

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 0, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 1141]

YEAS—373

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk
Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Klein (FL)
Alexander	Dicks	Kline (MN)
Allen	Dingell	Knollenberg
Altmire	Doggett	Kucinich
Andrews	Donnelly	Kuhl (NY)
Arcuri	Doolittle	LaHood
Baca	Drake	Lamborn
Bachmann	Dreier	Lampson
Bachus	Duncan	Langevin
Baker	Edwards	Lantos
Baldwin	Ehlers	Larsen (WA)
Barrett (SC)	Ellison	Latham
Barrow	Ellsworth	LaTourette
Bartlett (MD)	Emanuel	Lee
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Levin
Bean	Engel	Lewis (CA)
Becerra	English (PA)	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Eshoo	Lewis (KY)
Biggert	Etheridge	Linder
Bilbray	Fallin	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Farr	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Loeb
Bishop (NY)	Ferguson	Lowe
Bishop (UT)	Filner	Lungren, Daniel
Blackburn	Flake	E.
Blumenauer	Forbes	Lynch
Blunt	Fortenberry	Mack
Boehner	Fossella	Mahoney (FL)
Bonner	Fox	Maloney (NY)
Bono	Frank (MA)	Manzullo
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Markey
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Boucher	Gallely	Matsui
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)
Boyd (FL)	Gerlach	McCarthy (NY)
Boyda (KS)	Giffords	McCaul (TX)
Brady (PA)	Gillibrand	McCormack (MN)
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	McCotter
Brown (GA)	Gohmert	McCrery
Brown, Corrine	Gonzalez	McDermott
Brown-Waite,	Goode	McGovern
Ginny	Goodlatte	McHenry
Buchanan	Gordon	McIntyre
Burgess	Graves	McMorris
Burton (IN)	Green, Al	Rodgers
Butterfield	Grijalva	McNerney
Buyer	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)
Calvert	Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Camp (MI)	Hare	Melancon
Cannon	Harman	Mica
Cantor	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Capito	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Capps	Heller	Miller (MI)
Capuano	Hensarling	Miller (NC)
Cardoza	Herger	Miller, George
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell
Carney	Higgins	Mollohan
Carter	Hinchey	Moore (KS)
Castle	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Castor	Hirono	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Chandler	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Clarke	Hoekstra	Murphy, Patrick
Clay	Holt	Murtha
Clyburn	Honda	Musgrave
Coble	Hoyer	Myrick
Cohen	Hulshof	Nadler
Conaway	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano
Conyers	Inslee	Neugebauer
Cooper	Israel	Oberstar
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Oliver
Courtney	(TX)	Pallone
Crenshaw	Jefferson	Pastor
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Payne
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Pence
Cummings	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter
Davis (AL)	Jordan	Peterson (MN)
Davis (CA)	Kagen	Petri
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Pickering
Davis (KY)	Kaptur	Pitts
Davis, David	Keller	Platts
Davis, Tom	Kennedy	Poe
Deal (GA)	Kildee	Pomeroy
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Porter
DeGette	Kind	Price (GA)
Delahunt	King (IA)	Price (NC)
DeLauro	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)
Dent	Kingston	Putnam

Radanovich	Scott (GA)	Tiberi
Rahall	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Ramstad	Serrano	Towns
Rangel	Sessions	Tsongas
Regula	Sestak	Turner
Rehberg	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Reichert	Shays	Udall (NM)
Renzi	Shea-Porter	Upton
Reyes	Sherman	Van Hollen
Reynolds	Shimkus	Velázquez
Richardson	Shuler	Visclosky
Rodriguez	Shuster	Walberg
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walden (OR)
Rogers (KY)	Sires	Walsh (NY)
Rogers (MI)	Skelton	Walz (MN)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Wamp
Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Ross	Snyder	Schultz
Rothman	Solis	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Souder	Watson
Royce	Space	Waxman
Ruppersberger	Spratt	Weiner
Rush	Stark	Westmoreland
Ryan (OH)	Stearns	Wexler
Ryan (WI)	Stupak	Whitfield
Salazar	Sullivan	Wicker
Sali	Sutton	Wilson (NM)
Sánchez, Linda	Tancredo	Wilson (OH)
T.	Tanner	Wilson (SC)
Sanchez, Loretta	Tauscher	Wolf
Sarbanes	Taylor	Wu
Saxton	Terry	Wynn
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Young (FL)
Schmidt	Thornberry	
Schwartz	Tiahrt	

