

NOT VOTING—22

Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Istook	Slaughter
Doyle	Jenkins	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McKinney	Strickland
Forbes	McNulty	Tiahrt
Green (WI)	Nussle	Wexler
Gutierrez	Ros-Lehtinen	
Hinchev	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1509

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 93, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

AYES—317

Aderholt	Coble	Harris
Akin	Cole (OK)	Hart
Alexander	Conaway	Hayes
Allen	Cooper	Hayworth
Bachus	Costa	Hefley
Baird	Costello	Hensarling
Baker	Cramer	Herger
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Herseth
Barrow	Crowley	Higgins
Bartlett (MD)	Cubin	Hobson
Barton (TX)	Cuellar	Hoekstra
Bass	Culberson	Holt
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hooley
Beauprez	Davis (CA)	Hostettler
Berry	Davis (KY)	Hulshof
Biggert	Davis (TN)	Hunter
Bilbray	Davis, Tom	Hyde
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Inglis (SC)
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Issa
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Jefferson
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Jindal
Blackburn	Dent	Johnson (CT)
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Boehler	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Doggett	Jones (OH)
Bonilla	Doallittle	Kanjorski
Bonner	Drake	Kaptur
Bono	Duncan	Keller
Boozman	Edwards	Kelly
Boren	Ehlers	Kennedy (MN)
Boswell	Emanuel	King (IA)
Boucher	Emerson	King (NY)
Boustany	English (PA)	Kingston
Boyd	Etheridge	Kirk
Bradley (NH)	Everett	Kline
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Kuhl (NY)
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	LaHood
Brown (SC)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Langevin
Brown-Waite,	Ford	Lantos
Ginny	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Burgess	Fox	Larson (CT)
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Buyer	Gallely	Leach
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Levin
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Cannon	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Cantor	Gingrey	Linder
Capito	Gohmert	Lipinski
Cardin	Goode	Lowe
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Lucas
Carter	Gordon	Lungren, Daniel
Case	Granger	E.
Castle	Graves	Lynch
Chabot	Green, Al	Maloney
Chandler	Green, Gene	Manzullo
Chocola	Gutknecht	Marchant
Cleaver	Hall	Marshall
Clyburn	Harman	Matheson

McCarthy	Pence
McCaul (TX)	Peterson (MN)
McCullum (MN)	Peterson (PA)
McCotter	Petri
McCrary	Pickering
McHugh	Pitts
McIntyre	Platts
McKeon	Pomeroy
McMorris	Price (GA)
Meehan	Price (NC)
Meek (FL)	Pryce (OH)
Meeks (NY)	Putnam
Melancon	Radanovich
Mica	Rahall
Michaud	Ramstad
Millender-	Regula
McDonald	Rehberg
Miller (FL)	Reichert
Miller (MI)	Renzi
Miller (NC)	Reynolds
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)
Mollohan	Rogers (KY)
Moore (KS)	Rogers (MI)
Moore (WI)	Ross
Moran (KS)	Royce
Moran (VA)	Ruppersberger
Murphy	Ryan (OH)
Murtha	Ryun (KS)
Musgrave	Sabo
Myrick	Salazar
Neugebauer	Sanders
Northup	Saxton
Norwood	Schmidt
Nunes	Schwartz (PA)
Oberstar	Schwarz (MI)
Obey	Scott (GA)
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner
Osborne	Shadegg
Otter	Shaw
Oxley	Shays
Pallone	Sherman
Pascarell	Sherwood
Payne	Shimkus
Pearce	Shuster
Pelosi	Simmons

