

Brown (SC)	Herger	Pickering
Brown-Waite,	Herseht Sandlin	Pitts
Ginny	Hoekstra	Poe
Buchanan	Hulshof	Porter
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Price (GA)
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Issa	Putnam
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Rehberg
Cannon	Keller	Renzi
Cantor	King (IA)	Reynolds
Capito	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	LaHood	Roskam
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Royce
Culberson	Latham	Sali
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Schmidt
Davis, David	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Deal (GA)	Lewis (NY)	Shimkus
Dent	Linder	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Doolittle	E.	Smith (TX)
Drake	Mack	Souder
Dreier	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan	Marchant	Sullivan
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Tancredo
English (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Terry
Everett	McCotter	Thornberry
Fallin	McCrery	Tiahrt
Feeney	McHenry	Tiberi
Flake	McHugh	Turner
Forbes	McKeon	Upton
Fossella	McMorris	Walberg
Fox	Rodgers	Walden (OR)
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walsh (NY)
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Gingrey	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Goode	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim	Wicker
Granger	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Graves	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Hall (TX)	Nunes	Wolf
Hastings (WA)	Pearce	Young (AK)
Hayes	Pence	
Heller	Peterson (PA)	

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Davis, Tom	Myrick
Alexander	Frank (MA)	Paul
Bachus	Gohmert	Shadegg
Burgess	Hastert	Shuler
Butterfield	Hensarling	Weller
Cardoza	Jindal	Wilson (OH)
Carson	Kaptur	
Cubin	McNulty	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1454

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 1, I was unable to vote on rollcall votes Nos. 1030, 1031, 1032, and 1033 due to a prior commitment in my district. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes Nos. 1030, 1031 and 1032, and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 1033.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2262, HARDROCK MINING AND RECLAMATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be

authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2262, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for information about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m.

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

On Tuesday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business and 9 a.m. on Friday.

We expect to consider H.R. 3688, the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act; H.R. 3355, the Homeowners' Defense Act of 2007; and H.R. 3996, Temporary Tax Relief Act of 2007; the conference report on the fiscal year 2008 Labor-HHS appropriations bill. If the President vetoes the WRDA bill, we will expect to take up that veto as well.

Also, Members should note on Wednesday, President Sarkozy of France will address a joint meeting of the House and Senate. I would like to say to all the Members who are listening, I would hope that they would make a special effort to be here for the address of President Sarkozy.

I would make the observation that the new President of France is someone who, I think, holds great promise for partnership with the United States. I think he has expressed that inclination. I think that is a very significant, positive step forward, and I hope that most of us that will be able to, within the framework of legislative business, be here to hear his address.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate my friend's comment there, and I agree totally that a leader of France who has been so open and receptive to America as an ally and a friend deserves that kind of welcome in the joint session of Congress next week. I hope we have the kind of presence here that would indicate our opportunity and our optimism about the Sarkozy government.

On appropriations, I wonder if you have any update on the Labor-HHS conference and the conference report, if you have any sense of that yet.

Mr. HOYER. As I said in my announcement, it is my expectation that the Labor-HHS conference report will be on the floor next week. I don't know whether it will be Wednesday or Thursday of next week, but I expect it to be on the floor next week.

The conference, much of the work of the conference, as I indicated last week, the preconference was occurring, both parties were involved in that preconference, and hopefully that has led to what will be a relatively brief conference. I do not have information whether or not they were able to conclude today. I know they met this morning and into this afternoon. I don't know whether they have concluded.

Mr. BLUNT. The press reports today were that that conference would not likely include the elements of the Defense appropriations but still would include the Veterans and the Military Construction appropriations bill.

Is that my friend's sense of where they are headed on that bill?

Mr. HOYER. My sense is those were the press reports.

I can neither confirm nor deny, as they say, that that is the case.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, of course the stated goal of the majority earlier this year to move these bills one at a time would be my preference, and if Defense is not part of that conference report, it seems to me it's only one bill away from being done the right way. I would have preferred to see it the other way.

