

Wasserman	Welch (VT)	Wolf
Schultz	Weller	Woolsey
Waters	Wexler	Wu
Watson	Whitfield	Wynn
Watt	Wicker	Yarmuth
Waxman	Wilson (NM)	Young (AK)
Weiner	Wilson (OH)	Young (FL)

NAYS—108

Aderholt	Foxx	Mica
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Musgrave
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Myrick
Bilirakis	Goode	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Blackburn	Granger	Pence
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bonner	Heller	Poe
Boozman	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Boustany	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Radanovich
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Cannon	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Keller	Sali
Carter	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kingston	Sessions
Coble	Klaine (MN)	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Simpson
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Latham	Souder
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Culberson	Linder	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Thornberry
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Tiahrt
Deal (GA)	E.	Tiberi
Dreier	Mack	Walberg
Duncan	Manzullo	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McCarthy (CA)	Westmoreland
Fallin	McCrery	Wilson (SC)
Flake	McHenry	
Forbes	McKeon	

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marchant
Berman	Doggett	Millender-
Boehner	Emanuel	McDonald
Bono	Eshoo	Moore (WI)
Boren	Feeney	Neugebauer
Calvert	Hayes	Nunes
Camp (MI)	Hunter	Tancredo
Davis, David	Larson (CT)	

□ 1418

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 133, 134, and 135 earlier today, March 9, 2007. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on the Baker Amendment—rollcall 133, “aye” on the Motion to Recommit—rollcall 134, and “nay” on Final Passage of H.R. 720—rollcall 135.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Friday, March 9, 2007, to vote on rollcall votes Nos. 132, 133, 134, and 135, due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall vote No. 132 on H. Res. 229, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 720—Water Quality Financing Act of 2007; “nay” on rollcall vote No. 133, on the amend-

ment to H.R. 720, to strike the Davis-Bacon section of the bill; “yea” on rollcall vote No. 134, on a motion to recommit H.R. 720 with instructions; and “yea” on rollcall vote No. 135, on the final passage of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Friday, March 9, 2007, 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 132—“nay”; rollcall 133—“aye”; rollcall 134—“aye”; and rollcall 135—“nay.”

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 202, 110th Congress, 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 Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming:

Mr. MARKEY, Massachusetts, Chairman

- Mr. BLUMENAUER, Oregon
- Mr. INSLEE, Washington
- Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
- Ms. SOLIS, California
- Ms. HERSETH, South Dakota
- Mr. CLEAVER, Missouri
- Mr. HALL, New York
- Mr. MCNERNEY, California
- Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
- Mr. SHADEGG, Arizona
- Mr. WALDEN, Oregon
- Mr. SULLIVAN, Oklahoma
- Mrs. BLACKBURN, Tennessee
- Mrs. MILLER, Michigan

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Dear Madam Speaker, Given my pending appointment to the House Committee on Financial Services, I hereby tender my resignation from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Sincerely,

KENNY MARCHANT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. CURTIS, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 342. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the “Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse”.

H.R. 544. An act to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the “Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse”.

H.R. 584. An act to designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the “Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building”.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the re-appointment of Guy Rocha of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

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, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about next week’s schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the minority whip for yielding. On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. There will be no votes, Madam Speaker, on Monday before 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour business, and noon for legislative business. We will consider additional bills under suspension of the rules, and a complete list of those bills for the week will be announced by the close of business today.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. We will consider several important pieces of open government and accountability legislation from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee: H.R. 1309, the Freedom of Information Act and amendments; H.R. 1255, Presidential Records Act Amendments; H.R. 1254, Presidential Library Donation Reform Act; H.R. 985, Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act; and H.R. 1362, Accountability in Contracting Act.

Notwithstanding everybody is requesting to meet next Friday, we are not going to do that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for sticking with his earlier decision on next Friday, in spite of what I am sure must have been the incredible pressure for us to be here next Friday; and we will try to get our work done.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Nobody in the House, other than yourself and Mr. BOEHNER, know that pressure more than I.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the gentleman’s view of that, and he is right. I do share it. I would ask the gentleman, on the supplemental that has been described in concept this week, when

would we expect to see language on the supplemental?

Mr. HOYER. The supplemental I expect to be marked up in committee. We have moved it one week, as the gentleman knows, as we have worked on trying to get language that is appropriate language from the perspective of the committee. And Mr. OBEY has been working very hard on that, as have others. I expect that to be marked up next week, and I expect the language to be available early next week.

Mr. BLUNT. And the gentleman then would expect it to be on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. You expect it to be on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. I believe that is the week of the 19th.