NOES—93

Abercrombie	Hastings (WA)
Ackerman	Holden
Andrews	Honda
Baca	Hoyer
Baldwin	Inslee
Becerra	Israel
Berkley	Jackson (IL)
Berman	Jackson-Lee
Brown, Corrine	(TX)
Capps	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)
Carnahan	Kildee
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)
Clay	Kind
Conyers	Kolbe
Cummings	Kucinich
Davis (IL)	Lee
DeLahunt	LoBiondo
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe
Dreier	Mack
Engel	Markey
Eshoo	Matsui
Farr	McDermott
Finler	McGovern
Flake	McKinney
Foley	Miller, George
Fossella	Nadler
Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Gibbons	Neal (MA)
Gonzalez	Ney
Grijalva	Olver
Hastings (FL)	Owens

NOT VOTING—22

Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Istook	Slaughter
Doyle	Jenkins	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McHenry	Strickland
Forbes	McNulty	Tiahrt
Green (WI)	Nussle	Wexler
Gutierrez	Ros-Lehtinen	
Hinchev	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1518

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at a funeral for a family member of my staff I was unavoidably detained from voting on H.R. 4411, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage and “nay” on the passage of the Berkley/Conyers/Wexler amendment. I support passage of H.R. 4411 in the Judiciary Committee and I continue to support efforts to rein in the proliferation of internet gambling.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if I were present for today's vote on rollcall 363, passage of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act of 2006, I would have voted “aye”. In addition, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall 361, the amendment offered by Ms. BERKLEY, because I feel it would have undermined the intent of the legislation. I also would have opposed rollcall 362, the motion to recommit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today, due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote 360 and 361, “yea” on rollcall vote 362 and “no” on rollcall vote 363.

CELEBRATING ADVANCEMENT VIA INDIVIDUAL DETERMINATION'S 25 YEARS OF SUCCESS

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 576) celebrating Advancement Via Individual Determination's 25 years of success, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 576

Whereas Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) has provided academic and motivational support that has enabled more than 95 percent of the over 257,000 underperforming students who have been in its program to go on to college;

Whereas Advancement Via Individual Determination has grown over 25 years to more than 2,200 middle and high schools in 36 States and Department of Defense schools in 15 countries;

Whereas Advancement Via Individual Determination started in 1980 with one teacher and 32 high school students in San Diego, California, and developed into an easily replicated program that promotes academic success;

Whereas students are selected because they are low-income, first-generation, college-going students who are underperforming academically;

Whereas college students support the program with individual academic coaching;

Whereas students are required to take a rigorous, college preparatory curriculum including advanced level courses;

Whereas the program provides SAT/ACT preparation, college information and financial aid assistance, college visits, and motivational experiences;

Whereas at the end of the first college year, 89 percent of Advancement Via Individual Determination students are fully eligible and do enroll for their sophomore year

compared to a national average of 50 percent; and

Whereas over 98,000 teachers and administrators have attended training in the high-quality teaching skills that support Advancement Via Individual Determination students: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Advancement Via Individual Determination students and their teachers on increasing college eligibility and attendance; and

(2) celebrates Advancement Via Individual Determination's 25 years of success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 576.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 576, celebrating the success of the Advancement Via Individual Determination program, also known as AVID.

AVID began in one classroom in 1980, and has now trained more than 98,000 educators and nearly 260,000 student alumni. Fortunately, AVID is beginning to spread to the East Coast, and has already reached five schools in my home State of Delaware.

The accomplishments of AVID extend beyond the growth and expansion of the program. AVID seeks to help underachieving students by providing them with the support they need to take challenging classes and go on to college. School officials select average students making Cs and Ds, but have the potential to do better, and then place them in honors and college-prep classes with academic and motivational support. Over the past 25 years, more than 95 percent of the almost 260,000 students who have participated in the program have gone to college.

AVID takes strong evidence of what we know to be true about closing the achievement gap and provides it for those students who not only need the assistance, but also want it. In addition to providing assistance and guidance to help students achieve, the program drives success by promoting rigorous standards, coupled with professional development not only for teachers, but also for school and district administrators. These are key components to any successful education program.