□ 1500

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

And I know that point has been made, but I want to tell you, very honestly, I hear you make the point, but not only did you package almost all, the majority of bills in 2005 and 2006, but you packaged them in the calendar year, that is to say, 3 months from today, before they were passed. And so that, although that is your desire, and it is my desire, we share that view, you're absolutely right. These bills ought to be considered individually, one at a time, on their merits, sent to the President, and he ought to have the opportunity to veto them or sign them individually.

But I would remind the gentleman that in fiscal year, I believe, I may be wrong on the fiscal year, fiscal year 2005, it was not until February 2005 that that bill was passed, with eight or nine of the bills incorporated in an omnibus. And in either the year before that, or the year after that, in January, eight bills were sent.

Now, I may be off one or two bills on the numbers, but my point is, the gentleman is correct. Unfortunately, that has not been the practice, either under your leadership or our leadership. And I think it's unfortunate, personally. But we're going to move these bills, as I said last week, hopefully as quickly

and effectively as possible; and, hopefully, the President will sign them. They've passed with an average of 285 votes, some closer, some different than that. Averages lie in that respect. But they have passed pretty handily both Houses of the Congress. In the Senate every one has passed with a veto-proof majority. That's not true in the House. But we're hopeful that we can get these bills to the President and signed by the President, whether they're individually or in packages.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend.

Looking backwards at this, I think that my friend is right that there was a pattern that developed with the bill that included the Veterans bill that we didn't like. And so in the Congress that started in 2005, we tried to restructure that so that that would not happen in the future. We were trying to break that pattern, and, in fact, we did. And in 2005, that bill passed individually, as did every other bill.

In 2006, unfortunately, that was not the case, and there was a penalty to be paid for that, and I guess we paid it. But we were trying to break that pattern of coupling veterans benefits with something that was much more controversial than veterans benefits. It was part of at that time Veterans Administration and Housing and Urban Development, and so we took Veterans and put them with the Military Construction so that military families, military personnel, veterans and retirees would all be in a bill that we hoped would be the least controversial of all bills and not be the subject of that packaging to get those most controversial things done. Frankly, I think the 2005 experience showed that we were on the way to achieving that.

My concern on this would be exactly that, that the pattern of using the veterans benefit bill, to couple that with bills that are less popular, and not only appropriations bills, but I can certainly see, even in this Congress, that bill becoming the host for authorizing bills that are not popular, I think is a very unfortunate development and I regret it. I wish that we could have stayed with the pattern that we tried to create in the last Congress and successfully did create in the first year of the last Congress. Again, as we look back on history, this is the first time in 20 years that not a single bill has passed now.

Also, when we coupled bills together in the 10 years I was here, we coupled those bills together to try to get a signature rather than anticipating a veto, and we got those signatures.

Mr. HOYER. Is there any doubt that that's what we're trying to do?

Mr. BLUNT. I think there is. Well, we'll see. We'll see if that's what happened.

I have a couple more questions, but I would yield on that point.

Mr. HOYER. On that point, because I think it's important for our Members to understand and for the public to understand what's going on. The gen-

tleman is correct. You took the Veterans bill out of the Housing bill. We think you liked the Veterans bill. We're not sure you liked the Housing bill, and so you took them apart so you could pass what you liked and leave what you didn't like alone.

As you know, the first 2 months that we came in, we dealt with the eight bills that you had not passed. They were all domestic bills. You passed the Defense bill, the MilCon bill, Homeland Security bill, all of that, broad bipartisan support on our side, your side. Education was left on the table. Health was left on the table. Environment, left on the table. Space, left on the table. Law enforcement, left on the table.

We understand the decoupling. Decoupling is to put us in a position where we don't have any options. You'll take what was passed with 409 votes in this House. It was \$4 billion over what the President requested, billions of dollars under what the veterans said they needed.

