

Jackson-Lee (TX)	Napolitano (GA)	Shakowsky
Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Serrano
Johnson, E. B. (FL)	Oberstar	Sherman
Klein (FL)	Olver	Simpson
Kucinich	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
LaTourette	Pallone	Snyder
Lee	Pascarell	Stupak
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Tanner
Lipinski	Paul	Thompson (MS)
Mahoney (FL)	Price (NC)	Tierney
Markey	Rahall	Towns
Matsui	Reyes	Tsongas
McDermott	Richardson	Velázquez
Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Melancon	Rothman	Walsh (NY)
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
Mollohan	Ruppersberger	Watson
Moore (WI)	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Moran (VA)	Salazar	Weiner
Murtha	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wexler
Nadler	Sarbanes	Wynn
		Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—55

Ackerman	Fortuño	Payne
Andrews	Franks (AZ)	Pryce (OH)
Baca	Galleghy	Ramstad
Barton (TX)	Gilchrest	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Granger	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Rush
Boehner	Hinojosa	Sanchez, Loretta
Boren	Holden	Scott (GA)
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Sessions
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Sires
Burgess	Jones (OH)	Skelton
Buyer	LaHood	Stark
Calvert	Larsen (WA)	Udall (CO)
Cardoza	Larson (CT)	Udall (NM)
Cubin	Lofgren, Zoe	Walden (OR)
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Waters
Doyle	Marchant	Weller
Emanuel	McNulty	Wilson (NM)
Ferguson	Musgrave	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois) (during the vote). Members are advised there are approximately 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1632

Messrs. WEINER, MURTHA, INSLEE, CROWLEY, ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Messrs. MITCHELL, BRADY of Texas, TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SPRATT, HALL of New York, and MCINTYRE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall 182, I was unable to vote because of pressing business with my constituents in my home district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday, April 10, 2008, I missed three rollcall recorded votes due to unforeseen circumstances. Had I been present, the RECORD would reflect the following votes:

Rollcall vote No. 178—"yea"; rollcall vote No. 179—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2537—Beach Protection Act of 2007—"yea"; rollcall vote No. 180—Recognizing the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Na-

tion—"yea"; rollcall vote No. 182—imposes a no earmark limitation on a formula driven EPA grant authority for State beach water quality monitoring and notification programs—"no."

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas) having assumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2537) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader from Maryland, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the Republican whip.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. And on Thursday, the House will meet at 8:30 a.m. and recess immediately to allow for the Former Members Association annual meeting, and will reconvene at approximately 10 a.m. for legislative business after the meeting is concluded.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The final list will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

On Friday, no votes are expected.

We will consider H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007; H.R. 5719, Taxpayer Assistance and Simplification Act of 2008; and H.R. 5715, Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loan Act of 2008.

In addition, we intend to consider at some point next week the bill we started today, H.R. 2537, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring. We will consider that to its conclusion.

Mr. BLUNT. I would ask my friend on the last bill you mentioned, the Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loan Act of 2008, H.R. 5715, is that the bill that was introduced this week?

Mr. HOYER. I am not sure when it was introduced, very frankly. It was marked up this week and reported out of committee. Whether it was introduced this week or not, I do not know.

As you know, Secretary Spelling has indicated this is a very severe challenge confronting student loans. Obviously we want to get ready for September in particular so families have

some confidence they will be able to secure loans for their children, or for young people going to college, securing the loans themselves.

Mr. BLUNT. That is a problem, and part of what I used to do before I came here involved that. I am anxious to see what the bill looks like. It is clearly a major problem out there.

On the vote we took earlier today, the rule vote on Colombia trade, if you listened to the debate, you heard two very different views of that debate. The view of my side was that this likely ends this discussion for this year, and the view I heard from the other side was not quite there at all. I am wondering if as the majority leader you have a sense of this bill, this agreement, whether it can come back to the floor this year or not.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, I would agree with the observation on our side. I say that, and it is obviously not humorous except to me.

The fact of the matter is I believe that what was said on this side of the aisle and what the Speaker has indicated was that this was sent down we believed contrary to normal practice not with agreement of the leadership and the administration on how this would be considered. The Speaker believed, and obviously the House did as well, that additional time was needed. This was not, the Speaker has indicated that, an attempt to kill this agreement. It still could come up. There still is going to be discussion between the administration and ourselves. We want to resolve some outstanding issues and discuss what we might reach agreement on with the President and the administration.

As you know, we began those conversations yesterday. You and I were down there at the White House together. We hope to continue and hope for positive movement. Regarding other agreements that are pending, we have not discussed nor ruled out the possibility that future trade agreements may be considered by this Congress.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman. That was going to be my second question. There are two other negotiated agreements, and I believe what you just said was that this vote today was about the Colombia agreement only and those other agreements should not be prejudiced by the vote we took today, and perhaps the Colombia vote will not be either.

I felt strongly about this. I still do, but I hope my friend's comments are correct and there is some way to now actively pursue whatever discussions need to be had on Colombia.

But on the final two if I heard you right, the two that have been negotiated and have not been sent up yet, I think I am hearing you say this does not establish any new way of doing this, and I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think this was intended necessarily to be precedent-setting. The precedent, of course, has

been that administrations, Republican and Democratic, have discussed with Republican and Democratic Congresses the timing and conditions under which these would be sent forward. We did not believe that had been accomplished this time. The administration's perspective was that there had not been response to their attempts to do so. Whatever the reasons, the answer to your question is we do not believe at this point in time that this is precedent for the two pending agreements.