Over the course of the past several years, there has been a growing debate surrounding our high schools. There is

much to do, but I am thrilled by the response from all levels of government, as well as the private sector. Some of what we have heard about the struggles in our high schools is exactly what AVID embraces, the notion that there is a silent majority, average students who do okay in ordinary classes. The fear of failure often steers them away from more challenging course work or from seeking a postsecondary degree. I commend AVID for recognizing this need 25 years ago, and I commend those school districts that have incorporated the program into their schools.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for bringing this program to my attention, and I congratulate our Delaware schools and students who participate. Here is to another 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to take this time to recognize a tremendous and extremely valuable asset to public education in the United States that began in my city of San Diego in 1980. The Advancement Via Individual Determination, or AVID, program has helped hundreds of thousands of underachieving middle and high school students across the United States learn the study habits and the skills needed to get into college and graduate; and for many of them to be the first in their family to go to college and to graduate.

A teacher at Clairemont High School, Mary Catherine Swanson, created AVID because she wanted to find a way to help students tap their true potential and help them achieve academic success. The program emphasizes individual achievement, while teaching sound study skills and new study habits. AVID also encourages goal setting, and works to lift self-expectations and self-esteem in students so they can rise to the challenge.

Mary Catherine Swanson recently retired, and now is the perfect time to celebrate what she accomplished for education through the AVID program. While overseeing the program for 25 years, AVID went from one classroom in San Diego to over 2,300 middle and high schools in 36 States and 15 nations abroad. Nearly 260,000 students have benefited tremendously from its ground-breaking teaching methods, encouraging time management, sound study habits, self-confidence, and hard work.

These students enroll in the toughest classes, such as AP courses, and are given the support and resources to rise to the challenge through AVID. Amazingly, over 95 percent of those who complete the AVID program attend college, and 89 percent of these students return for their sophomore year.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to choose from the thousands of success stories produced by AVID. The program helped

U.S. Olympic athlete Joanna Hayes earn the grades and develop the study habits needed to attend UCLA. Joanna then went on to win the Gold in the 100-Meter Hurdle event at the 2004 Summer Olympics in Greece, and she attributes her success in part to the discipline she learned from AVID.

Another great story is that of AVID student Truong-Son Vinh, who earned degrees in engineering and applied math from the University of California at San Diego after high school. Vinh came to the United States as a boy when his family fled Vietnam after it fell to the North in the 1970s, and he went on to apply his knowledge and skills working for NASA.

There are thousands of success stories. AVID students have gone on to earn advanced degrees in all key subjects and disciplines.

I want to thank Mary Catherine Swanson for having a vision and working hard to implement this vision beginning with one classroom and 32 students at Clairemont High. And I want to thank the teachers and the tutors for their dedication, and also recognize the students who had the courage to take on the rigorous academic track required by AVID, and who had the desire to go on one day and find success in college.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman CASTLE, for his efforts on behalf of this resolution, and also I would like to thank Chairman McKEON and House leadership for bringing House Res. 576 to the floor today.

If we are to eliminate the achievement gap in the United States and remain competitive globally, I believe we need to build upon the programs that have proven success, encouraging and inspiring hard work in academics. AVID is clearly one of these programs, and I know it will continue its tradition of success in the years to come.

Finally, as we look at the No Child Left Behind reauthorization and how we can improve it, I believe it is more than worthwhile to look at programs such as AVID. AVID provides the strong and uniform training techniques to those who oversee it in schools across the Nation. It sets high standards for both its instructors and its students.

AVID is not about one community or one region, but a national push to encourage strong academic standards, and provides the accountability and support to back up those standards. It further gives the students the support they need both academically and socially to achieve in difficult classes.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of this resolution today and encourage my colleagues to learn from this highly successful program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to thank the gentlewoman from California. It is her initiative that brings us here to the floor today to recognize this excellent program, and I encourage everyone to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 576, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) authorizing the printing and binding of a supplement to, and revised edition of, Senate Procedure, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRINTING OF SUPPLEMENT TO, AND REVISED EDITION OF, SENATE PROCEDURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following documents shall be prepared under the supervision of Alan Frumin, Parliamentarian and Parliamentarian Emeritus of the Senate, and shall be printed and bound as a Senate document:

(1) A supplement to “Riddick’s Senate Procedure”, to be styled “Frumin’s Supplement to Riddick’s Senate Procedure”.