NOT VOTING—58

Abercrombie	Green, Gene	Murphy, Tim
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Baird	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Berkley	Hill	Ortiz
Berry	Holden	Pascrell
Boswell	Hooley	Paul
Braley (IA)	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	Jindal	Scott (VA)
Carson	Johnson (GA)	Slaughter
Cleaver	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)
Cole (OK)	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lofgren, Zoe	Watt
Cubin	Lucas	Welch (VT)
Davis, Lincoln	Marchant	Weldon (FL)
Doyle	Marshall	Weller
Everett	McHugh	Woolsey
Feeney	McKeon	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	McNulty	
Granger	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1540

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make the vote for H.R. 2085. Had I been present, I would have voted for H.R. 2085.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 1140 and 1141.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to important business in my district, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall No. 1131: "yea"; rollcall No. 1132: "yea"; rollcall No. 1133: "yea"; rollcall No. 1134: "yea"; rollcall No. 1135: "yea"; rollcall No. 1136: "nay"; rollcall No. 1137: "nay"; rollcall No. 1138: "yea"; rollcall No. 1139: "present"; rollcall No. 1140: "nay"; and rollcall No. 1141: "yea".

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2761, TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE REVISION AND EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-475) on the resolution (H. Res. 849) providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2761) to extend the Terrorism Insurance Program of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Ms. CASTOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-476) on the resolution (H. Res. 850) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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 from Maryland, the majority leader, for information about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 3 p.m. in a pro forma session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business and at 9 a.m. on Friday.

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

Under a rule, we expect to consider a conference report on the Intelligence authorization bill and on the Department of Defense authorization bill and further action on appropriations and terrorism risk insurance. There may well be other legislation, if it comes from the Senate.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman.

I am wondering, on the appropriations process, the remaining 11 bills, if

the gentleman has a sense of when those might come before the House. I know there was at least a discussion of a same-day rule for Tuesday for that purpose. So whatever information my friend has, I yield to get his ideas on when we might see the first effort on the appropriations bill on the floor or maybe the final effort on that bill.

Mr. HOYER. I will tell my friend, the first action we had on appropriation bills was of course when we passed all of our appropriation bills before we left for the August break. We now hope to have action on the remaining appropriation bills. We expect those to be included in an omnibus appropriation bill. Obviously, we have considered all of them. They essentially have been conferred, notwithstanding the fact that the other body did not pass through the Senate five of their bills, as you know, but they did in fact pass them out of subcommittee. So we had products to conference with.

Both the House and the Senate have been working together to get them in a place where they could be considered, and it would be my expectation that we would consider an omnibus appropriation bill Tuesday night after we come back. I would hope to be able to pass such a bill on Tuesday. Again, that is being worked on between the House and the Senate. There have been discussions, as you know, with the administration as well trying to reach agreement so that we can ensure that the Government certainly doesn't shut down.

□ 1545

The CR expires on the 14th of next week. We would hope that we can pass an omnibus appropriation before that.

Mr. BLUNT. On the remaining 11 of the 12 appropriations bills, some of which the Senate did not pass, was the minority involved in these nonconference conferences that you described?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. OBEY is not here, and I think the answer to that question is "yes," but you would know better than I. I am sure you would hear complaints if that were not the case, and perhaps you have heard complaints.

