

Kanjorski	Millender-	Sanders
Kaptur	McDonald	Schakowsky
Kennedy (RI)	Miller (NC)	Schiff
Kildee	Miller, George	Scott (GA)
Kilpatrick	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kind	Moore	Serrano
Klecza	Murtha	Sherman
Kucinich	Nadler	Slaughter
Lampson	Napolitano	Snyder
Langevin	Neal (MA)	Solis
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Spratt
Lee	Obey	Stark
Levin	Olver	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Stupak
Lipinski	Pallone	Tauscher
Lofgren	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Lowey	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Majette	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Maloney	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Markey	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)
Matsui	Rahall	Van Hollen
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Velazquez
McCollum	Reyes	Visclosky
McDermott	Rodriguez	Watson
McGovern	Rothman	Watt
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	Woolsey
Menendez	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Carson (OK)	Gordon	Smith (WA)
Cole	Houghton	Tierney
DeLay	Jenkins	Toomey
Eshoo	Jantos	Waters
Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1623

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida changed her vote from "aye" to "no." So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 2003 for rollcall votes 252 and 253, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present, on rollcall vote No. 252, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall vote No. 253, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2143.

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

There was no objection.

UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 263 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2143.

□ 1625

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill today. There are going to be several amendments offered. One amendment will be offered as if it is an antigambling amendment. In essence, the amendment will actually bring this bill down. Fifteen years ago, there was gambling in two States, Nevada and New Jersey. Once we in this country moved to what we call convenience gambling, we have seen an increase in crime, corruption, domestic violence, physical abuse, and many other bad things that we Republicans and Democrats do not want to see. The ultimate in what is called "convenience gambling," meaning that you do not have to go very far to gamble, is Internet gambling where you can sit in your own family room in your bathrobe on a rainy weekend and literally go broke in about 24 hours.

There will be an amendment offered that will be sort of viewed as maybe some of the pro-family groups are for it. Let me say I have a letter to the gentleman from Alabama signed by the Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, the Family Research Council, the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, and the National Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches headed by former Democratic Congressman Bob Edgar who served here for many years.

I would ask you, do not support the amendments that will weaken this bill. Internet gambling is beginning to be very corrosive in our society. We have a chance to deal with Internet gambling in the Bachus bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and other Members of the House have put forth. I rise in strong support of the bill. I think this is an opportunity to get control of Internet gambling and to do it in a way that is constructive and positive.

I ask my colleagues, one, support the bill on final passage; but, lastly, do not support any amendments that may ap-

pear on the surface to be good but what will in essence bring down this bill and thereby mean that Internet gambling will never be controlled. Five to 7 percent of the young people in our country are addicted to gambling.

□ 1630

As Internet gambling becomes easier and easier, that addiction rate goes up.

So I hope Members will oppose the amendments that will really bring the bill down, and on final passage do something to help this country, to help the young people, to get control of it, to get control and regulate Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, legislation needed to prevent the use of credit cards, checks, or electronic funds transfers for unlawful Internet gambling. It will be of vital assistance in curbing illegal Internet gambling.

This legislation states in the findings section that: "the National Gambling Impact Study Commission in 1999 recommended the passage of legislation to prohibit wire transfers to Internet gambling sites or the banks which represent them."

As the author of the legislation which established the commission, I am pleased to see that one of its most important recommendations may indeed become law. The spread of Internet gambling means that people can now gamble at the workplace and their homes, around the clock. The unchecked progress of Internet gambling must be curbed.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission report went on to state that gambling can breed bankruptcy, divorce, domestic violence, and physical and emotional problems. Even suicide has been linked to gambling. Often times, even school-aged children—who have never gambled before—are lured into on-line gambling.

H.R. 2143 will establish an enforcement structure that will let federal regulators set up regulations which will limit the acceptance of bank instruments such as credit cards for use in illegal Internet gambling, reducing the chance for gambling to gain a further foothold in our society.

Before I close, let me share with you a story. Donna Kelly, a mother of a 12-year-old daughter and a 7-year-old son developed a gambling problem. At one time there were 13 warrants for her arrest for writing bad checks. Gambling had so wrecked her life that she saw only one option: suicide. Two days before Thanksgiving, she tried to kill herself. She failed, and was placed in a mental hospital. Mrs. Kelly spent Thanksgiving in a mental hospital because of her gambling problem.

Her daughter asked her afterwards, "Momma, why did you try to kill yourself? Do you not love me anymore?" This is the human dimension to gambling. This story illustrates why it is so important to vote for this bill. When you cast your vote today, remember the many lives ruined by gambling, and remember the family members left devastated by their loved ones gambling activities.

