

Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha

Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler

Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—134

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cardoza
Carter
Castle
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin

Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery

Alexander
Bishop (UT)
Brady (PA)
Cantor
Conyers
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Ehlers
Fattah
Ferguson
Gerlach
Gohmert
Hayes
Higgins
Hoekstra
Hunter
Jones (NC)
Lampson
Levin
Lowey
Meek (FL)
Melancon

NOT VOTING—30

Millender-
McDonald
Mollohan
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Rohrabacher
Thornberry
Walsh (NY)
Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1205

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed rollcall votes 236–244. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: Rollcall No. 236: “no”; rollcall No. 237: “no”; rollcall No. 238: “no”; rollcall No. 239: “no”; rollcall No. 240: “no”; rollcall No. 241: “no”; rollcall No. 242: “no”; rollcall No. 243: “no”; rollcall No. 244: “yea”.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEEE ON
H.R. 1591, U.S. TROOP READINESS,
VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection and pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) as a conferee on H.R. 1591 and appoints the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. There will be no votes before 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour business and at noon for legislative business. We will consider additional bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of those bills, Mr. Speaker, will be available by the end of business today. We will also expect to consider H.R. 362,

the 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds Science and Math Scholarship Act; and H.R. 363, Sowing the Seeds through Science and Engineering Research Act.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. on both those days. On Friday, no votes are expected, and Friday is not scheduled at this date. We will consider H.R. 1332, the Small Business Lending Improvements Act; and H.R. 249, a bill to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that information.

Last evening we did appoint conferees to the conference on the emergency supplemental for the war. Would we expect to have a conference report, do you think, sometime next week? I think it has been 94 days now since the President requested that, and I am wondering if we would anticipate a conference report anytime next week.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, as he knows, it was only 38 days ago that the President made his last request for an addition to the supplemental, and 94 days sounds like longer than I think it has been. But notwithstanding that, we do expect the supplemental to be on the floor next week. That is our expectation. If things go as we hope, the supplemental will be on the floor, and, hopefully, we can get that to the President either very late next week or no later than a week from this coming Monday. We think that is important.

As you know, you and I and others were down at the White House to discuss whether there was room for agreement and accommodation on this issue. We are still having those discussions, as you know, and we are hopeful that that can be reached.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that response. And we would hope to see that bill next week on the floor or as soon as possible because there is some great likelihood from that White House meeting that the gentleman mentioned that there is going to have to be a second bill if we can't resolve these issues that lead toward a veto.

On one of those issues we did yesterday, the House voted on the motion to instruct the conferees to sustain the House position. Does the gentleman have any information on the likelihood of the House or Senate view of the deadline issue that we discussed yesterday?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his question. And, frankly, I don't want to anticipate what the conferees are going to do, having been appointed just last night. There was a vote on the House floor. Frankly, the vote would have had no effect whether it passed or

failed in light of the fact that it instructed the House to do what it had already done. So if it had failed, presumably the House was going to be in the same position that it otherwise would have been in.

But notwithstanding that, I don't want to anticipate what the conferees are going to do in light of the fact that they have just been appointed, but I do know that the chairmen of the conference on both sides, House and Senate, want to see this matter resolved quickly, sent to the President, would want to see the troops funded. We were very pleased to see the Department of Defense make it very clear, as, frankly, General Speer and General Ward made clear to me in Europe, that funding is available and will be able to be accommodated through June.

As the gentleman knows, last year when the President made a request for a supplemental, that was not passed until mid-June, that supplemental. So I was pleased to see the Department of Defense indicate that that would be okay. It is not perfect. That is not what they would choose, but, in any event, through the month of June. We hope to get this work done long before that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that answer, Mr. Speaker. I hope we can. I think we do need to continue to talk about how we ultimately resolve this issue.

Now, in the information that I am getting from both the Defense Department and our Members that have military installations is that while the war effort, itself, with lots of changing of categories of money and determinations of money around may be very well up through June, that the defense effort generally is impacted because money that would have been spent for National Guard training or money that would have been spent to pay obligations to a contractor are not available in this process.

