

and for spending to grow out of control. In my view, that is simply not acceptable. I hope that, next year, we do not find ourselves in the position we are in today.

We are presently attempting to work with the Senate to finish a disaster assistance package that would be fully offset. It may include some avian flu preparedness money. Some have suggested that legislative language related to ANWR be included as well. This language has the potential, in my judgment, to sink the entire package once it reaches the Senate.

The underlying bill, the DOD appropriations bill, is the most important of our annual appropriations bills for it funds our national security. Agreements have been reached on all major issues in the DOD portion of the bill. Frankly, we could have passed this bill weeks ago. We are at war, we have troops in harm's way, and we still have not passed this critical legislation. There are funds in this bill to provide body armor for our troops, up-armored Humvees and a military pay raise. Failure to enact this bill in a timely fashion is a disservice to our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this CR and would like to close my remarks by wishing all my friends on both sides of the aisle a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. It is great to be with you.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members of the House, at least those who are around, to understand what the controversy has been with respect to this continuing resolution today. Let me back up even further.

As the gentleman has indicated, the House Appropriations Committee was able to pass every bill through the House before we left for the August recess. Despite that fact, for a variety of reasons, most of which have nothing to do with the Appropriations Committee, the fact is that, today, we are 2 months into the fiscal year and the Department of Defense and the Departments of Labor, Health, Education and Social Services still have not received their funding for the year under a regular appropriation bill. That means that about 65 percent of the discretionary spending in the budget still has not been tied down for the coming year.

That is not just a problem in Washington. It means that local people cannot plan. It means that school boards cannot plan. It means that the Pentagon cannot plan. And it discombobulates everybody. This is not the first time it has happened, but it is certainly one of the most troubling episodes that we have had in a long time.

I think we are here with so little of this work finished because I really do believe that the leadership of the House has tried to impose an agenda on the House and on the Senate which is so extreme that even members of their own majority party have rebelled. Ex-

ample: We take a look at what happened on the PATRIOT Act. Example: We take a look at the inability to pass the labor health bill, first in the House and now in the Senate. It seems to me that a little more flexibility on the part of the House leadership could have resolved a lot of those problems.

Anyway, to bring us up to date, 10 minutes before the House opened today, we were informed on this side of the aisle that the continuing resolution to keep the government functioning for these agencies who have not yet received their funding, we received notice that a decision had been made to change the effective date of the continuing resolution, which meant that it would be extended through February 15 rather than simply to the end of the year.

It is one thing to provide a short extension so that the President has the ability to review legislation passed by the Congress before he signs it. It is quite another to try to leverage one group or another into a severe disadvantage with respect to some of this funding.

The problem with extending the CR to February 15 is that it creates a number of anomalies in both funding for the Defense Department and in the funding for the social service agencies which I do not think this Congress wants to be responsible for.

The problem with allowing the Pentagon, for instance, to continue on a CR, which is what would happen, the problem is that, at the levels under this CR, the military would be expected to run out of money for Iraq operations in January. That could create some significant problems for them. In addition, Pentagon contracts could be significantly delayed. Now, that could be overcome if we do manage to pass the Defense Appropriations Bill, and I hope we do, but we still would have a major problem with funding in the Labor-Health-Education bill.

Example: Everybody knows that, just a few days ago, the majority party restored funding to Rural Health Outreach Grants in order to try to overcome their inability to pass the Labor-Health bill earlier in the week. Guess what? The CR before us today takes out that additional money for Rural Health Outreach Grants, and it again returns us to a funding level which is 73 percent below last year. I do not think people want to do that, but that is the result of the continuing resolution.

The Community Services Block Grant Program, under the funding level in this CR, that program is cut in half from last year. The Low Income Heating Assistance Program, we had all kinds of people talking about adding money for that program, and yet under the funding level in this CR, LIHEAP is cut by \$176 million. Under No Child Left Behind, under the funding level in this resolution, No Child Left Behind programs would be cut more than \$1.1 billion below last year's level.

We have heard a lot of fulminating on both sides of the aisle about IDEA, about special education. Guess what? The funding level for this continuing resolution would freeze IDEA grants.

The International Labor Affairs Bureau, which protects American workers and wages through its efforts to eradicate child labor around the world, would be cut by 87 percent under the funding level in this continuing resolution. Unemployment help for people who are looking for jobs would be cut by \$157 million under this continuing resolution level.