Internet gambling is a vast and growing enterprise which can serve as an avenue for money launders and terrorist funding. Gambling also involves great social costs. This bill will reduce access to the medium of the Internet as another forum for inducing people to

gamble. I urge Members to vote for this legislation.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
House of Representatives, Financial Services
Committee Member, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BACHUS: As a diverse bipartisan coalition of family and faith-based organizations, we are very concerned with the effects of gambling on our society and the well-being of young people and families. We write to strongly support the passage of H.R. 2143, To Prevent the Use of Certain Bank Instruments for Unlawful Internet Gambling, and for Other Purposes. Internet Gambling is already against the law in all 50 states, yet offshore gambling interests continue to operate without any accountability and are available in every state by utilizing the Internet. We urge you to support H.R. 2143 and reject any amendment or proposal which would weaken the bill or hinder its enforcement according to current federal law.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission Report presents a disturbing and devastating picture of the effect of gambling on families. Some critical points to consider in the report as it relates to Internet gambling are:

Gambling costs society \$5 billion a year in societal costs including job loss, unemployment benefits, welfare benefits, poor physical and mental health, and problem or pathological gambling treatment, bankruptcy, arrests, imprisonment, legal fees for divorce, and so forth.

Because the Internet can be used anonymously, the danger exists that access to Internet gambling will be abused by underage gamblers, our children and youth.

The high-speed instant gratification of Internet games and the high level of privacy they offer may exacerbate problem and pathological gambling.

Lack of accountability also raises the potential for criminal activities, which can occur in several ways. First, there is the possibility of abuse by gambling operators. Most Internet service providers hosting Internet gambling operations are physically located offshore; as a result, operators can alter, move, or entirely remove sites within minutes. Furthermore, gambling on the Internet provides an easy means for money laundering. Internet gambling provides anonymity, remote access, and encrypted data. To launder money, a person need only deposit money into an offshore account, use those funds to gamble, lose a small percent of the original funds, then cash out the remaining funds. Through the dual protection of encryption and anonymity, much of this activity can take place undetected.

Computer hackers or gambling operators may tamper with gambling software to manipulate games to their benefit. Unlike the physical world of highly regulated resort-destination casinos, assessing the integrity of Internet operators is quite difficult.

Please support H.R. 2143 and reject the spread of a predatory industry, which is contrary to the well-being of individuals and all of society.

Sincerely,

Christian Coalition of America, Concerned Women for America, Family Research Council, General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, National Council of Christians.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2143, the unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. I thank

the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for all of the hard work he has done on this particular piece of legislation, for working with me and the rest of the subcommittee.

This bill is really about enforcing what is already illegal activity. I have had several people come up to me and say, well, what does this bill really do? What this bill really does, it takes what is already illegal, it makes nothing more illegal or nothing less illegal, it takes what is already illegal and tries to enforce that law.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, for the opportunity to manage the debate for the Democratic Caucus. He and I do not see eye to eye on this legislation, but I appreciate and respect the fact that we agreed to disagree, and I welcome healthy debate on the topic of illegal Internet gambling.

I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2143, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Financial Services in March. Actions taken recently by the Committee on the Judiciary served to weaken this bill in such a way as to throw into question whether the bill would still adequately preserve the Federal law and protect States rights when it comes to regulating Internet gambling. Today's legislation will reduce that uncertainty by moving forward with the financial services-related provisions of H.R. 2143, which would serve as a core purpose of the bill to shut off that financial spigot to the illegal offshore casino sites.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a minute about what that financial spigot looks like. It is currently around \$6 billion a year. None of that contributes to the United States economy. There are between 1,500 and 2,000 offshore Internet gambling sites. Unlawful Internet gambling is a scourge of our society. It not only leads to crime, but in many cases it is run by criminal enterprises. By shutting off the funding flow, we will go a long way toward shutting down these illicit enterprises.

The Committee on Financial Services and all of the members, the ranking member and the chair, have worked diligently over the last few years with industry groups and civic organizations to strengthen the measure and to build support for its enactment. We consulted with financial services companies to improve the bill, recognizing current industry practices and protecting firms from liability for refusing to honor restricted transactions.

The policy rationale for this legislation is very simple: Offshore Internet gambling is already deemed illegal. By continuing to allow the financing of illegal Internet gambling, we are stating that we are not serious about enforcing the law. Worse, the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the Department of State have all stated that Internet gambling can be exploited to launder money for such groups as drug dealers,

organized crime and terrorist organizations.

