

Moran (KS)	Roskam	Sullivan
Moran (VA)	Ross	Sutton
Murphy (CT)	Rothman	Tanner
Murphy, Patrick	Royce	Tauscher
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Taylor
Murtha	Rush	Terry
Musgrave	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Salazar	Thornberry
Neal (MA)	Sánchez, Linda	Tiahrt
Oberstar	T.	Tiberi
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney
Olver	Sarbanes	Towns
Ortiz	Saxton	Tsongas
Pallone	Scalise	Turner
Pascarell	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Pastor	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Payne	Schmidt	Upton
Pearce	Schwartz	Van Hollen
Perlmutter	Scott (GA)	Visclosky
Peterson (NC)	Scott (VA)	Walberg
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Walsh (NY)
Petri	Serrano	Walz (MN)
Pickering	Sessions	Wamp
Platts	Shays	Wasserman
Pomeroy	Sherman	Schultz
Porter	Shimkus	Waters
Price (GA)	Shuler	Watson
Price (NC)	Shuster	Watt
Putnam	Simpson	Waxman
Radanovich	Sires	Weiner
Rahall	Skelton	Welch (VT)
Ramstad	Slaughter	Weller
Rangel	Smith (NE)	Wexler
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield (KY)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Wilson (NM)
Reichert	Smith (WA)	Wilson (OH)
Renzi	Snyder	Wilson (SC)
Reyes	Solis	Wittman (VA)
Richardson	Souder	Wolf
Rodriguez	Space	Woolsey
Rogers (AL)	Speier	Wu
Rogers (KY)	Spratt	Yarmuth
Rogers (MI)	Stark	Young (AK)
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	

NOES—20

Barrett (SC)	Foxx	Neugebauer
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Paul
Campbell (CA)	Garrett (NJ)	Sali
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Tancredo
Carter	Lamborn	Westmoreland
Coble	Lungren, Daniel	
Conaway	E.	
Deal (GA)	Mack	

NOT VOTING—42

Biggert	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Hulshof	Pence
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Pitts
Burgess	Issa	Poe
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Pryce (OH)
Cramer	(TX)	Reynolds
Crowley	King (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Cubin	Kingston	Sestak
Dreier	Lampson	Shadegg
Everett	Marchant	Shea-Porter
Flake	McCrery	Velázquez
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Walden (OR)
Gingrey	Rodgers	Weldon (FL)
Grijalva	McNerney	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1733

Mr. SALI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote 615 on Thursday, September 18, 2008. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” to suspend the rules

and pass H.R. 6460, the Great Lakes Legacy Reauthorization Act of 2008.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 615 I was inadvertently absent. As a representative of a Great Lakes State, a co-sponsor of H.R. 6460, and a strong supporter of the Great Lakes Basin, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, today, September 18, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall 612, “no”; rollcall 613, “no”; rollcall 614, “nay”; rollcall 615, “aye.”

REPORT ON H.R. 6947, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-862) on the bill (H.R. 6947) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BERKLEY). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to my friend, the majority leader, to give us an update on what we intend to do next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the whip for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 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, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by close of business tomorrow. We will also consider H.R. 5244, the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights Act of 2008; the fiscal year 2009 Department of Defense Authorization Act; and a continuing resolution for fiscal year 2009.

In addition, we will consider any bills we get back from the Senate, including an energy tax extender bill, the alternative minimum tax bill, and the mental health parity bill.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman.

On the Department of Defense Authorization Act, would that be a conference report we'd expect?

Mr. HOYER. We're hopeful. As you know, the Senate has passed it but has not, as I understand it, agreed to go to conference. So we may have to just have an informal conference, as I call them, or others call it ping-ponging. In other words, I think Mr. SKELTON and Mr. LEVIN and the ranking members are working to see whether they can agree on a form of the bill that would then pass from here again to them, and they would then pass it finally. It's effectively a conference, but the Senate has not gone to conference. So we can't very well have a conference report if the Senate doesn't go to conference. But both Mr. SKELTON and Mr. LEVIN and I believe the ranking members as well want to get the reauthorization bill done.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. I am tempted to go into the whole topic of the informal conference. It's so frustrating to all of us.

Mr. HOYER. I know you have time constraints that would dictate against that.

Mr. BLUNT. This may very well be the last time, certainly before the election, we have a chance to talk about the work we get done in the next few days, and so I do have some questions, and I won't go there, but I would like to see us get that Defense authorization bill done. I do think it's a shame that we can't do that in an appropriate conference and go through the regular process.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I share his angst about not getting this bill done. As you know, I gave Mr. SKELTON on May 18 of this year to do that bill. The committee brought the bill out on May 18. We passed the bill. It's been in the Senate ever since, and I think we both share a concern that that hasn't been done, but of course, as you know, the Senate just passed it a few days ago, yesterday as a matter of fact.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that.

