

in which enacted and each fiscal year thereafter.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF JESSE ALEXANDER HELMS, JR., DISTINGUISHED FORMER SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA**

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 1325 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

**H. RES. 1325**

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., born in Monroe, North Carolina on October 18, 1921, spent a 52-year public career dedicating himself to his country, his family, and his home State, representing North Carolina in the United States Senate for 30 years;

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., served in the United States Navy from 1942 until 1945;

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., was educated in the public schools of Monroe, North Carolina, and at Wingate Junior College and Wake Forest College, and served as a city editor of the Raleigh Times, an administrative assistant to United States Senators Willis Smith and Alton Lennon, an executive director of the North Carolina Bankers Association, a member of the Raleigh City Council, and a television and radio executive;

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., was elected to the United States Senate in 1972, and served as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee, ultimately serving five terms, equal to the longest service of any Senator from North Carolina;

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., was a leader against Communism and became the first legislator of any nation to address the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., was married for 65 years to Dorothy "Dot" Coble Helms, whom he termed his "best friend", and Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., is the father of three children; and

Whereas Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., made valuable contributions to his community, State, Nation, and the World: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life, achievements, and distinguished career of Jesse Alexander Helms, Jr., public servant and former Member of the United States Senate; and

(2) expresses its condolences to his wife, "Dot", and his three children on his passing.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend from Maryland, the majority leader, to tell us what is planned for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the Republican Whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

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

In addition, we will consider H.R. 415, a bill to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 5959, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009; H.R. 3999, the National Highway Bridge Reconstruction and Inspection Act; and, we may also consider important energy-related legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

On H.R. 415, the Taunton River bill, the Wild and Scenic Rivers bill, does the gentleman know, does the location change at all? Or was it the location that was on the bill that earlier was scheduled for this week?

Mr. HOYER. In response, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. BLUNT. I will.

Mr. HOYER. It is the same bill.

Mr. BLUNT. I think one of our concerns about that on the energy topic, which I would hope to go to for a few minutes next, is there was a proposed liquid natural gas facility in that area that I think this designation will impact unless it is defined somehow out of that. And if the gentleman wants to respond to that, I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is an extensive letter to all of our colleagues from Congressmen FRANK, MCGOVERN, KENNEDY, LANGEVIN, and LYNCH.

I don't want to read the whole letter; but responding to the points in question, I am looking at the letter to see whether or not—one of the points they make is that notwithstanding this bill there are several barriers to this proposal going forward, that is the LNG plant. Killing the bill that would provide environmental benefits to people of our districts would in no way save the LNG plant from the rejection it has already received. The point being, and I have not read the entire letter, but that there are other impediments apparently to moving forward on that LNG plant. As I say, it is a long letter, I haven't read it fully, but I do know that each one of the points that was

raised in the article today have been responded to and therefore will be the subject of debate once the bill is considered.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. And that is exactly right. That will be a bill to be debated, and leaders shouldn't be expected to know everything about every aspect of that, and particularly on a bill that will be debated. I would assume that this designation would create an additional obstacle, and there may be other obstacles already in place and I am sure that will be part of the debate.

The gentleman's last comment about work for next week indicated that there may be other energy-related bills scheduled for the floor next week. Does the gentleman have a sense of what some of those options might be, and which ones may be more likely to be on the floor next week?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes. As you know, we have been talking about, on both sides of the aisle, developing greater domestic supply from that which we have control over here in this country. I think both sides agree that that is an objective that ought to be pursued. The differences have been I think where that should be done at least in the short term, maybe not in the long term.

In the short term, it is our belief that there is very substantial areas available for further exploration and development of energy resources from our own country. As the gentleman may have heard me say on the floor earlier today, there is about 88 million acres that we believe is currently available for leasing that experts indicate are prime opportunities for finding, drilling, and producing energy for our country. We may well consider legislation which will try to accelerate, particularly in Alaska, where there is 23 million acres in the National Petroleum Reserve area designated and approved by the Congress for drilling, where approximately 1 million acres of that has been currently let for lease but there are substantial millions of acres still available. So we may well have legislation which will direct the administration to accelerate the leases for that area and speed the development.

In addition, we may well include in that legislation the Use It Or Lose It bill, we had disagreements on whether that was appropriate, which essentially says to companies: Don't inventory large segments. If you are not going to use it, let's get it back and give it to some who may well use it at this point in time. Again, an opportunity to accelerate the exploration and securing of oil within our control here in this country.

In addition, that legislation I think will include a requirement that any oil petroleum products that are produced as a result of this legislation or as a result of these leaseholds being extended, that petroleum would need to be used

in the United States of America, not exported to Japan or to other nations.