Mr. BLUNT. That would be the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. Yes, sir. I expect the supplemental to be on the floor the week of the 19th, and then we are very hopeful that the budget will be on the floor the week of the 26th.

Mr. BLUNT. And as an appropriations bill, does the gentleman anticipate that we will have opportunities to amend that bill on the floor?

Mr. HOYER. We don't know that yet. We are discussing that. I don't know yet.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would just say before I move to my next question, of course, this is, as we all know, an important and at the same time controversial piece of legislation, and we would hope for a full debate and an opportunity to have a chance to amend the bill on the floor.

The leader also announced, I believe, this week, maybe it was late last week, that we should anticipate seeing legislation on the floor within the month on allowing the Delegate from D.C. to vote on the floor. I wonder if the leader could tell us a little more about his idea on what this proposal would include.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question. As you know, I feel very strongly that the representative of the District of Columbia should have full voting membership in the House of Representatives, as does the representative in parliament of, I believe, every other capital of every other democracy in the world, except for the District of Columbia.

I expect that legislation, and hope that legislation, will be on the floor before we adjourn for the Easter work period, which would probably mean the week of the 26th. The legislation is the legislation, as you know, that is sponsored by Mr. DAVIS, TOM DAVIS, the Republican former chairman of your campaign committee, but more importantly, the former chairman of the Government Reform Committee, and cosponsored by Mrs. NORTON, the representative of the District of Columbia.

I would expect that legislation to include, as the original legislation included, an additional Member from Utah and full voting rights being extended, and full membership as a full Member, both of the new Utah Representative, but also of the Representative of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLUNT. Does the gentleman know when that legislation was designed to take effect? After the next election? I am not familiar with the specifics of that legislation. Certainly I do know that Mr. DAVIS was the sponsor.

Mr. HOYER. The hearings I expect to be held next week, I believe. Hearings and markup, I think, will be next week, so I can't tell you exactly, obviously, because it hasn't been marked up yet. But it is my contemplation that there would be a special election in the case of the District of Columbia Representative, and in the case of the Utah Representative.

As we all know, the only way you can get to be a Member of this House is to be elected. There are no appointments to this, so that we would contemplate providing for a special election for both.

Mr. BLUNT. In our Constitution, as the gentleman knows, the District was established differently than most capitals and, I am sure, has developed in a different way than was anticipated at the time.

But when Presidential voting rights were extended to the District, the Constitution had to be amended to do that.

Would the gentleman anticipate that this would also require a constitutional amendment since the District is not part of any State?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you know, Mr. DAVIS is the author of this bill. He had extensive hearings on this bill, as you know, in the last Congress; reported this bill out in the last Congress. It was never brought to the floor, but it was reported out.

And as you know, it was Mr. DAVIS' and the committee's conclusion that this could be effected by legislation, as has been the admission of States to the Union, and the admission, therefore, of new voting Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Now, I don't represent that there is not another view as to whether or not you can do this statutorily or whether you need to do it constitutionally. But I can tell you, as you well know, that it was Mr. DAVIS' conclusion, the committee's conclusion, under his leadership when your party was in control of the House, and it was the conclusion of the committee that it could be done statutorily, and we are proceeding on that theory.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would caution the gentleman on that theory. As high a regard as I have for Mr. DAVIS, and it is high, I have certainly never consid-

ered him to be the ultimate authority on the Constitution. And, of course, when you allow States to enter the Union, as the Constitution provides for, you have the requisite number of Members of the House and two Members of the Senate.

And the major question I am sure I will have during that debate and later will be exactly what State is Washington, D.C. part of, since the Constitution specifically says that Members of the House are selected by the various States.

I think there is a constitutional question here, and that is one of the reasons that, when we were in the majority, that Mr. DAVIS' bill didn't come to the floor. And I think there will be, should be, a constitutional remedy, if there is a remedy.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield before we go on to a different subject?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I would ask my friend, would the gentleman be for a constitutional amendment if such an amendment were brought to the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. I might be for whatever it took to return the voting rights for the Member of Congress to a State that is represented by two Senators which, of course, would be, I would assume, your State.

I don't know that I would be for an amendment that would allow somebody to be represented uniquely that doesn't have Senatorial representation, and, of course, you are assuming that it would be inside the Constitution. I do think that would be the way to do it.

And while the population of the District may allow it to have a population similar to the districts that are represented by the average Member in terms of population, the Constitution, to me, appears to be very explicit on the question of Representatives of a State.

Half of the original District of Columbia, as the gentleman knows, was returned to the State of Virginia in, I believe, the 1840s. They are represented by a Member of Congress, and maybe more than one, and they are represented by two Senators, the Senators from Virginia. That appears to me to be a remedy that would be well within the Constitution. But this proposal that Mr. DAVIS and others have made, I think, will have a significant constitutional hurdle to overcome.