On your indication the House will and of course has to consider some way to continue funding the government with the fiscal year ending at the end of this month and no appropriation bills passed up until now, we would be considering a continuing resolution next week. Does the gentleman have a sense of whether that would be a continuing resolution with other items on it and what any of those other items might be?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I expect it to be a continuing resolution as opposed to an omnibus, an omnibus, of course, being the cumulative bills put into a very large bill. I don't expect that to be the case. I expect it to be a CR, but I do expect to have additional items on that continuing resolution. The extent of that has not yet been determined. There's a lot of discussion, as I'm sure you're well aware

of discussion on your side as well, about things that people would like to have on the bill.

In addition, there are discussions between the White House and the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY and Mr. Nussle, the OMB director. I have had discussions with the White House about items, some are called anomalies, that is, things that otherwise would have been done if we had done the regular bills, that the White House believes need to be done. There are a number of things that are being discussed of that kind.

In addition, we're going to have discussions about anything that we may need to do in the short term with reference to the extraordinary calamity that has confronted our economy. Whether anything addressing that will be in the CR or not is unclear at this point in time, but that's a possibility.

So I tell the gentleman, it will not be an omnibus in the sense that you and I understand an omnibus and the body understands an omnibus. For the most part, we will probably be looking at spending being at last year's levels for most of the items that we're talking about.

Mr. BLUNT. The House has, I guess, passed one of the 12 appropriations bills. Would the gentleman anticipate that any other bills in addition to that one might be included in the continuing resolution, and if so, which ones might we be looking at?

Mr. HOYER. It is possible, but I think given the time frame that there is some concern about the time it will take to consider more lengthy pieces of legislation would impede getting the CR done. So that there may not be full bills, as I indicated. Obviously we do want to ensure funding of the government. We want to continue further operations of the government, both on the national defense side and the national security side, homeland security side, as well as all other departments of government.

At this point in time, I really can't answer that question, but I can tell you that my belief is at this point in time that we would be largely dealing with bills at last year's level.

Mr. BLUNT. Would the gentleman anticipate that we would be dealing with the continued funding of the government again in this session of Congress? In other words, would the time frame be mid-November or do you anticipate a time frame well into next year?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think mid-November is obviously an option. There have been discussions, as you know, on timing with the White House. I don't know whether you know, but I've had discussions with the White House on timing. I think they're relatively flexible on timing. Nobody has said this time or that time. There is obviously a wide variety of dates being discussed, mid-November being one. The Speaker and I, and I think Senator REID has also ex-

pressed himself on this issue, but the Speaker and I are hoping that we would do a February date or even a March 1 date, so there would be some clarity in where we're going, whoever is elected President.

The date, though, is still obviously not resolved. We will have to discuss that with the White House and see what we can get through the House and the Senate, but November is obviously a possibility.

I will tell the gentleman we will be back here. I hope my office has had these discussions with you. But we're looking at, as we usually do, the week before Thanksgiving, about a week-and-a-half, 10 days after the election, the week of the 17th as the date when we would come back and organize, which would also be a week available for session if it was needed.

I might also add, if I could, further, that we had discussions today and we're all very, very concerned, and you and I are going to be meeting on it later tonight, very concerned with the economic conditions that confront our Nation at this point in time. So we are going to be ready to come back in October, if necessary, depending upon what discussions we have and what, hopefully together, in a bipartisan way, we believe needs to be done to respond to the crisis.

Mr. BLUNT. I'm grateful to have that potential to be back in October, and we have very few scheduled work days from the 1st of August to the end of the year, but clearly this economic situation we're in could very well bring us back.

The gentleman mentioned that list of—we call them here anomalies, but they're really the things that wouldn't necessarily be part of or perhaps should be part of a straight extension of funding. I know one of those on the energy front that's been discussed a lot would be the moratorium on using money to begin the process of leasing and exploration on either the Outer Continental Shelf or the so-called oil shale moratorium in the West. Does the gentleman have a sense of whether those moratoriums would be included in the CR or, as the administration has asked, that they not be included in the CR?

I would yield.

□ 1745

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We've had discussions about this. As I said at my press conference on Tuesday, there have been no discussions about including that moratoria in a CR. I want to make it clear; there haven't been discussions about it that we won't or we will. My expectation is, though, we passed a bill, we think it is a good bill, we think it opens up drilling. And there will be some discussions both on the Senate side—we don't know what the Senate side is going to do with it—and with the White House on that issue.

We've had pretty open discussions with the White House on this issue. I

know there's been a letter signed by a large number on your side about that issue. The White House is obviously sensitive to that, but I don't think that's going to be a stumbling block.

Mr. BLUNT. If it's not there, it won't be a stumbling block for our side, based on the letters you've seen and other things. That's for sure.