You had in a piece of legislation that you had in 2005 a similar provision. I can't recall the phrase right now, but essentially requiring due diligent requirement as they proceeded with the leases to develop the energy. So we think our Use Or Lose It is, while not exactly what you include in your 2005 bill, certainly a similar objective of saying: You get the leases, let's develop the oil.

We will also be calling I think in that legislation, Mr. Whip, on the President to pursue finishing construction of the natural gas and the oil pipelines from Alaska as soon as possible. If that requires resources, for the administration to ask for those resources.

We share again a view that it is prudent for us to develop all of the lands that we currently have available. And pretty significant, again, I don't know whether you were there, but the 88 million acres essentially covers Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Delaware, New Jersey, and most of Maryland. So a pretty large area that is available now.

So we want to pursue that, but clearly want to see further exploration, further drilling, and further utilization of our own resources here in this country, all with the view of bringing prices down.

Now, we don't know specifically why prices have spiked so rapidly, but we are very concerned about it. As you have heard me say before, prices during the last 8 years of the nineties went from \$1.06 to \$1.46, about one nickel a year. Prices during the last 7½ years have spiked from that \$1.46 to now \$4.15 or so. All the energy policies that have been adopted have obviously been adopted in the last 7½ years with President Bush's signature. There is no energy bill that is passed without his signature. So that we believe that we have not been successful over the last 7½ years of getting an energy policy in place which has given us independence and provided for stable prices.

□ 1600

Both the President and proponents of the 2005 legislation, which I voted for, by the way, because I think we need to seek energy independence, but the proponents of that bill indicated 3 years ago that it would keep prices down and make sure that we had supply. That hasn't been the case. Obviously, that was not the intent of anybody who was for the bill that that wouldn't happen, but that is the legislation that we currently are looking at. We are developing that now and trying to write the language essentially with the objective of utilizing the 88 million acres that we currently have authorized on which to drill because we think that is the quickest way to proceed.

Mr. BLUNT. In that regard, on the 2005 energy bill that I voted for and the gentleman just said he voted for, I

think we did head things in the right direction. Of course from the 6 years prior to 2007, energy gas prices increased by about 50 cents a gallon; and in the 17 months since then, they have better than doubled. Everybody can take the numbers and do lots of things with them. Nobody likes the doubled number. There is no doubt about that.

In one of the early bills, I think it was H.R. 6, actually this Congress voted to repeal the incentives that we put in that bill that you and I voted for in 2005, the House voted to repeal those incentives which would have made it easier to promote the NPRA drilling area. I think maybe the position we would hopefully take in the future would be that we would want to continue to make those things easier to do rather than harder to do.

I would also say in terms of the 68 million acres, I have heard that a lot and I am sure we will continue to hear it a lot. Number one, not all of that land has oil or gas on it. Two, even if it does, you don't drill on every acre to drain this important resource from it. We are all going to learn a lot more about the gas and oil business, even than we know today, and my guess is that we know a lot more than we did even 6 months ago.

I do know in the last 6 years, as we frankly have accelerated exploration, that lawsuits to slow down exploration have gone up 718 percent in the last 6 years.

So if we want to deal with things like lawsuits and trying to expedite the process, that's a very appropriate thing to do, and at that point it is even more appropriate to hold people to their strict lease standards that they have.

The 22 million acres in Alaska, while that is some place we ought to look for both oil and gas, I don't know that we are going to be in an either/or environment, and particularly in this case where we want to look at what makes the most sense the quickest. I would also mention to the gentleman that we have a bill on the ANWR itself, it is H.R. 6107, that already adopts that principle that none of the petroleum coming out of there would go anywhere but to the United States. So many are already cosponsoring legislation that accepts that principle. It is a principle that if it's an easy way to open up new resources, I think it is something that we should be talking about and making sure that we get it just right. We do not want to assume that the oil companies can be micromanaged by Congress. We want to do what we can to make sure that we are producing American energy in the maximum way, and also understand that every oil lease does not result in oil. If it did, my good friend and I could open up Hoyer & Blunt and become oilmen if we could just get a lease. A lease doesn't mean there is anything there, but we ought to be sure that these leases are being vigorously pursued. We also should be sure that we are doing anything we reasonably can do to remove impedi-

ments, whether those impediments are lawsuits or the language that was in H.R. 6 that the House of Representatives passed. The Senate didn't pass it so the law didn't change, but the message to people out there looking for oil is that there is a new sheriff in town and the rules are different than they were under the old sheriff, and maybe we ought to get out of town.