Now, the last time Secretary Gates, at least, who was not Secretary at the time, said that the spend-out was not quite as quick, and he also said that the need was not quite as critical. But the gentleman is absolutely right in pointing out that last time this process took a long time, and one of the reasons it took a long time was that the House leaders, the majority leaders at that time, were in conflict with the Senate about additional spending. I don't see any of those discussions, frankly, going on, but the additional spending last time at \$14.5 billion did not occur because the House leaders wouldn't accept that and we passed the bill in the House last time a month after the President sent the request up, and then it was a number of months, almost 4 or 5 months, before we got a final bill because we were fighting that additional spending, and at some point we are going to have to also engage not just on the issues of deadlines and whether or not we are micromanaging the effort, but the additional spending

was the real problem last time. I would like to think that there was some effort going on there. I don't know that there is.

My next question, though, is that the gentleman's goals for the appropriations process really would require us to pretty quickly move on the budget itself. We missed a deadline that we often miss. I don't want to belabor that point, but that April 15 deadline we normally had to hit if we had a real opportunity to get the bills out of the House by the Fourth of July, which we did in the first part of the last Congress and all but one of the bills in the second part of the last Congress.

What is your sense of where we are on the conferees for the budget and a final budget document?

□ 1215

Mr. HOYER. Obviously, we are very hopeful that we will pass a budget, that we will pass a budget in a timely fashion. As you know, we did pass a budget through the House in a timely fashion. The Senate passed its budget. It is now in conference.

Because of the April break, Easter-Passover break, we have not reached the April 15th. As a matter of fact, I talked to Mr. CONRAD just an hour ago, I talked to Mr. SPRATT just an hour ago, and we are very hopeful that we will come to an agreement.

I would observe, of course, last year the disagreement was between the Republican leadership in the Senate and the Republican leadership in the House. I understand what the gentleman is saying. Some of the votes in the Senate were overwhelming and bipartisan in terms of some of these issues. So this is an issue that we've got to overcome. We hope we can overcome it and move the budget.

But I want to tell the gentleman, he is absolutely correct. I am very focused. Mr. OBEY is very focused. We are going to pass appropriation bills in a timely fashion. We hope to finish by the 30th of June. Very frankly, the more quickly we can move appropriation bills, perhaps the more flexibility we will have in June's schedule. But as you know, June now is scheduled for every Monday and every Friday meeting to effect that business, which is critical.

As the gentleman knows, we met last year for the full year. We left here in December and nine of the 11 appropriation bills were unpassed. We don't want to be in that position. The gentleman knows, and I know, that part of that problem was the Senate's inability to move its business as quickly as we would like, as quickly as we did. The Labor-Health bill, of course, never passed this floor last year, but we are hopeful that that will happen.

I will go over the schedule of the appropriations process with the gentleman at some point in time. We are hopeful that mid-May to the end of June we will pass our appropriation bills. I will tell the gentleman it will

be my intention to discuss with both Chairman SPRATT and Chairman OBEY that if the budget process cannot be resolved, not in this House, but in the other House, that it would be my hope that the House would mark its bills to the House-passed number, as you know we have done in the past; and that would certainly be my intention.

Again, I have not discussed that with Mr. OBEY at this point in time, that's premature, nor have I discussed it with others, but we are hopeful to move ahead on the appropriation bills.

As you know, passage of the budget has a much greater impact in the Senate than it does in the House with respect to the rules process under which appropriation bills are considered in the Senate.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for sharing that with me. And certainly there were occasions where we had to do exactly what the gentleman is suggesting, and that is always one option. At some point, based on the meeting the deadlines we hope to meet and you hope to meet on the calendar, you have to decide whether that is the option you have to go to or not, as opposed to a conference report that we can agree to that lets us move forward that way.

I would also like to repeat one of the comments the gentleman made simply because we don't get much credit here or didn't get much credit for efforts we did make to control spending. And you are absolutely right, a year ago at this time the fight was between the Senate, which was led by Republicans at the time, and the House that was led by the Republicans on that additional spending.