Frankly, as you know, and you and I have discussed this experience by the House before under both parties, because of the lateness of the Senate's actions, we are not in a position where we had all of the bills passed. Furthermore, there was not an inclination on some of the bills to go to the conference. Thirdly, we have been facing, as you know, a veto threat from the President on all of the bills except the Veterans MILCON bill and perhaps Homeland Security. Defense was signed, as you know. Notwithstanding the fact that the MILCON bill is very substantially above the President's request, he said he would sign that one, but bills like the Labor-Health bill were vetoed, so we have to consider that one again.

Mr. OBEY has had a meeting with Mr. Nussle, as you know. It has been re-

ported in the paper. That meeting was to try to figure out whether they could come to agreement. That meeting was not dispositive over that issue. Others have had meetings, including myself. We are hopeful to get to a place where everyone will not get everything that they want, but hopefully we will have agreement. I can't guarantee that.

The answer to your question, as I told you at the outset, I don't have specific answers to. My presumption is, however, the staffs have been talking to one another.

Mr. BLUNT. That's what I thought, the possibility of Tuesday.

I would point out to my friend that the bill that the President did sign, the Defense bill, was very close to the amount of money, a reduction in the amount of money that was equal to the increase on the Military Construction and Veterans bill the President said he would sign, which is actually in the context of both what most of the Members on this side of the aisle had hoped for and what the President said he would insist on, which is the obvious ability of the majority, within the 6.5 percent increase that he proposed, to stay below that number. Actually, Military Construction and Defense, while they are not a perfectly balanced outcome, come close to the way that system can work and still be within the President's number and an example of two bills that he said he would be willing to sign, neither of which are the bills he proposed, but the combination of which certainly are within an amount of money that could be adjusted in the other bills.

On the military question, those two bills we are talking about, does the gentleman anticipate any opportunity to have funding, either full or partial, for Iraq and Afghanistan without withdrawal language in the bill we would send over to the Senate or at some later time next week?

Mr. HOYER. I anticipate at some point in time that will be the case.

Mr. BLUNT. I would hope that can be the case, and we'd hope for our troops in the field and to prevent any layoffs that might occur between now and the time we return in January.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield on that issue?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As you know, I had a discussion with my good friend, and I know you know him well, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Gordon England. Obviously he is required, the Department of Defense is required under contract agreements that if there is not funding at a certain point in time, for them to send notice, not because they necessarily anticipate that there will be a necessity to have RIFs, but because under the agreement, when they contemplate running out of money, which would be sometime in February, 60 days before that, they have to send out a notice.

My expectation is that the Secretary will be sending us a letter. But I think

the Secretary's expectation, and I think the letter may say this, his expectation is, pursuant to our conversations, that will not be necessary nor does anybody contemplate that being done. And I certainly want to say to any and all employees who are listening, that is not going to happen.

Mr. BLUNT. I am glad with that assurance that won't happen, and I am sure they will be, too. While we won't know on the 15th whether they can run out of money by the date you mentioned, the middle of February, it is very possible that we will know by the day we leave here, and a January letter then would be required before we got back that indicated that a furlough would happen.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield again?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I am very hopeful and we are working very hard, as I know Mr. OBEY is and others, and I know Senator REID is as well, trying to reach agreement with the President.

Let me say respectfully that the discretionary spending that we have provided for is less a percentage of the GDP in terms of the spending of our national income than any of the bills that were passed from 2002 to 2006. We believe the differences are relatively small between the executive and the legislative branches.

We are prepared, as you have undoubtedly read and, as a matter of fact, you and I have discussed, to make some accommodations with the President, as is appropriate, to try to negotiate those.

What we are not prepared to do is simply have the President say, "Look, this is what I have determined you can do." He can veto, we understand that, but we don't think that the proper place for the Congress of the United States under article I of the Constitution, which gives us the authority and puts in the Congress of the United States, the Senate and the House, the responsibility to make policy and appropriate funds for the priorities that we deem to be appropriate for our national security and general welfare, we don't think that it is appropriate to simply be given a number that we must meet. That is not what the Founding Fathers contemplated. As you well know, the budget is a relatively recent advent in terms of the President's authority over the budget.