(2) A revised edition of “Riddick’s Senate Procedure”, to be styled “Frumin’s Senate Procedure”.

(b) COPIES.—One thousand five hundred copies of each document described in subsection (a) shall be printed for distribution to Senators and for the use of the Senate.

The Senate joint resolution 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.

□ 1530

APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 86) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 86

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

Section 9(b)(3) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking “three years” and inserting “six years”.

SEC. 2. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or July 26, 2006, whichever occurs first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 86. According to the State Department, the Burmese military regime has resisted all international pressure to enact meaningful political reforms and create true democracy. In response, for many years now, the United States has imposed sanctions, including banning all imports from Burma. Additionally, we have prohibited exportation of financial services from the United States to Burma and have targeted the regime itself by freezing certain assets.

Today the passage of this resolution is necessary to extend for 1 year the import restrictions enacted within the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. On February 7, 2006, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Christopher Hill, testified that these sanctions are “an essential component of our strategy.” He went on to say that “they serve as a constant reminder to the regime, and everyone else concerned with Burma, that its behavior is unacceptable, and that regime leaders will remain international pariahs as long as they continue this behavior.”

As chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, I do not support trade sanctions lightly. However, Burma has not taken the necessary steps to warrant lifting these sanctions. The Burmese regime claims it is implementing its so-called road map to democracy, but in truth it is taking no such steps.

The State Department has found that the delegates charged with creating the constitution that this democracy would be built upon are all hand-picked supporters of the current regime. Additionally, pro-democracy advocates remain imprisoned, and military conflicts continue with internal groups.

Perhaps most disturbing are reports that Burma’s human rights record con-

tinues to worsen. In 2005, security forces in the country continued to rape and murder Burmese citizens, force them into slave labor, and compel people into serving in militia units to defend the regime that they abhor.

Since enactment of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, the Treasury Department has blocked over \$16.8 million in transactions and frozen hundreds of thousands of dollars of assets belonging to the Burmese regime. The vast majority of democratic opposition within Burma supports the continuation of these sanctions and even welcomes additional actions.

It is now incumbent upon all of us to ensure that the “essential component” Assistant Secretary Hill referenced remains in place until this murderous regime yields to the desire of its citizens to be free. To back down now would send the wrong message to the military regime in Burma as well as the international community. Most importantly, it would send the wrong message to those pro-democracy advocates within Burma fighting for the freedom of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in supporting this important measure and vote “aye” on H.J. Res. 86.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 86, a resolution extending trade sanctions against Burma.

It is imperative that the United States continue sanctions against Burma so as to maintain pressure on the government of Burma to end its brutal repression against the Burmese people.

The government of Burma’s litany of abuses is appalling. According to the U.S. State Department and human rights organizations, the government of Burma has continued to arrest and imprison supporters of democracy for alleged political offenses. Over 1,100 persons remain in jail today for their political beliefs.

Earlier this year, the government of Burma extended the detention of Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the National League of Democracy, a pro-democracy party, and her deputy. Aung San Suu Kyi has spent 10 of the last 17 years in confinement.

Burmese security forces regularly monitor the movement and communication of residents, search homes without warrants, and relocate people without compensation or legal recourse. The government of Burma has failed to crack down on trafficking in persons; and, in fact, the government of Burma has sanctioned the use of forced labor. In fact, the government of Burma has supported the use of forced labor for large infrastructure projects, forced children to join the Burmese Army, imprisoned individuals who have communicated with the International Labor Organization on the subject of forced labor.