Tomorrow, at one point we were believing that some issues could be included in what was being called an economic stimulus package could be on the floor. That's not happening now. Would you see some of those issues also as likely things that might be added to the continuing resolution?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Those are some of the items that, yes, as I said, could well be added to the CR. We're going to have discussions. I'm going to have discussions with your side—with you, in particular—on this issue.

Again, I think there's nobody who wants to shut down government. And there's nobody, frankly, that doesn't want to make sure—for instance, let me give you an example: Unemployment insurance. We're very concerned about people who are going to be running out of their unemployment insurance. If we're not here, we want to make sure that there is authorization for the dollars—that are available, obviously—to be spent for extension benefits for people that run out because they can't find employment in the context in which we are now finding ourselves. So yes, that is possible.

Mr. BLUNT. I would say, just to clarify on that topic, what they would be running out of would be the end of the first 13-week extension on top of the normal unemployment.

Mr. HOYER. That's correct.

Mr. BLUNT. So the unemployment fund would not be running out of money—

Mr. HOYER. That's correct. You would have to authorize the additional 13 weeks.

Mr. BLUNT. But the people who already used one extension, that extension we agreed to 9 or so weeks ago would reach its 13-week conclusion is what the gentleman is discussing?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, sir. We won't be here on that particular date, or week, and therefore, we might have to make accommodations for that.

There are other things, obviously, that we have talked about that we are having concerns about: creating jobs, providing for jobs in our economy. We're doing a lot of investing in, some would say "bailing out" companies that had a whole lot of assets, but now we have people who don't have a whole lot of assets, have lost their home and who are facing heating bills that are spiking up very seriously, facing a tough time buying groceries because grocery prices have spiked, and they may be out of a job.

There are a number of issues that we are concerned about. We have been faced with Lehman Brothers and AIG

and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. But there are a lot of little people who are having equal problems for them, and we want to make sure that we address them, and I know you do as well.

Mr. BLUNT. On that list of things we discussed, I don't know that we have specifically discussed it, but some kind of redefining the previously authorized loans to auto companies could be in that effort of things we look at on the CR?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Redefining, as much as both clarifying what is available, and funding.

As you know, we authorized, in the 2007 bill, \$25 billion in guarantees for modernization to comply with more efficient automobiles, which we believe is a very important aspect of becoming energy independent, reducing the demand for petroleum products. And, yes, that may well be there as well. Hopefully we can get agreement with the administration, your side, and our side on what that ought to be.

Mr. BLUNT. The only specific question I had from a Member right before we started was whether or not, in the suspensions for next week, the Great Lakes Compact could be included in that. I think we sent that message over that I might be asking about that.

Mr. HOYER. It's possible. I'm smiling because—

Mr. BLUNT. I was hoping for a little more definition than that.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that, and I'm sure you would like that. I'm smiling because every time I walk on the floor I have at least 50 Members who ask me if it's possible that a suspension bill will be on the Suspension Calendar next week. We're working to try to get a workable list that both sides can agree with and we can facilitate the passing of policies that are not controversial, but just need time to get done. And so I say it's certainly possible.

Mr. BLUNT. On that issue, it's my understanding, at least, that Chairman OBERSTAR and the Great Lakes delegation is substantially in favor of that. Hopefully that has removed whatever obstacle that we've been dealing with with that issue.

And I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AS ADOPTED MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to suspend the rules relating to the following measures be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Wednesday, September 17, 2008:

House Resolution 1432; H.R. 6681; H.R. 6229; H.R. 6338; S. 171; H.R. 6772; House Resolution 1356; House Concurrent Resolution 408; H.R. 3986; and Senate Joint 35.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, sundry motions to reconsider are laid on the table.

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-148)

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 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2008.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks in New York, in Pennsylvania, and

against the Pentagon committed on September 11, 2001, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2008.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

HONORING COACH DON HASKINS

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor one of the greatest figures in American sports history, a coach who shattered racial barriers and forever changed the game of basketball. He led an all-African American starting lineup to victory against an all-white powerhouse team in the 1966 NCAA Basketball Championship.

Coach Don Haskins, better known to us as The Bear, passed away on Sunday, September 7, in El Paso, Texas at the age of 78. I had the privilege of calling Coach Haskins a friend, and I join all of El Paso and his many fans across the Nation in mourning his passing.

Although he never saw it or intended to be one of the greatest civil rights pioneers in sports, his commitment to playing the most talented athletes regardless of skin color in the 1966 championship was a major turning point in American sports and the civil rights movement.

The landmark game between Texas Western College—which is now proudly known as the University of Texas at El Paso—and the University of Kentucky at that time is often regarded as one of the greatest moments in sports history and the most important game in college basketball.

For those of us from El Paso, Don Haskins was more than just a coach. He was a community icon that put a little known west Texas town in the national spotlight. He was fiercely a loyal supporter and has always been a diehard fan of the University of Texas at El Paso and could be seen often in the stands cheering on his beloved Minors.