And I just want to make the point that you already made once, but we don't hear it emphasized very often, but that was the fight. House Republicans did win, and we spent \$14.5 billion less than our friends on the other side intended to spend, offered to spend, wanted to spend; and that is what that time frame was all about.

We do, I believe, have more concerns in overall defense spending just because the spend-down has been quicker this year than last year, and Secretary Gates, not me, would be the source for that view of the difference in the 2 years. But clearly, the process, as the gentleman rightly pointed out, is never as easy as we want, as quick as we want, and there are obstacles there.

I would like to, before we conclude today, ask a couple more questions. One is the concern that I have and many of our Members have on the rule that was used this week to waive PAYGO for the D.C. bill and to create a new obstacle for Members who hope to offer a motion to recommit.

Twelve years and, now, a few months ago, when Republicans took control of the House, they extended the motion to recommit to the minority at that time and never failed to offer that motion to recommit under the traditions of the House. I believe, while it often was not

allowed the minority in previous years, never in either previous times or the last 12 years was an actual tabling motion put in the rule, which creates a different circumstance intentionally, but a different circumstance than was ever created in this House before.

And I wonder really two things: Would that tabling motion be something that we will see again? And also, would we expect to see the PAYGO effort in the future waived for the principal reason to be on the floor and handled in a separate vote and a separate piece of legislation, like we did this time?

Is that now the anticipated norm for this process, Mr. Leader?

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman and I have a slightly different perspective on what the rule provided.

First of all, as you know, motions to recommit were available in both of the bills that were on the floor. The tabling referred to that, if the second bill had not been adopted or the PAYGO provision had not been adopted, they would both be tabled. The reason for that was, we wanted to be consistent with our pledge to the PAYGO principle.

What we didn't want, what I don't want, and you and I have discussed this, is, I'm frankly "perplexed," might be the word, as someone who has been in the legislative body for some 40 years; and I think the parliamentarians were accurate in their determination of germaneness, but germaneness has always meant to me in 40 years, I will tell my friend, that it is pertinent to the subject at hand.

You know that when you add a PAYGO provision, which frankly you abandoned on your side in 2002, you did not want to be constrained by PAYGO. I understand why you didn't want to be constrained by PAYGO because you couldn't pay for your tax cuts. You talked about spending. We've cut revenues very deeply. There were different philosophical arguments about that; but the fact is, they were not paid for, and as a result, the deficits have in large part expanded very greatly.

With respect to the rule, yes, the rule was structured in a way that limited to the subject matter at hand, whether it was the tax bill or the D.C. voting rights bill, motions to recommit to those subjects, as opposed to expanding to subjects that, frankly, from my perspective, are used for political purposes.

I will tell my friend that the motion last night and the motion on the previous D.C. bill had nothing to do with D.C. voting rights. And last night's bill had everything to do with trying to focus on our Members being targeted. And, in fact, the memorandum that you sent—not you, but somebody sent around to all of your Members expressed the purpose of your motion to recommit to target Members for political reasons, from my perspective.

In that context, if you are asking me if it is my intent in the future to try to limit you from doing that, the answer to that question is "yes." If your question is, do I want to make sure that you have a motion to recommit with or without instructions, a motion to recommit, of course, kills the bill, as the motion to recommit to report back promptly kills the bill.

The irony is, the gentleman from North Carolina offered a motion to recommit the other day with respect to guns that related to the District of Columbia. Excuse me, I'm not sure it related directly to the District of Columbia, which would have had the perverse effect of offering the amendment and, if adopted, would have killed the amendment in the same process. That is because it was referring it back to committee. The committee would not have reported out that amendment.

If he had really been interested, in my opinion, in passing that amendment, as opposed to politically giving a vote that was difficult for Members on our side of the aisle, what he would have done is moved his gun amendment to be reported back forthwith and had his vote on that up or down.

But I will tell my friend, as he well knows, I want to make sure that from my perspective, and I have told him, I will not suggest a change in the rules, we did not change the rules, there was some discussion about that, without discussing it with him. I want your side to feel that you are getting a fair shot at relevant motions to recommit with or without amendments that do not kill the bill in the process. I don't think that is something that is unfair to expect.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I thank my friend for that.