Now is the time to close the loophole that allows illegal Internet gambling to still exist in the United States.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN). I understand he has an inquiry about this legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to engage the chairman in a brief colloquy and say that I commend him for his very important work on this legislation, which I strongly support.

As the chairman is aware, there are legitimate businesses Ohio and elsewhere that provide legal, skill-based Internet games, such as Monopoly and Boggle. Is it the gentleman's understanding that H.R. 2143 is not intended to apply to these games of skill that are played, created, or distributed over the Internet and which do not involve the risk of something of value?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. It is intended to apply to gambling, which is primarily determined by chance, rather than the skill of one of the players over the other.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Chair. As we know, several States and the District of Columbia have State lotteries that fund education and other State needs. In these States, the lotteries operate under a strict set of State rules.

Is it the gentleman's understanding, again, that H.R. 2143 is not intended to prohibit the use of electronic fund transfers, ACH transactions, checks or other bank instruments to pay for lottery play within the boundaries of a State within which the lot is located?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so long as it is legal within that State, that is correct.

Mr. PORTMAN. Again, I commend the chairman for his good work on this legislation. I hope he can beat back the amendments.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I both commend and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the full committee, who has been instrumental in bringing this legislation to the floor.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today, H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Funding Prohibition Act, represents the culmination of many hours of deliberation and hard work on the part of members and staff of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the former chairman of the

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, has led a determined battle to cut off the financial lifeblood of the unlawful Internet gambling industry, and the battle has been joined with vigor by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, and the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who has been a staunch advocate in the committee's efforts to stop this illegal activity. I want to commend both of them for their strong leadership.

Support for our committee's efforts to stop the money flow to illegal gambling sites has been nearly universal, from family and religious groups, to anti-gambling groups, from professional sports to college athletics, from major players in the banking and credit card industries, to law enforcement and Internet service providers.

Mr. Chairman, it would be far easier and far quicker just to list who does not support such efforts. That would, of course, be the illegal Internet gambling industry itself and the "wannabes" waiting in the wing for some sign that the Federal Government will roll over and sanction Internet gambling. They have launched an all-out effort at obfuscation and mischaracterization in hopes of defeating this bill and perpetuating their obnoxious activities.

Six years ago Internet gambling was nearly nonexistent. Indeed, the Internet itself was just coming into its own. Sadly, just as nature abhors a vacuum, so do criminals, and it was just a matter of time before gambling sites began cropping up offshore, beyond the reach of U.S. regulators and law enforcement.

Seeing their opportunity, they multiplied unchecked, gobbling up victims in the United States who represented the most vulnerable in our society: children, college students, and problem gamblers. Enticed by pop-up ads that promised untold riches, these victims yielded up their credit card numbers and other valuable personal financial information to an unregulated criminal element that could use that information as it chose.

All of the privacy hawks in this Chamber need to listen to this plea. The Committee on Financial Services has heard testimony from the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI that Internet gambling serves as a haven for money launderers, and unregulated offshore gambling sites can be exploited by terrorists to launder money. FBI Director Mueller, in testimony before our committee, cited Internet gambling as a substantial problem for law enforcement. That view has been reinforced by the Financial Action Task Force, an international body that seeks to combat money laundering, which stated in a 2001 report that some member countries had evidence that criminals were using Internet gambling to launder their illicit funds.

For the record, let us make clear what the bill does and what it does not

do. It does require the Federal functional regulators to establish regulations to limit the acceptance of U.S. financial instruments, such as credit cards, for use in unlawful Internet gambling transactions. By so doing, it cuts off the financial lifeblood of the illegal Internet gambling industry.

It does not, and I point out, it does not expand gambling in any way, shape, or form. Why would we want to do that? Those who claim otherwise are either not telling the truth, or they simply do not get it.

The bill's provisions kick in only, and only, where a regulator determines that an illegal activity has taken place and relies on Federal and State law current at that time to guide in that determination.

Let me be crystal clear: H.R. 2143 protects the right of States to regulate gambling within their borders. It neither expands nor limits gambling beyond what is allowed under existing Federal, State and Tribal law.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2143 represents legislation at its best. It is a directed approach to a serious problem. It will give regulators an important new tool to fight unlawful Internet gambling, and will protect families throughout America. It deserves the support and vote of every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to point out that this legislation is intended to address funding of illegal Internet gambling, not to regulate general purpose communications networks that may be used in isolated instances to transmit funds. The terms "networks" and "participants in networks", used in section 3(c) and in the definition of a "Designated Payment System" in section (4)(3), are intended to refer to payment networks, such as funds transfer networks, not to general purpose telecommunications or Internet networks. Thus, this bill would not regulate the provision of Internet connectivity or frame relay service to an electronic funds transfer network, but would regulate the operation of the funds transfer network itself.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all compliment my good friend, the gentleman from the other half of Birmingham, Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), for his leadership on this issue.

