

Mack	Peterson (PA)	Slaughter
Mahoney (FL)	Petri	Smith (NE)
Maloney (NY)	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Manzullo	Platts	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Poe	Smith (WA)
Markey	Pomeroy	Snyder
Marshall	Porter	Solis
Matheson	Price (GA)	Souder
Matsui	Price (NC)	Space
McCarthy (CA)	Price (OH)	Spratt
McCarthy (NY)	Putnam	Stark
McCauley (TX)	Radanovich	Stearns
McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Sullivan
McCotter	Ramstad	Sutton
McCrery	Rangel	Tanner
McDermott	Regula	Tauscher
McGovern	Rehberg	Taylor
McHugh	Reichert	Terry
McIntyre	Renzi	Thompson (CA)
McKeon	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
McMorris	Reynolds	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rodriguez	Tiahrt
McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Tierney
Meek (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Towns
Meeks (NY)	Rohrabacher	Turner
Melancon	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (CO)
Mica	Roskam	Udall (NM)
Michaud	Ross	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rothman	Van Hollen
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Miller (NC)	Royce	Visclosky
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Walberg
Mitchell	Rush	Walden (OR)
Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Walsh (NY)
Moore (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Walz (MN)
Moore (WI)	Salazar	Walt
Moran (KS)	Sali	Wamp
Moran (VA)	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Murphy (CT)	T.	Schultz
Murphy, Patrick	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Murphy, Tim	Sanbanes	Watson
Murtha	Saxton	Watt
Musgrave	Schakowsky	Waxman
Myrick	Schiff	Weiner
Nadler	Schmidt	Welch (VT)
Napolitano	Schwartz	Weldon (FL)
Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Weller
Neugebauer	Scott (VA)	Wexler
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Oberstar	Serrano	Wicker
Obey	Sestak	Wilson (NM)
Oliver	Shadegg	Wilson (OH)
Ortiz	Shays	Wilson (SC)
Pallone	Shea-Porter	Wolf
Pascarell	Sherman	Woolsey
Pastor	Shimkus	Wu
Payne	Shuler	Wynn
Pearce	Shuster	Yarmuth
Pence	Simpson	Young (AK)
Perlmutter	Sires	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Skelton	

## NAYS—2

Campbell (CA) Feeney

## NOT VOTING—21

Bonner	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Buchanan	Kilpatrick	Pickering
Coble	LaHood	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Lofgren, Zoe	Stupak
Diaz-Balart, L.	McHenry	Tancred
Eshoo	Meehan	Westmoreland

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1653

So 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. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I was detained and not present on the House Floor when the final vote for passage of H.R. 2642—Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations was taken. Had I been present I would have voted “yea.”

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule. I yield to my good friend, the majority leader, for information about the schedule next week. In light of the agreement we reached this week, any sense you could give us at all about the remaining 10 appropriations bills would be helpful.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I hope my recitation of the schedule for next week is a little more accurate than my recitation of the schedule last week, which had a little bit of a problem getting done.

In any event, my distinguished friend, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and then at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of those bills will be announced later today.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m., and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. We will consider the following fiscal year 2008 appropriations bills: Energy and Water Development; State, Foreign Operations; and the Legislative Branch bill.

In addition to that, in the week following, I am waiting for it to be written up for me, but I know Financial Services we hope to have up on the last week of the session; the Commerce, Justice, Science bill and the Interior bill in the last week; and then in July, the week we get back, which is the second full week of July, we expect to have the Labor-Health bill, the Agriculture bill and the Transportation-HUD bill.

In addition, after that, we will have the Defense appropriations bill as we have always planned to have that, approximately mid-July.

I want to tell my friend that obviously the three bills that are scheduled for the second week in July may slip to the third week in July because of the difficulty of getting together all of the projects that will be added to the bills as a result of Members' initiatives and the committee's action. But whether it is the second week in July or the third week in July, they will be in mid-July sometime.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that. I would ask my friend, on the Energy and Water bill that we expect to do next week, it is my understanding we will come back at a later time and finish that bill, once time has been adequate to allow projects that would have otherwise gone in at some time even later than House passage.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, the Energy and Water bill, again because of the numbers of projects in Members' districts that are very important to them and, I

think, to the country, but will take time to vet properly to make sure that they are justified and to check with the agency, those projects are going to be added after we consider the Energy and Water bill, which is scheduled for next week.

But before the Energy and Water bill is sent to the Senate, we will have those add-ons added to another appropriation bill that will come to the floor and will be, therefore, subject to Members' actions on each and every one of the legislatively added provisions. When that bill passes, those provisions will then be added to the Energy and Water bill and then, and only then, sent to the Senate.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for that.

