quite clearly and constitutionally the primary responsibility of the Federal Government—defending our home, our citizens and our way of life against foreign threats. This bill contains a 130 percent increase since 1994—it has more than doubled in size!

By any objective standard—whether you are JERRY LEWIS or DAVID OBEY—that is a healthy increase.

And today, the House is being asked to override the president's veto and spend nearly \$10 billion more than was requested and \$6 billion more than last year under the mistaken notion that throwing money at our nation's problems will cause them to fade away.

Under the mistaken notion that the Federal Government is the panacea—

That government health insurance is the answer for the uninsured;

That the judgment of bureaucrats in Washington who contribute only 9 cents of every dollar spent to educate our children is superior to the judgment of parents and local school districts who face very different circumstances across our country;

That job training is somehow the responsibility of the Federal Government rather than of schools, private employers and individuals.

I contend that government is not the long-term solution. While government offers safety net programs that I support, these programs are and should be short-term solutions to help our fellow citizens move toward self-sufficiency. These programs are meant to be a hand up, not a hand out.

As we move forward with consideration of these FY 2008 appropriations bills, Members of Congress ought to be aware that voting to override the president's vetoes on this and other appropriations bills—in short, voting to support this majority's spending spree—will increase the average annual burden on the individual taxpayer by roughly \$3,000.

That is \$3,000 that cannot be used to buy food, to save for college, to pay for health insurance, or, for that matter, to contribute to public television.

Finally, I must express my dismay at remarks made by the chairman of the committee with respect to the fate of member projects if this veto is sustained. I would hope that my colleagues do not take the bait on what I consider an inappropriate threat that suggests that members care more about pork than they do about bad fiscal policy.

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

Madam Speaker, I recognize Members want to get out of here and, as I indicated, we are going to facilitate that. But this is an important issue, and it deserves a few minutes of discussion.

As I said on the floor last week, in November I believe the American people sent two messages to this body and to the White House. Number one, they wanted a change in policy in Iraq; and, number two, they wanted a change in domestic priorities here at home.

I think that the White House, by its insistence on no compromise on both the Iraqi front and on the domestic appropriations front, has indicated that it would prefer to tell the American people: We don't care what you thought you were telling us in November, we are going to do it our way; and, it is our way or the highway.

Madam Speaker, it is simply not credible for a President who is asking us to spend \$200 billion in additional money in Iraq, it is not credible for a President who is asking us to spend \$50 billion to \$60 billion again this year on tax cuts for people who make over \$1 million a year, to then say that we cannot afford to make basic investments in education, in health care, in medical research.

The President insists that we follow his budget with respect to this bill. If we do, we would cut vocational education 50 percent; we would eliminate every student aid program except Pell Grants and work study; we would cut handicapped education by \$300 million; we would cut mental health resources by \$100 million; we would cut the training in children's hospitals by 63 percent; we would cut rural health by 54 percent; and, we would cut low-income heating assistance by 18 percent.

The gentleman from New York mentioned the need for compromise on this bill. We have already had incredible

compromise. We have had compromise on virtually every item in this bill, on every issue ranging from family planning to special education, and the minority has been involved every step of the way. When the bill was reported out of subcommittee, every single member of the subcommittee signed the committee report, and yet today we face a Presidential veto.

Madam Speaker, I want to make one thing clear. We have said from the beginning to the White House we would like to compromise. We have asked the White House, I have asked Mr. Nussle, I know our leadership has asked the President personally, to sit down and work out our differences. We have been told as recently as last Saturday by the press secretary speaking for the White House that the White House had no intention of compromising, and that all the Congress had to do to meet the President's standards was to submit a bill which was fully identical with his budget.

□ 2115

I'm sorry, this is an independent branch of government, and we have an obligation to do better than that.

Now, I was asked by a number of members of the press earlier today why the Senate majority leader had released information indicating that I and Senator BYRD were in the process of trying to put together a split-the-difference appropriation bill for all of the remaining appropriation items that still have yet to be finished. I want to take this opportunity to explain why we've done that.

People might like to cast a vote without having to take responsibility for knowing the consequences, but there are severe consequences for voting against overriding the President's veto of the Labor-Health-Education bill.