I take up where the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) left off. This is a very well-conceived piece of legislation. I speak from the perspective of someone who spent 5 years as a Federal prosecutor.

When I started out as a Federal prosecutor, we did not hear a whole lot of about gambling, frankly, from a lot of the people who crossed my desk. By the time I left, gambling had become the means of choice for disguising large sums of money being moved back and forth by drug dealers.

It goes without saying that in this age of Internet access, a lot of children

are finding their way to a lot of things that parents do not know that they are finding, and one of them is Internet gambling.

This is a positive bill. I will note that some people have raised concerns about how financial institutions would go about enforcing it, how they would go about policing and enforcing the various mechanisms contained within it. And I will note for those who raised those concerns that this legislation only requires financial institutions to develop adequate policies and procedures for identifying and blocking gambling payments.

Most of the credit card industry and most of the financial services industry have said they can easily take on this burden. It is a burden that they regularly assume in policing all kinds of transactions.

I do want to address one line of amendments that I do expect will come before the House today, and it deals with the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin that refers to one very specific section of the bill. Right now this bill would exclude from its coverage "any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized from a State."

That is an important provision, for a very simple reason. As many of my colleagues well know, a number of States in this country permit various forms of pari-mutuel betting. We may not like that, we may not engage in it, but there is not one of us in this institution who questions that it is the right of a State to determine what is gambling and what is not gambling. It is the right of the State of Alabama to decide and the right of our legislature to decide if we are going to recognize pari-mutuel betting or not.

If this amendment, which I believe is well-guided, were to be enacted, it would fundamentally change the purpose of this bill, because what it would do, very simply, is it would prevent a State from accepting pari-mutuel betting or any other forms of gambling that have been recognized, frankly, and declared as permissible by State law.

We talk a lot about States rights in this institution, and both parties now have picked up that mantra. It is in the interests of States rights if we decide that States can decide what is legal and what is not illegal. So I would urge my colleagues to reject the stream of amendments that would take away the States' ability to decide what is valid inside their own house.

So I close, Mr. Chairman, by saying this is well constructed, bipartisan legislation of the kind, frankly, that our committee regularly and routinely produces.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to oppose my chairman of the full committee, but I am doing it today. What

I am saying today is consistent with what I have said previously about this bill. We reported the bill out of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security without the Cannon amendment. The Cannon amendment was added in full committee and comes back to us today when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENBRENNER) submits his amendment subsequently.

The amendment, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, will strike the provision of the bill that states that the term "bets or wagers" does not include any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized by a State. This provision is duplicative of the actual definition of "unlawful Internet gambling," which is defined as a bet or wager that is unlawful under any applicable Federal or State law.

□ 1645

I am told, Mr. Chairman, and I think the gentleman from Louisiana has corroborated this, that some groups feel that this is a carve-out from the prohibition set forth in the bill. I believe that those groups who so declare are misinterpreting current law and, with or without this provision, we still have to contend with the prohibitions of the Wire Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Sensenbrenner amendment will pretty well remove the muscle from the arm of States' rights. I believe that the language that the Sensenbrenner amendment seeks to strike simply preserves the ability of States to regulate gambling, and that is where I think the regulatory issue should arise.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), our ranking member.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, where are the libertarians when we need them? What we have before us is the Inconsistency Act of 2003. Rarely has a bill come forward which is in conflict with as many principles as Members of this House have professed. In the first place, we have the question as to whether or not we should substitute the government's opinion for individuals' choices.

Now, there are ills in this world against which people should be protected. There are economic injustices, there are environmental problems, there are criminal elements who would prey on people. I spend all of my energy trying to protect people against things done by others, whether forces of nature or individuals, that would harm them. I envy my colleagues who have more energy than I. I do not have enough left to protect people against themselves. This is an example of our deciding that we cannot trust adults to decide what to do with their own money.

Now, if we were talking about someone who was being forced to gamble at

gunpoint, I am with you. If there are people who are being coerced into putting down a bet, let us protect them. But if an individual has gone out and earned his or her money and decides he or she wants to gamble, why in the world is it anybody in this building's business?

So we, first of all, have this inconsistency with the principle of let us keep big government off our backs. I do not myself gamble. I do not like to see my money go when I do not have any control over it, and so I do not gamble. And other people who are opposed to gambling, I do not always hold myself out as an example, but I will in this case. Be like me: do not gamble. But if other people want to put a bet down, mind your own business.