The other question I would direct to the gentleman is on the budget itself. When does the majority expect that we will see a markup in committee of the budget resolution, and when would that resolution be on the floor?

Mr. HOYER. I would expect a markup, certainly this is the target for markup, the week of the 19th and on the floor the week of the 26th.

Mr. BLUNT. So you are anticipating, if I could refresh my mind here to the gentleman's comments, that both the supplemental appropriations bill and the budget will be marked up during the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. No, I expect the supplemental to be marked up in committee next week.

Mr. BLUNT. Next week. And on the floor the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. And on the floor the week of the 19th.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, it is a good thing I clarified that in my mind.

Mr. HOYER. So you would have on the week of the 19th the supplemental and on the week of the 26th the budget on the floor.

□ 1430

Mr. BLUNT. As I recall, that is exactly what the leader suggested, and now I have that straight in my mind, and those will be weeks that we would hope to have a full debate and important debate for the country.

I thank my friend for the information he has provided.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

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 (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota). 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. Madam 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.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SPECIALIST BLAKE HARRIS

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, yesterday we resumed reading the names of our servicemembers on this House floor that have paid the ultimate sacrifice in this war. To date, 3,188 American servicemembers have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I am greatly saddened today to add the name of Specialist Blake Harris to that list of the fallen soldiers.

Specialist Harris was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 12th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

Specialist Harris died on Monday, March 5, in Baqubah, Iraq, of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his patrol.

Blake Harris was born and raised in Pueblo, Colorado. He was a 2002 graduate of Pueblo South High School.

In Pueblo, Blake leaves behind a loving wife, Joanna; a 2-year-old son, Jonah; and his mother, Deborah Harris. He is also survived by his father, John Harris of Denver.

Madam Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his family and friends who have suffered this loss, and I pray for their comfort and strength in their time of greatest need.

Specialist Harris was a proud and courageous soldier whose story must never be forgotten. Blake Harris was 22 years old.

Madam Speaker, I submit this recognition to the United States House of Representatives in honor of his sacrifice so that the memory of Blake Harris may live on forever.

CALLING FOR REAL BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon in western North Carolina, a routine traffic stop netted 11 illegal immigrants. How do we know they were illegal? Because when they were asked for identification, they presented their Mexican voting card; and when asked by the sheriff's deputy whether or not they were illegal, they said, "yes."

The sheriff's deputy called the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency in Charlotte, North Carolina, to which the reply was, "We are sorry; we can't pick them up." So the sheriff's deputy let them go on their way. According to the illegal immigrants, 11 in the car, they were going to New York City to get a job.

This shows in real form the need for real border security and real border enforcement. It also shows the need for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency to get with the times, to get rid of this bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., that is hamstringing the agents in the field, to increase their budget.

And, Madam Speaker, I call on the House of Representatives to act to make sure that we have more border enforcement agents and Customs agents in this Nation to make sure a travesty like this never happens again.

PEACHCARE IV

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I rise for the third time this week to speak about Georgia's PeachCare crisis.

This Sunday, in just 2 days, PeachCare closes its doors to new enrollees. And if funding shortages continue, it will close its doors to all chil-

dren next month. The collapse of PeachCare will leave hundreds of thousands of hardworking Georgia families unable to provide health care for their children.

This Congress and the State of Georgia cannot let this happen. I call on the Governor of Georgia to use available State funds, and there are some that are available, to reinstate new enrollment and to sustain this imperative program until Federal funding can be increased.

PeachCare provides health care for our most precious and most vulnerable population: our children. It simply must be saved.

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.

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

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

CONGRESS MUST NOT INTRUDE ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVINCE OF THE PRESIDENT AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, it has been quite a week here on Capitol Hill with the unveiling by the Democratic majority of their new plan for a fully funded withdrawal from our presence in Iraq.

The contrast that took place yesterday also was quite striking. General Petraeus, our new commander on the ground in Baghdad, had his first meeting this Thursday with the media in Baghdad, describing what our military leaders were doing in the midst of that war-torn country. And at the same time, on the other side of the world, many would-be generals here in Congress were describing their plans for the war in Iraq.

Democratic leaders, according to press releases from the House Appropriations Committee, outlined a plan for veterans' funding in the so-called war supplemental but also a plan that would set a timeline for bringing United States participation in Iraq's war to an end.

Setting very, very specific dates, the leadership, at least at this point, as we know, has outlined a proposal that establishes a timeline that would end U.S. participation in Iraq's civil war by July 1, 2007. If the President does not certify that the troops have met certain specific criteria that has been released to the media, the troops must