And now the President says he is going to sign that bill. Why is he going to sign that bill? Because I think he believes it's politically feasible to do it. It's \$4 billion over what the President asked for, and he said we shouldn't ask for more than he asked for. We asked for \$4 billion more than he asked for for veterans, and he's going to sign it. Overwhelmingly supported here in the House, and we would override his veto. He knows that, so I don't think he's given us much, very frankly.

And we are trying to figure out how we can get Education signed by the President, funding No Child Left Behind signed by the President, NIH, cancer research, heart, lung and blood research, diabetes research signed by the President.

So very frankly, your decoupling was to make sure that you got the bill you liked signed. Our coupling may be to ensure that we get the bill that we like signed. So very frankly, the efforts, I think, are the same. The priorities just may be different.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, if we want to try to determine the motives of each other, which is, I suppose, what we do in this place, that's one thing. But you're the one that started that.

What we were trying to do, I'll advance again, was to take the Veterans bill out of the tug of war that always went on over the Housing bill, and that's what we did.

Now, your assertion that that's because we didn't like Housing, I don't agree with that. I do agree with the idea that we thought that the Veterans bill did not need to be needlessly held back by a bill that was assured to always be intensely debated. And that's why we did that. And that's why we passed the bill. And that's why if we would have passed this bill 60 days ago when it came over from the Senate, military families and veterans would have \$18.5 million every day that they haven't had the last 32 days now.

On the other issue, I don't have any reason to believe that the President is

not for all of those health care issues you talked about. That's not what this veto will be about. I know I'm for advancing all of those, partly because I've benefited from research in some of those.

But I think you said at the first of the year, and you were right when you said it, that the best way to advance these bills is one at a time. Now, I think I'm hearing a different argument than that today. But I agree with your first-of-the-year view of this; and I would hope, after this process, we can get back to that.

Another thing I wanted to ask about, I read in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers this week that the majority continues to look at the possibility of limiting the minority's right, and it has been a right of the minority since 1822, to have the opportunity to have a motion to recommit at the end of the bill.

I will point out, I believe yesterday, on the bill we dealt with yesterday, the first substitute that the minority had been allowed in this entire Congress, the last day of the 10th month of the Congress, we finally get a substitute.

No question, we've had to maximize our use of the motion to recommit because, while we appreciate the amendments we had on the bill today, we haven't had many amendments before today. And while we appreciate the substitute we had yesterday, we had had no substitutes before yesterday.

I'm wondering if the gentleman will want to talk a little bit about any discussions going on, the majority has going on, about limiting the 1822 right of the motion to recommit.

And I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I don't have the figure in front of me, but I will find it out. I believe, very frankly, very few substitutes have been brought to the Rules Committee by your side. But that aside, I will get that number so we will know it.

But I take your point. That aside, I take your point.

Let me say that what we intend to do is continue to try to facilitate the work of this House, facilitate passing legislation, and we will continue to try to do that.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would only say my concern on that would be when the majority says "facilitate the work of the House," that may mean to further restrict the ability of the minority; and, of course, we would object strenuously to that.

Another topic that, I don't believe, it may or may not have been mentioned, was the AMT patch topic. Did you mention that as something you expect to come up next week?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, I think I mentioned that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thought maybe you did. Does the gentleman have any more information about that than he has already given?

Mr. HOYER. No, I don't know whether it will be Wednesday, Thursday or

Friday; but it will be one of those three days is my expectation. I know Mr. RANGEL wants to move the AMT patch. I'm for moving the AMT patch. I'm for paying for it. But I'm for moving it. The Temporary Tax Relief Act.

Mr. BLUNT. So that would be the AMT patch?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, that's what we're referring to. So the answer is, yes, we intend to move that next week.

Mr. BLUNT. And the amount of money involved there?

Mr. HOYER. I don't have that dollar amount, but I know that it's in the \$50 billion category to do a temporary patch, which we have done over the last few years. We borrowed the money each time we've done that, but it's about \$50 billion. We intend to pay for it.