But I don't want to by that response represent, if we were confronted with the same set of conditions, that is, that we did not reach agreement on how those agreements were moving forward, that this might not be again something that might be considered. But it is not precedent.

Mr. BLUNT. I hear your answer and the explanation of your answer, and I understand that.

On the supplemental defense budget that we talked about last week, it would seem that during this period of time between now and the work period at home during Memorial Day, that the supplemental budget will move. I think last week it was your anticipation that it might move in committee as early as this week. That didn't happen. I also read this week that following the Petraeus-Crocker testimony, that a number of Members, including the chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, indicated that they thought that this supplemental would have not only extraneous spending, but also some restrictive language. Have you had any further discussions about either timing or whether this supplemental will get, in my opinion, bogged down and held back by any restrictive language?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me say that last week, and I would reiterate the comment, I don't think I spoke to when the committee would move on it. What I did say was that hopefully the supplemental would be on the floor either the last week in April or the first week in May. I don't think that I referenced the committee consideration of that. I still believe that is the case.

With respect to your second question as to what might be on the supplemental, obviously it has not been marked up in committee. There are discussions, as have been reported in the public press, with respect to either language that might be appended to that by the committee or by the House itself. I would not want to preclude that effort.

I want to say that it is my understanding that the President has made a comment today again that what I sent you and the dollar I sent you, not a penny more will I sign.

I will tell my friend, I don't think that is particularly useful. It continues to say from the President of the United States to the Congress of the United

States, which is, after all, the policy-making body of this country under the Constitution, "What I propose you take, or we'll leave it. We'll not do anything other."

I would hope to have discussions on this. As you know, the economy is in crisis. It is very nice to give money to Iraq. As you know, I support funding our troops. Having said that, we have people in crisis in housing, we have people in crisis in jobs, we have people in crisis without health care, and we have people in crisis with their educational expenses. We have a lot of people in this country who are in trouble.

We think that they need to know that the Congress of the United States is responding to their issues as well as to the issues that the President brings up with respect to Iraq.

So I don't want to commit us to simply doing exactly what the President asks, or apparently thinks he can tell us to do. We don't think that is the process.

□ 1645

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I thank the gentleman for that. I would say that my sense of that is that the troop supplemental should be that, and that we should be willing to work together on these other issues, as we did the stimulus package earlier this year. That's a package that the tax provisions are already beginning to have some impact. The rebate provisions will begin to have impact when people get their money in May, June and July.

But I think we proved, with that effort to work together, that when both sides decide we want to make something happen, we don't have to use the troop funding or any other issue. We just have to get together and make something happen. I think that would be, generally, the view on this side of the House about how to move forward on those two issues, and we can and will probably debate this for some time.

One of the issues that puts people in crisis, we saw a discussion on the floor today, a bill out of transportation that dealt with beach nutrition. Many of our Members thought that the Transportation Committee and the Energy Committee would be better spending their time focused on gasoline prices, which are \$1 higher today, per gallon, on the average, than they were a year ago today. And I wonder if the gentleman has any sense of when we might see some legislation on the floor that would deal with gasoline prices.

Mr. HOYER. Well, of course, as you know, we have passed legislation that's still pending in the Senate. In addition to that, as you know, gas prices in January 2001 were \$1.46, on average, in this country. They're now, on average, \$3.30, so they've more than doubled during the last 87 months of this administration. We're concerned about that, as I know you are as well. The public would like to have \$1.46 gas, I'm sure, back. And we are concerned about that.

We're concerned about energy independence. We all know that it's going to be very tough in the short term on both sides, it's recognized in the short term, to do something on gas prices, given where we are today from that \$1.46 where we were in January of 2001.

Having said that, this bill that was on the floor today was an important bill. It was an important bill to a Member on your side of the aisle, and you and I had the opportunity to talk to him about it. It was a bipartisan bill. It's a bill that we thought had merit. And, as a matter of fact, my expectation is that overwhelming numbers of the House are going to vote for it when it comes up for final passage.

But, clearly, gasoline prices, gasoline, energy independence, which is a critical component of why we are in the position of having to pay such high prices, because we don't have great alternatives, getting more efficient automobiles, using alternative energy sources, providing for renewable fuels, as you know, I think you and I, I know you and I were both down when we presented the President with a bill that was signed by him at the Energy Department. We in a bipartisan way moved towards that last year on bills that we passed in a bipartisan way.

Mr. BLUNT. The debate today, I thought, was important and, you know, certainly, the numbers you cited about what's happened in the last 7 years, I don't fault those numbers at all. But we took a lot of responsibility for all of that when we were in the majority. And I haven't seen anything coming from this majority that would have stopped that \$1 increase we've seen since the majority changed. I just hope we can work together to do that. And some of it's shorter term rather than longer.

Our long-term energy needs are clearly going to be met with some long-term solutions. But things that encourage more production here, more and better use of the fuel sources we have as we develop alternatives, I think, are part of that solution. I hope that the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Transportation Committee both are encouraged by both sides of the aisle to get some legislation to the floor that would let us deal with that. And I hope that happens sooner rather than later.

Actually, the debate today may have related more to the committee than it did the bill, but I thought it was a debate that the American people want to see us have on the floor of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
APRIL 14, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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