But I do think in that view of this that there is a significant restriction of the rights available to Members. Members have to defend what they do on the floor. Let me make a couple of points.

One is, in the incident you mentioned when the gentleman from Texas offered a motion to recommit well within the rules, and, by the way, in that case and many other cases the only option that the minority has had has been the option of last resort, unless you take that away, which was the motion to recommit. All of our amendments were rejected; no matter how germane they might have been, they were not allowed.

The Members of the House are the ones who have the opportunity to decide what is the right vote and what's not. And, in fact, stopping that vote offered under the rules by a Member in good faith I think was a violation of that Member's rights as a Member of the House.

Now, you could have had that vote, it might have killed the bill, but you could have started a new bill just like you did anyway. The only difference would have been that the Member of the House that brought the issue to the

floor would have had his full rights as a Member to have his issue not only debated, but voted on. And we were literally seconds from actually having that vote, which under the rules of the House would have sent the bill to the committee promptly.

There may have been no way to leave the committee with that bill, but you could have started a new bill just like you did. The only difference would have been that the gentleman from Texas would have had his motion voted on, as I believe he had a right to.

On the other issue, we did have PAYGO for 8 years of the 12 years we were in the majority. We complied with it. We still never took away the ability of your side to do just what you said we shouldn't be able to do.

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

Mr. BLUNT. Let me finish the thought, and then I will.

I can give you many instances where not only did your side try to avail themselves of that right, which we never then took away, and it probably did create political concerns for our Members; but the House has been here longer than any Member has been here and will be here longer than any Member will be here. And beginning to change the rules in that way or change the rights of Members to offer their objections, their ideas, their improvements as Members always have is a bigger step than I think the gentleman may realize.

And in terms of whether things are germane or not, I very well remember a bill to create the Homeland Security part of our government and the motion to recommit was about corporate inversions. Now, that is every bit as tangential as anything the gentleman just mentioned. But we didn't go back the next week and say, we're never going to allow the minority to have that vote again because it was troublesome for us. Troublesome for us and protecting the rights of Members as they relate to past Members and future Members I think are two different things.

I will yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We could go on for some period of time on this. We have a different perspective, not on providing fairness for all Members. I said the gentleman from North Carolina; it was the young gentleman from Texas, and I thank you for correcting me on that.

Frankly, I want to tell my friend that if the gentleman from Texas was sincere, in my view, in wanting his amendment adopted, he would not have rereferred it to committee. Very frankly, in my opinion, his amendment would have passed. The bill would have been reported back forthwith, and the bill would have passed.

We all make a judgment as to what the purposes of amendments are. My view is, the gentleman voted against the underlying bill. The gentleman was opposed to the underlying bill. His motion was to do two things: to provide

an instance where on an issue not related to voting rights in the District of Columbia, but on an issue he thought the majority of the House supported which, I think he was correct, he wanted attached to that, and therefore create a dichotomy for Members. They either had to vote for an issue they were for and kill the bill, or vote against an issue they were for and be perceived as being against the proposition.

□ 1230

I understand what you are saying. I do not believe that it is fair legislative process to necessarily believe that that needs to be made in order.

Now, having said that, we did not amend the rules. Consistent with the rules, we provided a process on PAYGO. You waived PAYGO on a regular basis when it was in effect. As a result of doing so, you narrowed the scope of amendments. Not only did you do that, but you also waived the necessity to pay for things from time to time.

But, having said that, I want to reiterate to my friend, and we have had good discussions and will continue to have good discussions, but I am not going to say that we are going to allow our Members to be put in very difficult positions for what we perceive to be for political reasons only, not for the substance. If the gentleman from Texas had wanted to amend the substance with the motion to recommit, he had that available to him and have it reported back forthwith so it could be adopted. He had that available to him. He chose not to take that route.

It caused us some consternation, as was noticed, I am sure by some, particularly to me, because I felt very strongly about that bill. The majority of this House has now passed that bill, with significant support from your side of the aisle. As a matter of fact, it was a bill sponsored by one of your leaders, a former chairman of your campaign committee.