Mr. BLUNT. And your intention is for that to be under the PAYGO rule to be paid for.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, we have followed the PAYGO rules since we adopted them, and we intend to hew to that practice. And we think it's the appropriate practice, rather than borrow \$50 billion today to give taxpayers relief so that our children can pay for that tax relief in the future. We feel strongly about that and we intend to do that.

Mr. BLUNT. I think the view of that, if we were debating the bill, which we won't do, I assure you, would be that this kind of tax relief actually produces tax revenue. But in a static scoring model you don't see that revenue.

Do you have any more information about November's schedule? I know next week. You said you anticipated we would work Friday of next week.

Mr. HOYER. We anticipate Friday of next week. And I'm not yet anticipating the 16th, which is Friday, because I'm not sure exactly. The continuing resolution ends on the 16th of November. It is my expectation that we will do another continuing resolution while we continue to try to pass the balance of the appropriation bills, and I expect to do that earlier than the 16th, but we can't give away the 16th at this point in time because we have no intention of shutting down the government and, therefore, we're going to make sure that we provide for making sure the government stays in operation. But if we can conclude our work by the 15th, I'm sure the Members will be happy. But the 16th is still on the schedule.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that information. I'm sure that we would be, at least I'm confident we would be more than happy to work with the majority so that we don't run into a needless last-minute crisis on the 16th in the almost unavoidable circumstance now that we don't have all of the appropriations bills done by then, and I would think the earlier that process starts, the better off we are.

And I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding one more time.

I have not mentioned something, but I do want to mention, so the House knows and, frankly, the public knows as well. As you know, we have been working very hard on the Children's Health Insurance Program, trying to get as many children as possible covered by children's health. I want to thank the whip. I had the opportunity of meeting with Mr. BOEHNER. Their staffs have been engaged. Our staffs have been engaged. Senate Democratic and Republican staff and Members have been engaged. We're still working on that.

□ 1515

As you know, Senator REID attempted to get a delay in the consideration of the bill on the Senate floor. That was objected to by Mr. MCCONNELL, or actually Mr. LOTT on behalf of Mr. MCCONNELL, and they took it up today. Mr. REID asked for another extension. That was objected to by Mr. MCCONNELL this time. So they considered it today.

But I want the whip to know that we are intending to continue to pursue discussions. Obviously the Senate has to send the bill back here. But we want to continue to pursue these discussions to see whether or not we can come to agreement so that we can send a bill to the President that, hopefully, he would sign but, if he doesn't sign, that two-thirds of us on this side of the Capitol and two-thirds on the other side of the Capitol would be prepared to see it move forward.

Mr. BLUNT. If I could ask a question in that regard, do you anticipate some changes in the Senate bill so that it comes back here? I was assuming, based on your other information, that if the Senate passed the same bill the House had passed, it would go directly to the President.

Mr. HOYER. Well, they have to send it back here as the House of origin, I believe. I'm not sure that it has to be sent back. I may be incorrect in that. But I am not sure how soon the Senate will send the bill down.

Mr. BLUNT. We will be glad to continue work on that. And in regard to the failure to provide time on the Senate side, it seems to me that's a very interesting contradiction to our desire to provide time over here to change the bill. I will assure my friend we are working in good faith to try to address the less than a handful of issues, though they are all important, that we think need to be addressed, from who benefits from this program to how you determine your eligibility and legal presence in the country to benefit, to how you work effectively to see that adults are moved off the program. We are more than willing to work on that. We have been trying to work on that all week.

And, of course, our request just a few days ago was the reverse of the problem that now we see is a problem in the Senate, which was give us some time to work this out. We were denied time on

this side. Apparently the Senate has also been denied time to work this out. And, once again, I think we have headed toward a needless conclusion to this debate that could have been prevented if we would have all engaged more effectively before we sent the bill to the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Frankly, we have a disagreement on whether you were denied time. We did pass the bill, but we have been pursuing, as the gentleman observed, and I appreciate the participation of those Republicans, one of whom is sitting on the floor, who have participated in numerous meetings, whether or not we can accommodate the interests of both sides in passing legislation to include the children, expanding it to 10 million. But notwithstanding the fact that we passed it, as I explained to the House, we wanted to get that bill to the Senate so that they could have it ready for consideration.