Having said that, we want to work with the President. We think that the differences are very small. We think that they can be bridged hopefully relatively easily, which is why we hope by next week we can accomplish both of the issues you raise.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman. I hope you are right. I don't know what the Founding Fathers contemplated for sure, the Founders when they wrote the Constitution. I do know they gave the House the ability to initiate spending bills and the President the ability to veto.

In the context of how much money we are really talking about, the President added a 6.5 percent increase, and then the House-passed bill added \$23 billion to that, which is more than the individual budgets of more than 35 of the States. So people, as they look at this discussion that this isn't much money, it is more than all of the money spent by 35 or 36 of the States in the country. You know, I think in that context, \$23 billion is a significant amount of money.

Mr. HOYER. And the \$196.4 billion that the President wants to spend in Baghdad and Kabul is probably more than the budgets of those States as well.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, that is absolutely true. And the money that we spend to defend the country every day is important and it is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government, and I agree with that.

Mr. HOYER. We agree.

Mr. BLUNT. On AMT, I am not sure the Senate has dealt with AMT yet, but my understanding is that they may very well send that back without the money to offset that tax relief in a tax increase. I am wondering under what circumstances we might or might not see the alternative minimum tax relief in the next 2 weeks.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that question. We believe very, very strongly, as you know, that the alternative minimum tax was never, ever meant to apply to some of the people it may well be applied to this tax year. We have passed legislation to prevent that. In that legislation, as the gentleman knows, was also tax cuts for millions of people on property taxes, on other taxes, tax relief for teachers who buy things for their classroom, in effect, business expenses for making sure that our kids are learning.

The Senate, as you know, tried to bring that bill, not that bill but the chairman of the Finance Committee today made a unanimous consent to place the alternative minimum tax relief bill on the floor of the United States Senate without paying for it and it was objected to, as you know, as you probably know, by a Republican Member of the Senate because there was a refusal, apparently not an allowed amendment on the flat tax. We think that is unfortunate.

In answer to your question, we hope the AMT, in fact, is passed by the Senate. We hope that it is paid for. We have committed ourselves to paying for things that we spend money on so our children don't have to pay for them.

But we are going to be working very hard next week, I want to assure the gentleman, to make sure that the AMT is, in fact, addressed so that the 23 million people who are at risk of a tax increase and were never intended to be, as both sides agree, do not have that reality come April 15.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that. My view of that and most of our Members' view of that is that those 23 million

people are not paying that tax this year, and so the idea that you have to replace that money to keep them from paying it next year is the fallacy of the PAYGO argument generally, as are many of the other extenders that you mentioned, the supplies for teachers and other things that are tax benefits they currently have, but that is obviously a fundamentally different view of how we view noncollected taxes this year that would be collected unless somehow what I consider to be very good tax policies for teachers and others are extended.

On those tax extenders, the doctor payment issue is another issue that I am wondering if the gentleman has any information on, and I would yield on that as well. This is the doctor payment issue under Medicare and the fact that they would take an automatic cut.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, we passed a bill earlier this year, some months ago, which not only dealt with children's health insurance but it also dealt with reimbursement to doctors, medical providers who will be confronting on January 1 of this year a 10 percent decrease in reimbursement. Many of them will not continue to serve Medicare patients. We think that is a great problem.

Unfortunately, the Senate refused to go to conference on that bill. We did have meetings on our SCHIP bill. Our SCHIP bill, our children's health bill, was a part of the larger bill dealing with Medicare during rural health, dealing with ensuring that nobody was disadvantaged by any of the pay-fors in our bill, but the Senate would not go to conference on that. The meetings that resulted essentially resulted in taking the Senate bill on children's health insurance.