Now, it is one thing to say, all right, we will let that go for a week because it simply is a short-term convenience to the President. It is quite another thing to say that we are going to hold those programs to that level of funding through February 15. When you do that, you ruin some of those programs and you make miserable the lives of a lot of people who depend on those programs, which is why we objected on this side of the aisle.

Now that the majority party has returned to the original understanding that the CR will extend only for a week, time for us to get our work done; now that we are in a position where we are not going to be able to conveniently take a vacation until February 15 while these other programs suffer, I am perfectly happy to withdraw my objection.

So I congratulate the gentleman for talking to whoever he had to talk to in order to bring them to their senses.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 75, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEM CELL THERAPEUTIC AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2520.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2520, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 664]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie DeLauro Kanjorski
Ackerman DeLay Kaptur
Aderholt Dent Keller
Alexander Diaz-Balart, L. Kelly
Allen Dicks Kennedy (MN)
Andrews Dingell Kennedy (RI)
Bachus Doggett Kildee
Baird Doolittle Kilpatrick (MI)
Baker Doyle Kind
Baldwin Drake King (IA)
Barrett (SC) Dreier King (NY)
Barrow Duncan Kingston
Bartlett (MD) Edwards Kirk
Bass Emanuel Kline
Bean Emerson Knollenberg
Beauprez Engel Kucinich
Berkley English (PA) Kuhl (NY)
Berman Eshoo LaHood
Berry Etheridge Langevin
Biggart Evans Lantos
Bilirakis Everett Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA) Farr Larson (CT)
Bishop (NY) Fattah Latham
Bishop (UT) Feeney LaTourette
Blackburn Ferguson Leach
Blumenauer Filner Lee
Blunt Fitzpatrick (PA) Levin
Boehlert Flake Lewis (CA)
Boehner Foley Lewis (GA)
Bonilla Forbes Lewis (KY)
Bonner Ford Linder
Bono Fortenberry Lipinski
Boozman Foxx LoBiondo
Boren Frank (MA) Lofgren, Zoe
Boswell Franks (AZ) Lowey
Boucher Frelinghuysen Lucas
Boustany Gallegly Lungren, Daniel
Boyd Garrett (NJ) E. Lynch
Bradley (NH) Gerlach Mack
Brady (PA) Gibbons Maloney
Brady (TX) Gilchrest Marchant
Brown (OH) Gillmor Markey
Brown (SC) Gingrey Marshall
Brown, Corrine Gohmert Matheson
Brown-Waite, Goode Matsui
Ginny Goodlatte McCaul (TX)
Burgess Gordon McCollum (MN)
Burton (IN) Granger McCotter
Butterfield Graves McCreery
Buyer Green (WI) McDermott
Calvert Green, Al McGovern
Camp (MI) Green, Gene McHenry
Campbell (CA) Grijalva McHugh
Cannon Gutierrez McIntyre
Cantor Gutknecht McKeon
Capito Hall McKinney
Capps Harman McMorris
Capuano Harris McNulty
Cardin Hart Meehan
Cardoza Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)
Carnahan Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY)
Carson Hayes Melancon
Carter Hayworth Menendez
Case Hefley Mica
Castle Hensarling Michaud
Chabot Hergert Millender-
Chandler Herseth McDonald
Chocola Higgins Miller (FL)
Clay Hinchey Miller (MI)
Cleaver Hinojosa Miller (NC)
Clyburn Hobson Miller, Gary
Coble Hoekstra Miller, George
Cole (OK) Holden Mollohan
Conaway Holt Moore (KS)
Conyers Holt Moore (WI)
Cooper Honda Moran (KS)
Costa Hooley Moran (VA)
Costello Hoyer Murphy
Cramer Hulshof Hunter
Crenshaw Hunter Musgrave
Crowley Inglis (SC) Nadler
Cubin Inslee Napolitano
Cuellar Israel Neal (MA)
Culberson Issa Neugebauer
Cummings Jackson (IL) Ney
Davis (AL) Jackson-Lee Northup
Davis (CA) (TX) Norwood
Davis (FL) Jefferson Nunes
Davis (IL) Jenkins Nussle
Davis (KY) Jindal Oberstar
Davis (TN) Johnson (CT) Obey
Davis, Tom Johnson (IL) Oliver
Deal (GA) Johnson, E. B. Ortiz
DeFazio Johnson, Sam Osborne
DeGette Jones (NC) Otter
Delahunt Jones (OH) Owens