If this veto is not overridden, the best that could happen is that we will wind up splitting the difference with the President's wholly inadequate budgets. If we were to do a 50 percent cut to the difference between the Labor-Health-Education bill and the President's budget, what will that mean for the programs that so many Members of Congress claim that they are for?

For medical research into diseases like cancer, Parkinson's and diabetes at the National Institutes of Health, meeting the President halfway would put us \$700 million below the bill we are considering today. That means 700 fewer grants for research to treat and cure all of the deadly diseases that all of us like to tell our constituents we're sworn to try to overcome. I don't want to have to go back home and explain that kind of cut in NIH, but that's one of the things that will happen undoubtedly, if this veto is not overridden tonight.

For health care access, to provide 1.2 million more Americans with access to community health centers, this bill is

\$200 million above the President's request. Under a split-the-difference scenario, access for 600,000 Americans will evaporate.

Likewise, this bill provides \$95 million so that 200,000 Americans who can't get insurance because they are medically high risk will have access to health insurance at the State level. That insurance also evaporates for 100,000 people if we split the difference.

Under the President's budget, vocational education would be cut by 50 percent. This bill eliminates that cut, but meeting him halfway would still mean a 25 percent cut.

My Republican colleagues worked hard to push funding up for special education, even beyond what I had proposed in committee, funding the program \$800 million above the President's request. Defeat of this bill will slash that increase by \$400 million.

This bill provides \$400 million above the President to serve nearly 120,000 more low-income kids with title I grants. But 60,000 of those kids will be out of luck if we meet the President's budget halfway.

For the LIHEAP program, this bill also helps around 1½ million more families to pay their energy bills by providing \$630 million more than the President's budget. Anyone who votes against this bill will be making inevitable at least a \$315 million cut. That means 750,000 fewer families will have help this winter.

Now, please remember, everything that I've described is, at best, a best-case scenario if this bill is defeated and we have to pursue a split-the-difference alternative. In fact, as long as a sufficient number of Republican Members continue to follow the President's budget priorities, the result is likely to be even worse. Those who vote against overriding this veto will take full responsibility for the cuts in these essential investments.

I would like to make one other point. I know most of you on that side of the aisle, and I recognize that there are probably 50 or 60 of you who are so indifferent to these programs that you could care less what happens, but I don't believe that that's true about the rest of you. I think you care about America's children as much as I do. I think you care about medical research as much as I do. And many of you have told me that you wish you could vote for this bill, but your party leadership won't give you a permission slip.

I ask you to use your own judgment. I ask you to recognize that this issue may not be important to you, but it's important to the American families who are affected by what you do here tonight. It affects the quality of their education; it affects the degree to which we will protect the health and safety of American workers; it protects our ability to dig into the problem of serious disease across the board.

You know in your hearts that this is a decent bill. This is a bipartisan product put together in a bipartisan way. It deserves a bipartisan vote.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I support this effort to override the President's veto of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill funding the Departments of Labor, HHS, and Education.

After years of too little attention to our important domestic programs, this legislation makes important investments in our health care and education programs. Several years of flat funding and small increases have resulted in funding reductions for the health, education and labor programs that Americans rely on every day.

I am pleased that the bill provides the National Institutes of Health with a 4-percent increase over current funding levels. The \$30 billion in this legislation will help expand our nation's commitment to life-saving medical research, much of which is performed in my back yard at the Baylor College of Medicine, the MD Anderson Cancer Center and many other impressive research facilities located in the Texas Medical Center.

I also support the legislation's \$225 million increase for the Health Centers program. I know the administration supports this program, but by vetoing this bill, the President puts in jeopardy our goal to expand the program to a level that will provide 30 million Americans with a health care home.

H.R. 3043 also provides \$200,000 in funding for Gateway to Care, for the Community Health Center Technology Improvement Program. Gateway to Care is the community health care access collaborative in Harris County.

Gateway to Care will utilize this funding to help coordinate the deployment of health information technology among the county's health care clinics. This funding will allow Gateway to Care to offer technical support to the developing health centers in Harris Co. during the implementation of a common Management Information System.

Additionally, this funding will allow Gateway to Care staff to lead workforce development and training activities at health centers to utilize technology to improve the business management and health care delivery in area health centers.