A lot of this hesitancy about exploring could result from debates right here on the floor. We want to do things in debate, and I take my friend's word that he wants to, too, that encourages exploration, not discourages exploration.

I yield to my good friend.

Mr. HOYER. You mentioned H.R. 6. First of all, as you heard in my list, we are not contemplating adding that into this legislation that we might be considering. However, let me say this, very honestly. You and I both, I think every Member in this body very much supports the free market system. We have found it provides the greatest good for the greatest number throughout the world.

In 2005, you put incentives in the bill, \$14 billion worth of tax breaks for oil companies. Oil was then, as you point out, about half of what it is bringing today at the pump. The free market system, in my view, is if you are getting a high price for your product, you try to produce more of it and you try to find more of it. The oil companies are earning the highest price that they have ever received in the history of the sale of oil. That ought to be the incentive, not taxpayers who are paying the highest price at the pump they have ever paid, also having to pay higher taxes because the oil companies are getting an incentive of \$14 billion of tax cuts to incentivize what ought to be incentivized by the price that they are getting for their product.

I want to say further that the information I have, and I think you will find this interesting, is that Exxon made \$40 billion in profits last year. I am informed \$32 billion of that profit was spent to buy back stock. Not to do additional research, not to drill in America or any place else, but \$32 billion to buy back their stock. Obviously that did have a very good effect on those stockholders who remained because their equity clearly went up. I do not criticize that, but I point it out because it was not spent either to produce more oil product, petroleum product, or to pursue alternative energy sources which we think is important which is what we will use the \$14 billion in H.R. 6, whether it was hybrid cars, ethanol research, water, wind, hydroelectric, or from my perspective, nuclear.

Let me also say that I understand what you are saying, but when we talk about this 68 million or 88 million acres, let me give you this point. The oil and gas companies hold leases on these 68 million now, land and water.

They are not producing on these acreage, and 81 percent, according to experts, of the estimated oil and gas resources on Federal lands and the OCS are currently available for development in these reserves, and they are equal to 107 billion barrels of oil and 658 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

So what we are saying and what we will say in this legislation is that you have about 14 years supply here for America if you would develop this 107 billion barrels of oil or 658 trillion feet of natural gas on the land or offshore that you currently have leases on.

So I think this is a good debate to have, and ultimately hopefully at some point in time we will get through the politics of this issue on both sides and we will get to a point where frankly we develop this.

But I will also tell my friend that if we focus only on petroleum, we will not serve your young son or my grandchildren—you are much younger than I am—or my grandchildren very well because I will tell you, and as you know, I have a great granddaughter. She is 18 months of age. When she is my age, petroleum will not be her major source of energy. We know that. Petroleum is a wasting resource. By that I mean it is a resource that is going to go away. We don't know how much is left. Experts don't know how much Saudi Arabia still has. But we need to pursue vigorously alternatives while at the same time, as you and I would agree, developing that 107 billion barrels that we have here in this country that are currently available for lease.

Frankly, if the companies tell us that they really can't produce from that, then maybe we ought to look at other sites as well. But certainly it seems to us, you ought to use what you have first; and if that doesn't work, we ought to go on to a second or third or fourth site.

I thank the gentleman for his tolerance in my taking that time.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. I am old enough now that I never argue with anyone who suggests I am a lot younger, even if I am not a lot younger. My children and grandchildren, too, I think, will live in a world much different than the world we are in right now; but it will take awhile to get there. And I absolutely agree we should be at an all-systems-forward effort to find the next technology, and while we are finding the next technology, to use the resources we have as an economic asset, not to see them as an environmental hazard. We need to get there. We need to have a debate that gets us there.

We are going to have some figures that we are going to disagree about. It is hard with these sort of believed reserves to know what they are. I personally think I will have a lot of facts that suggest that 81 percent of the known reserves in oil and gas are not in those 68 million acres, but I am also for pursuing those 68 million acres vigorously.

The oil shale in the West, we had a hearing last week that only members

of my party attended because we wanted to talk about this whole issue of what this Congress could have done, and just the oil shale amounts in the West that I think are not calculated into your figure are hugely significant in how we use our resources in the future. We want to do that. We want to remove obstacles.