We want to make sure that we consider legislation on this floor fairly, and we will certainly work with you toward that end. But I don't want to assure the gentleman that I am not going to try to provide for the consideration of legislation and amendments thereto which are germane and relevant.

Mr. BLUNT. I would say to my friend, we do have a disagreement on this and I think we do see what my good friend perceives as a minor change in procedure differently because I don't think it is that at all.

I would say a couple of things: one is 18 times at least in the minority our friends on the other side used the same rule that my friend now so vigorously objects to because it would kill the bill. Eighteen times. They never were able to do it, but 18 times used it, many times with the provisions just like the one I cited earlier that were every bit as tangential as the one the gentleman is speaking to.

Also I am sure in terms of, I don't know if the word was "sincerity" or what, but I do know that our friend from Texas is a sincere and dedicated Member.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield on that, you understood my phrase. It was my perception. I did not question his sincerity. But the perception of what he did, offering the amendment, and within the ambit of the same amendment he offered killing the bill to which the amendment would be attached, appeared to me to be an act that was at least contradictory.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, my friend knows as well, if not better than anybody, how to explain exactly how a Member could be motivated to do both of those things and has defended the rights of the minority for a number of years in an extraordinary way on similar kinds of issues. But the point here is that we are about more than the moment, and my friend said that he wants to do everything he can to prevent his Members from being put in a difficult political situation. The truth is, this is a difficult job, and Members who run for it should understand it is a difficult job and there are things that not only have to be decided, but have to be explained as part of that job. And while changing a procedure, a process, in a way that has never been handled before with this tabling inclusion this week may seem insignificant, I don't think it is.

Also, on our side during the time we had PAYGO, my friend mentioned spending, we never waived PAYGO for spending. On any spending bill, we always adhered to the PAYGO rule. You always had that available to you.

We will move forward. I do appreciate the fact that we are going to continue to talk about these issues before we do anything to change the overall rules of the House. I am concerned, however, when we change what one of our outside observers has referred to recently as the norms of the House. This rule this week was not only outside the norms of the House; it was unique in the way it handled this tabling issue. It was not unique in the way it divided the bills. I am not complaining about that. I am complaining about the potential for a Member to use all the tools previously available to them to actually, frankly, stop legislation that they didn't like if they didn't like it. But you can't do that unless 217 other people join you in that.

We are not in the majority on our side, we understand that, and for us to do anything under the rules of the House, with a majority vote, Democrats have to join us. If we make those options too appealing, that is, frankly, not our fault. Changing the rules for the momentary relief of Members has greater long-term consequences than I believe my friend realizes.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observations. This has probably gone on longer than the Members or

the public wants it to, but let me simply observe that waivers obviously relate to and PAYGO relates to entitlement spending, and while you may not have waived it with respect to spending, because PAYGO does not affect discretionary spending, what it affects, of course, is entitlement spending.

The reason it affected the D.C. bill was because the Member from Utah would have had to have been paid and would have been entitled to be paid. So a relatively de minimis sum was involved in that.

Frankly, the gentleman and I have a disagreement in terms of the rule that was used. First, the rules have not been amended. They have not been amended. Secondly, this rule was consistent with our rules.

The only thing that this rule did that I think caused so much consternation on your side was it adopted PAYGO without opening the bill up to what were amendments that were extraneous to the subject matter and offered the bill on its merits. You were free to offer a motion to recommit, with or without amendments, on the subject matter of the bills, either bill. That was your right then.

The tabling simply referred to making sure that we kept our promise that bills would have PAYGO on them, and if they didn't have PAYGO on them, we weren't interested in passing them, because we were going to be faithful to our pledge on that rule. That is what the tabling dealt with. It didn't deal with your motion to recommit.

If you had defeated H.R. 1906, the second bill with the PAYGO provision, H.R. 1905 would not have gone forward. But our side of the aisle believed that both were important and wanted them together because we wanted the PAYGO provision in there, a relatively de minimis sum in terms of the budget, but consistent with our rule.