In this bill, the appropriators also generously dedicated \$415,000 in equipment funding for the Harris County Hospital District's Diabetes Program.

This project would help the Harris County Hospital District procure the necessary equipment to establish a Diabetes Program, which will provide comprehensive diabetes care in an appropriate setting for a multi-ethnic, indigent population.

The interdisciplinary program will include an outpatient referral center, diabetes specialists, educators, nurses, nutritionists, social workers, case managers and specialist services related to the screening and treatment of diabetes complications.

Houston is the only large city in the U.S. without a single comprehensive diabetes program, which is why this funding is so important to our community. The establishment of the diabetes program at the Harris County Hospital District would improve health outcomes for its 40,000 patients with diabetes.

I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for all of their hard work on this bill. This piece of legislation provides critical and necessary funding for programs that all of our districts need.

Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this veto override.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this veto override.

The conference report includes funding for many important programs and I am disappointed that the President has vetoed it. I recognize that the conferees had a challenging task in shaping the report because of budget constraints, but Congress did a good job balancing critical health, education and labor needs with the tight budget.

This conference report provides much needed funding for health, education and labor programs for the nation and for Colorado. For example, included in the overall increase for the Department of Health and Human Services is an increase in funding for essential research at the National Institute of Health (NIH) to increasing health care access in rural areas, as well as additional funding for the Center for Disease Control (CDC). It also includes critical funding increases for several important education programs, including No Child Left Behind, Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), and Pell Grants. I am also pleased the labor provisions of this report reflect a new direction and commitment to expanding job training and enhancing the safety of workers, by increasing funding for a number of employment, education, and protection programs for the American workforce.

I am encouraged that the report includes an increase in funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP is a critical program that helps many Colorado families, who are struggling to get by, avoid having to make choices between paying their heating bill and putting food on the table. The conference report will increase funding for this program by \$250 million over the fiscal year 2007 budget.

There are also critical Colorado-specific funds in the report. The report contains funding for Children's Hospital of Denver to help build the North Campus Ambulatory Surgery Center, which will broaden access to pediatric care in the north Denver metro area. This new development will also add more convenient alternative to patients, families, pediatricians, and physicians while also decreasing the burden on other health centers in the Denver metro area.

It also contains funding for Avista Hospital, a leader in the Electronic Medical Record field, to help Avista continue to implement a cutting edge system.

The funding for programs included in this report is a cause for celebration, not a veto. The President's budget request underfunded many of these critical programs and I am pleased that Congress has crafted a much better appropriations plan. While I am disappointed in the President's veto of the conference report, I am encouraged that we are attempting to override that veto today. This report is good for Colorado, good for the country and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, today Republicans in Congress ignored the will of the American people and rubber-stamped the President's veto of important funding for our domestic priorities. After 7 years of unrestrained spending and a ballooning deficit, the President and his Republican allies in Congress have, under the guise of fiscal responsibility, rejected a \$6.2 billion funding increase

for education, health care, and workforce development, even as the President requests nearly \$200 billion in unbudgeted, no strings attached funding to continue the Iraq War for another year. That is no way to balance America's checkbook.

Under the budget passed by the New Democratic Congress, we can take care of America at home—increase funding for our schools, offer more student assistance for college, invest in biomedical research at NIH, expand health care access, and help Americans compete in the global economy—and balance the budget by 2012. These priorities are America's priorities, and Democrats in Congress will continue to fight for them.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 141, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1122]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Honda
Ackerman	Davis, Lincoln	Hooley
Allen	DeFazio	Hoyer
Altmire	DeGette	Hulshof
Andrews	Delahunt	Inslee
Arcuri	DeLauro	Israel
Baca	Dent	Jackson (IL)
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)
Barrow	Dicks	Jefferson
Bean	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Berkley	Donnelly	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Berry	Ehlers	Kagen
Biggert	Ellison	Kanjorski
Bilirakis	Ellsworth	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Emanuel	Keller
Bishop (NY)	Emerson	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Engel	Kildee
Boren	English (PA)	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Eshoo	Kind
Boucher	Etheridge	Kirk
Boyd (FL)	Farr	Klein (FL)
Boyd (KS)	Fattah	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Ferguson	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Filner	Lantos
Brown, Corrine	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Buchanan	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Capito	Gerlach	Lee
Capps	Giffords	Levin
Capuano	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Cardoza	Gillibrand	Lipinski
Carnahan	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Carney	Gordon	Loehsack
Castle	Graves	Lofgren, Zoe
Castor	Green, Al	Lowey
Chandler	Green, Gene	Mahoney (FL)
Clarke	Grijalva	Maloney (NY)
Clay	Gutierrez	Markey
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Marshall
Clyburn	Hare	Matheson
Cohen	Harman	Matsui
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Cooper	Hayes	McCollum (MN)
Costa	Herseth Sandlin	McDermott
Costello	Higgins	McGovern
Courtney	Hill	McHugh
Cramer	Hinchee	McIntyre
Crowley	Hinojosa	McNerney
Cuellar	Hirono	McNulty
Cummings	Hodes	Meek (FL)
Davis (AL)	Holden	Meeks (NY)
Davis (CA)	Holt	Melancon