On the \$14 billion, and we have debated this before and I am not going to spend a lot of time on this, but I think everybody in this room understands that \$14 billion so-called tax break for the so-called oil companies is their part of the domestic manufacturing tax incentive that every American business gets. Now if we want to take that away from companies that are successful, that's a different principle. Maybe we take it away from computer companies. Who do we take it away from? We want those jobs here. That is what that is about. I would like to have that debate one of these days about whether or not those manufacturing jobs need to be here. We think that they need to be here for every other industry in the country. Why is this the one industry where we say, they are going to manufacture here anyway, particularly based on everything we know about the worldwide oil challenge we face, why would we want to do anything that would encourage the oil product to be refined somewhere outside of this country? That is what that domestic manufacturing incentive is for. I think every time when we talk about this as a big tax break for the oil companies, it sounds like we have gone into the tax law and said if you are an oil company, you get something that nobody else gets. What we have done in the tax law is say if you are an oil company and you refine a product, if you manufacture a product, if you produce a product in this country, you get exactly what everybody else gets that makes that decision to make their computer in Texas instead of Romania. That's what that incentive is.

Now, every time it is discussed on the floor, it is this big benefit that was just designed for the oil companies, and that is just not the fact. It is a domestic manufacturing benefit.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield just on that?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I just want to say that I understand what you have just said. But, of course, they never did have that until the 2005 bill, or one of the tax bills that was passed around that time. Prior to that time, the manufacturers had that, as you observed, that's correct, but the oil companies were never included in it originally or for long periods of time. They were added just in the last 2005 or 2006 or 2004, I am not sure exactly which bill added it. So it is not as if that had been in place when the tax to which you refer, the incentive to which you refer, was originally included in the code.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend, but part of the unfortunate circumstance

we find ourselves in is, as we have restricted access to some of our own supply, we in fact saw in the last decade that this industry that had been forced to be totally domestic, and we hoped it could be totally domestic again, was sending jobs out of the country because we were bringing in refined product for the first time.

□ 1615

Because we were bringing in refined product for the first time, we were doing other things that the Congress should want to reverse.

One other topic I have today, and I look forward to a good debate on these energy issues. I would hope these energy issues could come to the floor under a rule, by the way, and I would ask my friend if there is any plan to bring the energy bills that he would hope to bring to the floor in the next week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks with a rule that allows more than a 40-minute debate on a suspension bill.

And I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. That's under discussion. As I said, we're discussing the component parts of the bill. We haven't decided how that bill will come to the floor. But I will certainly look forward to discussing it with you.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend. I think that will be a helpful addition to this debate.

You know, when you have a suspension debate on a bill, particularly a bill that maybe has a majority but it can't get a suspension number, you check a box but you really don't move the agenda forward. I would hope that we could see some of these under rules.

My final topic of the day, unless you raise another one, is I read in the Associated Press just yesterday that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Chairman OBEY, announced that the House will not consider a single appropriations bill this year. If that was true, this will be the first time in at least 22 years, maybe ever, that the House has failed to consider a single appropriation bill in any given session.

The committee has passed five bills that are out of full committee ready to go to the floor: Homeland Security; Military Construction; Energy and Water; Commerce, Justice, Science; and Financial Services. And I guess I'm asking my friend to verify whether or not the chairman's view on this is the view of the majority, and if we would expect not to see any appropriations bills on the floor.

And you can take this question in whatever order in July, in August, or as he said, this year.

And I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I cannot confirm, because I haven't seen the report on that, nor has the chairman told me that he made such an announcement. I did read an article in which he indicated that he thought that might be the case.

As you know, he tried to move the Labor-Health bill through to markup

through the full committee, and as you know, the ranking member moved to substitute the Interior bill rather than do the Labor-Health bill.

The chairman believed he was pursuing the regular order. I have never seen, in the 23 years that I served on the Appropriations Committee, one of the appropriations bills substituted for another one of the appropriations bills in the appropriations process.

So a lot of unusual things are happening, unfortunately. And we haven't been pursuing regular order. I lament that, personally. I think that we ought to do that.

I will say that last year, as you know, we passed every appropriations bill through the House of Representatives by the August break. We had some difficulty at the end doing that, but we got them all passed. And we passed them all in the year, in the calendar year that we were supposed to pass them, not in the fiscal year, in December. As you know in a number of years we didn't do that until the following year: nine one year, eight the other passed in January, the end of January or the middle of February, as I recall, 2 years. I forget whether it was 2004 and 2005 or 2005 and 2006.

So I share the gentlemen's concern. I think both sides share the concern that the appropriations process is not proceeding in the regular order. But I want to say to the gentleman that from my perspective, I have not concluded that we're not going to consider any appropriations bills on the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. I just suggest, the statement I read, and perhaps it was not accurate, but it seemed like an incredibly definitive statement on the part of the chairman; and since this is the work that the Congress has to do to fund the government, I would assume that the chairman will soon be conferring with the leader and the Speaker to determine if bills are coming to the floor or not.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that?