As you know, the Senate had indicated they were going to address the Medicare reimbursement issue which we had already addressed. Unfortunately, it is my understanding that yesterday they decided they either could not or were not going to do that. I talked to Mr. RANGEL just a few minutes ago about that issue. We are going to be talking about that a little later today as to how we might address that. We think, again, that is a critical need for us to address. But I can't tell the gentleman exactly how that is going to be addressed because I don't know what ability we have to work with the Senate on this particular issue, but it needs to be addressed.

Mr. BLUNT. It does. As the gentleman knows, a month from today, actually starting January 1, those new payment schedules would go into effect which would go back to a cut in what those providers are being paid for those same services almost 10 years ago. That is a significant problem, and I am glad that the gentleman appreciates it and I am sad that we have gotten right down to this last moment in the year and not gotten to it yet.

You mentioned SCHIP. I know my good friend has worked hard to try to

get the votes to override a veto and now perhaps to pass another bill since the President has the bill we had earlier passed. If that does not happen, would you anticipate an extension of SCHIP? My view is that the State programs and the Governors in those States should have some assurance that they can move forward as we continue to work for a better solution than I believe we have found so far. But assuming that has not happened in weeks and doesn't happen in the next 2, would you expect to see an extender, a bill, of the current program while we continue to look for changes in that legislation? Or would that program end on December 14 or 15 when this current CR ends?

□ 1600

Mr. HOYER. Of course my friend could help me solve that problem very easily. I just need 10 or 12 votes; and you are such an excellent whip, I'm sure you could get those votes for me and we could cover those 4 million children. But if you don't give me those 10 votes, or 15, that we need, we have no intention of leaving here without presenting for the floor, which we hope will pass the Senate as well, an extension of the existing law.

In addition to the extension of the existing law, I'm sure you've talked to Republican Governors and Democratic Governors. I've talked to Democratic Governors just yesterday. All of them are very concerned. Missouri, as you well know, has a shortfall. A number of other States have a shortfall, including my own, so there will be need to, if we're going to simply extend, to also fund the shortfall, or children will be off the program that are currently on the program.

In addition to that, as you well know, a very controversial regulation was issued by the administration capping or requiring a 90 percent coverage of those under 200 percent or you can't participate further in the program, can't expand the program. No State, as I understand it, meets that obligation, so that we're also working on that.

But the answer to your question is, we are certainly planning for, if we cannot get, we hope to be able to get, frankly, in the near future, in the next few days, hopefully, we've worked very, very hard in trying to meet some of the concerns that some of your Members have had.

As you know, you and I and your leader had an opportunity to meet. Mr. BOEHNER indicated he thought there was a significant number of Republicans that would like to vote for the bill. But we got, as you know, 45 Republicans who did vote for the bill.

We have had extraordinary meetings, and I think it's worth telling the body. Mr. DINGELL and myself, as well as Mr. BAUCUS and Mr. GRASSLEY and Mr. HATCH and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and from time to time, Mr. BARTON and Mr. DEAL and others, Mr. Whip, literally spent about 50 hours over the last

month in meetings trying to come to a place where we could reach agreement. Obviously, we're not there in terms of sufficient numbers to think that we can, or are ready to, introduce a new bill. That would be our preference, to introduce a bill that, after these long discussions, that would enjoy hopefully 60, 70, 80 Members, which is the number your leader used as possible to vote for such legislation and move that through the Senate and send it to the President. That would be our hope.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the gentleman's work on this. I do know that in terms of a bill that would continue this program, that a significant majority of our Members would vote for that; and the bill that would even expand the program, a number of our Members might vote for that. But it has to be the right bill, structured in the right way.

I know you've spent a lot of time on that. I hope you can negotiate even further from where you've been. But I also know that my staff and your staff hopefully are even working together on this to determine that exact right number that would continue the existing program to be sure that shortfalls are met, and that the existing program and the impact of that potential guideline on the existing program, and I think I can assure my friend that there will be enough votes in the House, including votes on our side, to easily extend the existing program and cover those shortfalls while we work for a better program.