I would also ask, this was covered extensively last night, but just to verify this one more time as we look at the schedule for these appropriations bills and for next week, on Monday of next week, we intend under unanimous consent to reinstate the rule that we had at the end of the last Congress that would provide for a point of order on any projects that are put in a conference report that we hadn't had an opportunity to see prior to that. That would happen on Monday?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield further, let me be precise.

Mr. BLUNT. I will be glad to yield, and I am not trying to be unusually prescriptive in describing that.

Mr. HOYER. Let me be precise so there won't be any misunderstanding. I am not sure, but I think your rule dealt with more than appropriations conference reports. I may not be correct on that.

But in any event, the rule that will be offered Monday night, hopefully by unanimous consent, will be a rule that will say that a point of order will lie to a conference report from the appropriations conference which has added a project that was not listed in either the House consideration or the Senate consideration, and that point of order would have 10 minutes of debate on either side, 10 minutes for those in opposition to allowing the conference committee report to be considered, and 10 minutes for the proponents of the conference committee report being considered, effectively adding a third to the hour.

□ 1700

So it would be an hour and 20 minutes of debate rather than just an hour.

Obviously if the point of order is sustained, then the conference committee with the add-on or add-ons would be referred back to the conference committee.

Mr. BLUNT. That is the way I understand it, my friend, and our agreement at this point is for these appropriations bills, although in our rule last year we also extended that to authorizing bills. As you know, we don't want to continue that discussion, but the agreement we made this week, the majority

leader is fully in compliance with the agreement we made so we can move forward with these appropriations bills with the understanding that while now we will have a significant opportunity to look at the remainder of the specific Member projects or earmarks in the bill, we also would have an opportunity to have a debatable point of order on the conference report if those appear.

I would also like to ask about energy. I know in previous discussions on the floor at the end of previous weeks, I believe we discussed the likelihood that there would be an energy bill on the floor by July 4. I know in either this week's schedule or future scheduling that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Energy and Commerce Committee have all delayed some markups that they had intended, and I am wondering if the leader has a sense of what that means in terms of an energy bill on the floor, and also that bill on the floor in light of the appropriations works we just discussed.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, obviously the gentleman is correct. There has been a change in the July schedule in part because of the moving of three of the appropriations bills to July. So they will not be considered in June. It was always the intent, however, that there would be an announcement prior to July 4 of component parts of an energy policy, not necessarily one bill but an energy policy prior to July 4. We always contemplated energy bills being on the floor in July. As far as I know, that is still the plan.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank you for that response.

In addition to that, every indication I have up to this point is that those energy bills would go through the regular order of the committee. Is that what the leader and the majority still anticipates?

Mr. HOYER. That is correct.

Mr. BLUNT. On another topic where we had some discussions that indicated there would be an effort to have a vote before the August work period on the topic of trade. And of the agreements out there, generally the discussion was that there would be a significant effort made to have the Peru agreement on the floor in July. I know these take a significant amount of time because of the various things that have to be done in this trade promotion authority process. I am wondering on trade if my friend has a sense where those items might be.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and not with precision in the sense of weeks or months or days, I mean. Obviously as the gentleman knows, Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN of the subcommittee is working very closely with Ambassador Schwab and Secretary Paulson and the administration on these issues.

They have reached an understanding and that is moving forward, I believe, but I could not tell the gentleman at

this time what will be scheduled or when it will be scheduled. As the gentleman well knows, there is discussion with reference to Peru and Panama and actions that may be taken in Peru or Panama, and that is being discussed, as a matter of fact, I think today between Ambassador Schwab and Mr. RANGEL and others.

Clearly I think things are moving forward on that, but I cannot give the gentleman any time frames.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my good friend for that. We are interested in that. We will continue to talk about that both on the floor and off. It would certainly be one of my goals. By this time next week if we have any information on that, we can begin to get a sense of meeting those deadlines. Under this process, as the leader well knows, a number of things have to be done. There is very little flexibility in the time frame once you start the clock on a particular agreement, and the clock has to start right here in the House of Representatives. I look forward to that. I thank my friend for the information.

#### 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 (Mr. COURTNEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent 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.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CON- GRESSIONAL MAILING STAND- ARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), 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 House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. CAPUANO, Massachusetts, Chairman

Mr. SHERMAN, California

Mr. DAVIS, Alabama

Mr. EHLERS, Michigan

Mr. PRICE, Georgia

Mr. MCCARTHY, California

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTEN- NIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 note), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Abraham Lincoln Lincoln Bicentennial Commission:

Mr. JACKSON, Illinois

#### COMMUNICATION FROM HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, REPUBLICAN LEAD- ER

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 note), I am pleased to re-appoint the Honorable Ray LaHood of Illinois to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. LaHood has expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill his request.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Republican Leader.

#### CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REGARDING BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-39)

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:*

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 to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Belarus are to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2007.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. These actions