Oxley Ryun (KS) Tauscher
Pallone Sabo Taylor (MS)
Pascarell Salazar Taylor (NC)
Pastor Sanchez, Linda Terry
Payne T. Thomas
Pearce Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA)
Pelosi Sanders Thompson (MS)
Pence Saxton Thornberry
Peterson (MN) Schakowsky Tiahrt
Peterson (PA) Schiff Tiberi
Petri Schmidt Tierney
Pickering Schwartz (PA) Towns
Pitts Schwarz (MI) Turner
Platts Scott (GA) Udall (CO)
Poe Scott (VA) Udall (NM)
Pombo Sensenbrenner Upton
Pomeroy Serrano Van Hollen
Porter Sessions Velazquez
Price (GA) Shadegg Visclosky
Price (NC) Shaw Walden (OR)
Pryce (OH) Shays Walsh
Putnam Sherman Wamp
Rahall Sherwood Wasserman
Rangel Shimkus Schultz
Regula Simmons Waters
Rehberg Simpson Watt
Reichert Skelton Waxman
Renzi Smith (NJ) Weiner
Reyes Smith (TX) Weldon (FL)
Reynolds Smith (WA) Weldon (PA)
Rogers (AL) Snyder Weller
Rogers (KY) Sodrel Westmoreland
Rogers (MI) Solis Wexler
Rohrabacher Souder Whitfield
Ross Spratt Wicker
Stark Stark Wilson (NM)
Stearns Stearns Wilson (SC)
Strickland Strickland Wolf
Stupak Stupak Woolsey
Sullivan Sullivan Wu
Sweeney Sweeney Wynn
Tancredo Tancredo Young (AK)
Tanner Tanner Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Akin Fossella Murtha
Baca Hostettler Myrick
Barton (TX) Hyde Paul
Becerra Istook Radanovich
Davis, Jo Ann Kolbe Slaughter
Diaz-Balart, M. Manzullo Watson
Ehlers McCarthy

□ 1937

Ms. BERKLEY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, obviously the Members as we all know on both sides have been here for some period of time today and are very obviously desirous of knowing what our schedule is.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for yielding. As you know, it is hard to predict how exactly everything is going to work out. It is a little difficult to predict these last days before an adjournment period or before we leave for a work period, either one.

We will officially convene tomorrow at 1 p.m. I think it is highly unlikely that there would be any vote before around 5, and we would give 2-hour notice in any reasonable way that we

could before the first votes would occur.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, would it be safe, therefore, for Members to conclude that they need not be here before 5? If we went in at 1, you gave 2 hours' notice, the first vote would be 3, but am I correct that the Defense appropriations conference has not convened because the chairman sadly lost his mother, and it is my understanding he is coming back sometime, maybe he came back this afternoon, but would I be reasonably correct in saying that the chances of the Defense appropriations bill being ready to report prior to 5 would be very slim?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. We do have some suspensions for tomorrow, a few more suspensions. So we could have those before the report if it was not ready. I appreciate your comments also about the chairman's being away for his mother's memorial service. He did return this evening.

I believe the current plan is for their committee to meet early in the morning to have as much work as possible done before the committee meets and then to have that to Rules by midday. Obviously, we may not make all of those deadlines. If we do, we could very well be having our first votes at 5. We would give 2 hours' notice before that. So the earliest I would expect Members to get a notice that we would have votes in 2 hours would be around 3 o'clock.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, what I think then the message, correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Leader, is that Members can be assured that they will not have votes prior to 5 p.m. tomorrow, and presumably, notice would go out at 3 o'clock if votes were to be at 5 o'clock; would that be accurate?

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for yielding, and that is my accurate view of what is almost certain to happen tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, we do understand that the Defense appropriations committee conference report would probably be on the agenda. Can you tell us whether we expect the Defense authorization and/or the budget reconciliation bill also might be under consideration tomorrow?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for yielding.

You are right. The Appropriations Committee product, we have already discussed and we would expect, matter of fact, we are certain, as certain as you can be this time of year, of that for tomorrow. I think there is an excellent chance that we could get the budget reconciliation bill tomorrow, and we are still working to do what we can to bring Defense authorization to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. Can you tell us, can Members be relatively assured that they will be able to plan at least at