The last question I have is the gentleman's certainty about Friday. I know a few weeks ago we had scheduled that these 2 weeks would be 3-day weeks and the Members would be able to schedule things in their districts on Mondays and Fridays. I think your sense is today that we might very well be here on Friday, and I would appreciate some clarification on that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that question. As the gentleman knows, and I've been involved in this business for a long time, four decades about, and whether it was in the State Senate, which had a constitutional ending date, or in the House of Representatives, it's very difficult to predict the last days of a session.

Now, I will tell you that the Speaker and I are working around the clock, almost literally, to ensure that we can adjourn this first session of the Congress of the United States on the 14th. We had hoped the 13th, but we're letting Members know that the 14th, that's only 4 days from now. We've just gone through some pretty heavy lifting in terms of the appropriation bills, in terms of the AMT, in terms of SCHIP, in terms of Iraq and in terms of other matters that we need to address before we leave here. But we think we can do it, and it is our intention to do it.

But, obviously, there are things that are pending that we cannot leave without doing, so that if we cannot get that done in that time frame, we will have to see where we go from there.

But I want to make it very, very clear to everybody that the Speaker, Senator REID, and I have talked; and we are all very focused on the 14th being the day that we adjourn. The following week is the week before Christmas. We believe that individuals need to be home. I need to do shopping and decorating because all my family's coming to my house from some parts of the country, so I need to be home. And I'm sure every other Member shares that view.

So all I can tell my friend, and he knows this as well as I do, that the unpredictability of the next 4 legislative days is such that I can't make any guarantees, other than we are doing everything we can to get the business that we've just discussed done. We may have some very late nights on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday; but we are hopeful that we will get this done and not have to ask Members to come back the week before Christmas.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I'm hopeful that my friend has mentioned that date again. Even after the experience of this week, we're still looking at that date. It may be the triumph of hope over experience, but we may all be motivated enough to get that done.

Mr. HOYER. Well, we've had some success this week. As you know, we think we've passed a historic energy bill. Not only that, as my friend knows, because he's from the State of our distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, we were able to go to conference today, which has been somewhat contentious for a few days. We expect that conference to be on the floor early next week. So we are moving ahead.

But as we've discussed, there are some issues of difficulty that we haven't resolved that we need to resolve, and so we'll have to see whether or not we will be successful.

Mr. BLUNT. Hopefully next Friday we won't even have to have a discussion about the week's work coming up because we will be done. And I appreciate the information of the gentleman.

I yield back.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been unavoidably detained and away on official business on a number of rollcalls which I would like to place in the RECORD at this time.

In particular, I'd like to take note of December 5, 2007. Due to the tragic death of Reserve Deputy Constable Odum in my district, I was attending his funeral. On rollcall vote No. 1127, if I was present, I would have voted "no."

Rollcall vote No. 1128, I would have voted "no."

Rollcall vote No. 1129, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 1130, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 1131, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 1132, I would have voted "aye."

And Rollcall No. 1133, I would have voted "aye." That is on December 5, 2007.

For September 20, 2007, on rollcall vote 890, I would have voted "aye"; No. 889, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 888, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 887, I would have voted "aye."

And on rollcall No. 886, a motion to adjourn, I would have voted "no."

On July 16, 2007, rollcall vote No. 632, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 631, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 630, I would have voted "aye."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2007

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet to 3 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, December 11, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Ms. LEE. 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
November 29, 2007.

The Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to section 1238(6)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. (22 U.S.C. 7002) amended by Division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (22 U.S.C. 6901). I am pleased to appoint the following individuals to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

Mr. Peter T.R. Brookes of Virginia (re-appointment).

Mr. Daniel M. Slane of Ohio.

These individuals have expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill their requests.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.