Michaud	Reyes	Sutton
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Tanner
Miller (NC)	Richardson	Tauscher
Miller, George	Rodriguez	Taylor
Mitchell	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Moore (KS)	Ross	Tierney
Moore (WI)	Rothman	Towns
Moran (VA)	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Murphy (CT)	Ruppersberger	Turner
Murphy, Patrick	Rush	Udall (CO)
Murphy, Tim	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Murtha	Salazar	Upton
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Napolitano	T.	Visclosky
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walden (OR)
Obeys	Sarbanes	Walsh (NY)
Oliver	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Ortiz	Schiff	Wasserman
Pallone	Schwartz	Schultz
Pascarell	Scott (GA)	Waters
Pastor	Scott (VA)	Watson
Payne	Serrano	Watt
Pelosi	Sestak	Waxman
Perlmutter	Shays	Weiner
Peterson (MN)	Shea-Porter	Welch (VT)
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Wexler
Pickering	Shuler	Whitfield
Platts	Simpson	Wilson (NM)
Pomeroy	Sires	Wilson (OH)
Porter	Skelton	Wolf
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Woolsey
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Wu
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wynn
Ramstad	Snyder	Yarmuth
Rangel	Solis	Young (AK)
Regula	Space	Young (FL)
Rehberg	Spratt	
Reichert	Stupak	

NAYS—141

Aderholt	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Akin	Foxx	Miller, Gary
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Bachmann	Gallely	Musgrave
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Baker	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Nunes
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Pence
Bilbray	Granger	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Dicks	Hastert	Poe
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Blunt	Heller	Putnam
Boehner	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bonner	Herger	Renzi
Boozman	Hobson	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Hoekstra	Rogers (MD)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Inglis (SC)	Roskam
Brown (SC)	Issa	Royce
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Ginny	Jones (NC)	Sali
Burgess	Jordan	Saxton
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Buyer	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Kingston	Sessions
Camp (MI)	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Campbell (CA)	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Cannon	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Cantor	Lamborn	Latham
Carter	Chabot	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Coble	Lewis (KY)
Cole	Cole (OK)	Linder
Cole (OK)	Conaway	Lucas
Culberson	Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel
Davis (KY)	E.	Davis, David
Davis, David	Manzullo	Davis, Tom
Davis, Tom	Marchant	Deal (GA)
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Doolittle
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Drake
Drake	McCotter	Dreier
Dreier	McCrery	Duncan
Duncan	McHenry	Fallin
Fallin	McKeon	Feeney
Feeney	McMorris	Flake
Flake	Rodgers	Forbes
Forbes	Mica	

NOT VOTING—15

Bono	Jindal	Oberstar
Carson	Kucinich	Paul
Cubin	LaHood	Stark
Doyle	Lynch	Van Hollen
Everett	Mack	Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2141

Mr. RADANOVICH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY H. HOYER AND HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH DECEMBER 4, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

November 15, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER and the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through December 4, 2007.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2007

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, December 5, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

□ 2145

COMMENDING DEAN AGUILLEN

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Dean Aguillen, an important member of this body's staff, on the occasion of his transition. He's moving on from his job here.

Dean is the Director of Member Services for Speaker NANCY PELOSI, and there are a number of new Members here tonight, and as we all remember, Dean was one of the first, if not the first, members of the staff of the