If I can make another observation on another matter, you mentioned the supplemental had been pending 94 days. It has been pending 73 days. I think that is an important distinction. That is almost a month of legislative work, if not more.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, we will get our staffs together and look at the calendar later because they seem to be in disagreement on that, even at this moment as you give me that information.

I am going to make one, hopefully, final comment on this issue for now, though I am sure it is going to be an issue we talk about in the future.

Mr. HOYER. I am sure.

Mr. BLUNT. For my friend to understand, it is not a concern about this bill. It is not a concern about what happened on that bill. It is the fact that the tabling addition may be within the rules, but extraordinary. If it is within the rules it has never been done before. The tabling addition changes the consequences of a Member's motion. When you change the consequences of a Member's motion, you take a right away from the Member that the Member previously had.

We may have to discuss this. I can see we are still not quite on the same wavelength. It is not about this bill, Mr. HOYER. It is not about this week. It is about doing something that has never been done before that has consequential impact, and I believe this does. I think you and I should continue to talk about it. I think our Members in the minority are justly concerned about it, as you would have been in the minority if we had done something we never did in the majority, which is change the consequences of your motion to recommit.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 23, 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. 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER- PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois
Mr. MCCOTTER, Michigan
Mr. STEARNS, Florida
Mr. ENGLISH, Pennsylvania
Mr. BROWN, South Carolina

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER- PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MCCAUL, Texas
Mr. WELLER, Illinois
Mr. DREIER, California
Mr. MACK, Florida
Mr. FORTUÑO, PUERTO RICO

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE RICK LARSEN, MEMBER OF CON- GRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Luke Loeffler, Community Representative, Office of the Honorable RICK LARSEN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 12, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Municipal Court of the City of Bellingham, Whatcom County, Washington, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

LUKE LOEFFLER,
Community Representative.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON- ORABLE BRIAN P. BILBRAY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRIAN P. BILBRAY, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a judicial subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by House Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
Member of Congress.

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.

RECOGNIZING NEWTON CHISHOLM MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Chisholm Middle School in Newton, Kansas, for a prestigious award they recently received. Chisholm Middle School was one of only 16 schools selected by the Intel Corporation and Scholastic for their Schools of Distinction Awards.

Chisholm received this award under the category of Collaboration and

Teamwork. They were also awarded the "Best of the Best" award in part for their impressive academic record and exceptional staff, as well as their engaged and involved parents, community leaders, and local businesses.

Intel and Scholastic sponsor the awards and honor those schools which demonstrate academic excellence in the areas of science, mathematics, technology, literacy, and leadership. They reward the selected schools with \$10,000 as well as other wonderful prizes to acknowledge their achievement.

The school chosen as "Best of the Best" also receives an additional \$15,000 grant from the Intel Foundation and other prizes such as computer software. What an accomplishment it is for Chisholm Middle School to receive these grants for new technology and software.

It is wonderful to see families and communities come together to support the youth of America. The students, parents, educators, community leaders, and local businesses should all be commended for working together to improve education, for bringing excitement to learning, and for investing in the future of our generations.

The grants Chisholm Middle School received will go a long way in bringing new and exciting technology into the classroom. In fact, on Monday, April 30, they are hosting a reception in their media center to demonstrate the new technology that they have purchased with this award. That will be an interesting and exciting day at Chisholm Middle School.

In order to maintain a competitive edge in the global economy, America's schools need to provide quality education to ensure the next generation is well prepared. Schools across the Nation are striving for this kind of quality education.

It is evident that through the dedication of teachers, parents, communities, doors of opportunities are opening for America's young people. I encourage you to keep striving for excellence, and you will reap the benefits of hard work and perseverance.

I would like to also note that Ogden Elementary School in Ogden, Kansas, received a School of Distinction Award in the Mathematics Achievement category. The State of Kansas had two schools that were recipients of the Schools of Distinction Award for 2006.

We are proud of our students at Chisholm and Ogden for this high honor, and today I am pleased to offer congratulations on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

□ 1245

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)