Mr. BLUNT. I would

Mr. HOYER. Thank you.

Senator REID in the other body has made it pretty clear that he does not believe, again, given the failure to pursue regular order in the Senate, that he will be able to get any bills passed, the Senate appropriations bills.

So one of the factors under consideration by Mr. OBEY is that if the Senate is not going to consider any bills, that because they cannot get the bills through the House and to the President—of course, the President sent down a number, said, If you go over that number, I'm going to veto all of the bills anyway. And we had real difficulty last year, as you know, with that happening. That's not happened in my career before. I don't mean that a President hasn't indicated he would veto, but there was always room to work on that.

But that is one of the complicating factors or two of the complicating fac-

tors: the President's position and the Senate's position as well.

But I think the major problem is that the regular order Mr. OBEY did not feel was being pursued in the committee.

Mr. BLUNT. We might ask Mr. OBEY what his views might be about his bills that are already through the committee in regular order and why those five bills couldn't come to the House.

You know, we have, in the years of our majority, always with an open rule, taken substantial time. It seemed to me 1 year we took five full days of hearing amendments on the Labor HHS bill and other bills, numerous bills at a time.

The evaluation of last year, the House passed its bills, but at the end of the day, we had one vote on one big bill which may not have been nearly as healthy as having nine individual votes and then having to carry three bills over into the next year to get them done one at a time. But that's not really the question.

The question is what about the bills that are out of the committee now and what would be a violation of any regular order problem to bring those to the House and take the time that we clearly have? We're passing a lot of legislation off the House floor, but not very much of it winds up on the President's desk. If we begin to determine the House schedule based on what the Senate is willing to do and a bill that can get to the President, not much of what we've done in the last several weeks really had much impact.

But I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I would not agree with the gentleman. After all, we did pass the Iraq funding, we passed a very substantive supplemental, we passed a GI bill, we passed an unemployment insurance extension. We passed an energy bill last year signed by the President. I think much of what we passed in our '06 that was passed, that got through the Senate, was signed by the President and supported by a significant number of Republicans.

Furthermore, let me just remind you, and I'm sure you recall this, that we took 50 hours longer to do the appropriations bills last year than we did in 2006 when your side was in charge. And we had extensive debate. We had 10 open bills, open rules, and we had two rules at the end, because it was clear that we were having great difficulty getting our bills done in a time cramp. Even under those bills, we spent hours debating them. We spent 17 hours on the Homeland Security bill, for instance, and 12 hours on the Labor-Health bill on the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. If we don't deal with any bills this year, I guess our average is going to go down quickly. If we had 12 hours on Labor H last year and zero this year, I guess for this Congress we will say we spent an average of 6 hours debating the bills because one of them never got debated at all.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to get too testy, and you and I are good friends.

Mr. BLUNT. We are.

Mr. HOYER. But very frankly, it was not a process that we thought was very substantive last year, and every indication that we have received this year, it is not going to be very substantive this year when we consider appropriation bills.

Now, having said that, we didn't pursue the regular order on the Labor-Health bill. The gentleman is correct there are five bills which have passed, and I would reiterate that I have not yet, from my standpoint, concluded that we're not going to consider appropriation bills on the floor this year.

So I want to make it clear. I'm not sure exactly what Mr. OBEY announced. There was an article that said I was supporting Mr. OBEY's position. I went a little further. What I supported of Mr. OBEY's position was that regular order was not being followed in the appropriations committee, not the representation that you say he made with reference to no bills coming to the floor.

I think he's correct that regular order is not being pursued, and very frankly—and I'm going to talk to you about that, talk to my friend about this, because I think it is unfortunate that we have come to this place where the consideration of these bills last year became very politicized, and this year the announcement clearly was very early on out of your conference or your retreat and subsequently that it wasn't going to be a very happy process this year. I don't mean an agreement process. No reason why there should be an agreement. But Mr. OBEY has concerns that it would simply be impossible for him to get the bills through.

Mr. BLUNT. He's a capable man, and I'm sure he can figure out a way.

So I would like to close by saying we would like to see at least the bills that are through the full committee on the floor and would hope that the energy bills that the gentleman is looking at can come to the floor with a rule that allows a substantial and full debate on this critical problem of both gas prices at the pump now and home heating and other things that are going to quickly become problems for Americans.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 14, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Madam 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.

CONGRATULATING SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE EDWARDS

Mr. HOYER. Before I ask for the next unanimous consent, let me say how pleased I am that Congresswoman EDWARDS, I think this is her first time in