We were in agreement that it ought to be moved over until next week. Senator REID asked for that so we could continue to work. As I advised Senator REID, the leader, I advised him that I thought there were good-faith discussions going on. I thought there was an opportunity to move forward. I am still hopeful that that is the case. And as a result, I am hopeful that we will take the additional time, the next day, tomorrow, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, to try to see if we can come to agreement.

As you know, you, Mr. BOEHNER and I met, and Mr. BOEHNER's observation was there may be significant numbers that could accrue as a result of the discussions and negotiations. We're hopeful that that is the case. If that's the case, then we would be successful in adding the 4 million children that we seek to add to the President's 6 million plus.

What I wanted to indicate before we close this colloquy is that I am hopeful we will still take that time, and I have indicated to a number of people that I want to pursue, we want to pursue, those discussions with the opportunity to perhaps take some additional action if agreement is possible.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will just say we are continuing to be more than willing to be helpful, the minority is, I am individually, to try to solve these problems.

I want to repeat one more time, I think we would have been better off if we had taken these 2 days that we now would have liked to have had before we voted instead of now being at the mercy of the Senate to decide whether they are going to give us time to negotiate with each other or not. But we haven't, and, hopefully, we can continue to work for a good conclusion.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
NOVEMBER 5, 2007

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIRE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2007, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY NICHOLAS SARKOZY, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, November 7, 2007, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Nicholas Sarkozy, President of the French Republic.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if a message transmitting a Presidential veto is laid before the House on Monday, November 5, 2007, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the bill shall be postponed until the following day, Tuesday, November 6, 2007.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

CHILlicothe: "OHIO'S BEST HOMETOWN"

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

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride in congratulating Chillicothe, Ohio, our great State's first capital, in being named Ohio's Best Hometown in the November issue of Ohio Magazine.

A small town rich in history and nestled within the beautiful foothills of the Appalachian Mountains in southern Ohio, Chillicothe represents the very embodiment of everything that's right about middle America.

In recent years, the city has gone through an impressive transformation. It has completed a large expansion of its high school. Adena Hospital is consistently ranked as one of the top rural hospitals in the country. And the OU-Chillicothe campus has grown by over 25 percent in the last 2 years.

More and more people are discovering what we have known for a long time, that southeastern Ohio and southern Ohio and towns like Chillicothe offer a great place to live and a great place to raise a family.

I would like to congratulate Mayor Joe Sulzer and the rest of my friends in Chillicothe on this great honor.

RECALCITRANT STATE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today it became apparent that the employees of the State Department of the United States, or at least a large number of them, are resisting being assigned to Baghdad. They say it's too dangerous, and they have asked for a town hall meeting to explain their recalcitrance.

You know, when we go to Walter Reed and we go to Bethesda Hospital and we meet with our wounded warriors, our marines, our Army personnel, our naval personnel, our Air Force personnel, most of them say this to us: They say that they would like to return to fight side by side with their buddies, with their companions, in those warfighting theaters in Iraq and Afghanistan. They want to serve this Nation.

So I have recommended to the President today that we do this: That we fire those recalcitrant State Department personnel who say it's too dangerous for them to go back to Baghdad; they want another assignment. Let's let them leave the service, and let's go down to Walter Reed and Bethesda Hospital and let's recruit that wonderful team of American warriors who have been wounded in the service of their country and who have patriotism and devotion to duty and have a high enthusiasm for public service, and let's hire them into a bright new career in a new State Department.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the expansion of that emergency in Executive Order 13400 of April 26, 2006, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions against Sudan to respond to this threat.

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Sudan emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2007.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 1, 2007.

□ 1530

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. RHYS LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and mourn the extraordinary life of Rhys Lewis upon his passing at the age of 83.

Born on May 13, 1924, Rhys Lewis dedicated his life to serving others. As a United States Marine Corps sergeant