Now, there are people for whom this is enjoyable. I do not understand why we should cast aspersions on them. And it is true, some people will abuse it. There are a minority of people who will abuse this. But the notion that we prevent adults from making their own choices with their own money, to do things which have no harmful effect on anyone else, because a minority of people will abuse them is, of course, a very dangerous principle. There are people who drink too much. There are people who go to too many movies. There are people who do a lot of things in excess that most of us do in moderation. Ban the excess, if you want to; deal with the consequences of the excess. This is a violation, though, what we are doing now, of the fundamental principle: leave people alone.

There is another principle that I have heard: the sanctity of the Internet. We are told that we should not interfere with the Internet. Indeed, this House has refused to cooperate with State governments; now, many of them are in terrible fiscal crises, cutting back on health care, laying off public safety officials, but we will not cooperate with them in collecting sales taxes from people who buy things over the Internet in competition with local communities, and they lose tax revenue. But we say, oh, no, we cannot touch the Internet, unless it is being used for something people here do not like. That is basically what is involved here.

We have, and there is an interesting conjunction here of liberals and conservatives. Conservatives do not like it, some of them because I read from some of the very conservative groups that it is immoral to gamble. I am often baffled by their morality, and I do not understand why it is immoral to gamble. I am struck by so many of my liberal friends who do not want people to gamble. Indeed, gambling is, to many liberals, what sex-oriented literature is to conservatives. They do not like it, so they do not want anyone else to do it. There are people who do not like gambling; then do not gamble. But why use the law to prevent other people from doing it?

Now, I know they say, well, but this is not just making it illegal; this is

doing this, that, and the other. But let us cut right down to it. This is being put forward by people who do not like gambling and want to make it harder to gamble, and their principle of keeping government out of private choices, forget about it; their principle of being able to use the Internet without interference, forget about that; and their respect for financial institutions, forget about that.

Now, they say children will abuse it. I understand that. That is a serious effort. I am prepared to cooperate in efforts to try to protect children, although we should know that the major protection of children ought to be their own parents. This is protecting children, forgetting about any parental role; but that is another principle that is a problem. You cannot, in my judgment, sensibly, in a society like ours, make it illegal for adults to do things because there is a possibility that some young people will do them when they should not. Let us work on ways to prevent children from doing this sort of thing.

Gambling is a perfectly legitimate human activity. There are people who enjoy it. There are people who find that it engages them. I do not think they ought to be anesthetized on the floor of the House, but being anesthetized, I guess a lot of people do not pay a lot of attention to what we say. No real harm there. But when you take the law of the United States and you now put further criminal penalties here and further restrict people, I think we are making a very grave error.

So I hope Members who have talked about States' rights, who have talked about individual liberty being protected from an overreaching government, who have talked about not stifling the Internet and its creativity, will think about one of those things when you come to vote on this bill and vote it down.

I thank the gentlewoman for managing this time and yielding this time to me. I am the senior minority member, but since the majority of members of my committee, in a temporary lapse from their usual good judgment, supported this bill; I did not think it was appropriate for me to be the manager.

But I do hope that individual freedom, a distrust of overreaching government, a respect for the rights of State and local jurisdictions, and a respect for the Internet will count for something when we vote.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman that this bill is not about opposing legal gambling. This bill is about opposing mob activity, criminal activity. The FBI says that organized crime is behind these Internet sites. This is about the unsupervised, illegal, untaxed Internet gambling. Illegal, offshore.

We talk about adults. These sites specifically target preteenaged children; and as the University of Connecticut has shown us, it is becoming a problem for many of our teenagers. They are becoming addicted to it, and they then turn to crime. This is about protecting Americans from crime that arises from these sites, specifically from these sites.

In the gentleman's own State, Dr. Schaffer, Harvard Medical School, likened illegal Internet gambling to crack cocaine, and he said, "It is changing the gambling scene as crack cocaine changed the drug scene." We have all seen the scourge of crack cocaine. We have seen how it has ruined our country, ruined our youth. We have seen Adrian McPherson, a young man with a lot of promise, a star quarterback, a Mr. Basketball in the State of Florida, Mr. Football, we have seen him on trial, accused of Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, this is simply about enforcing the laws of this country and protecting our youth. We take the animals of the field, the one thing they do is they protect their youth. If dogs, cats, rabbits, any animal, if they protect their youth, at least we can rise to that level and above that level and protect the youth of our country.

Finally, as the NCAA said when they urged us to adopt this legislation for 5 straight years, "Illegal Internet gambling is destroying the integrity of college sports and we have scandals in the making." Let us put an end to it; let us put an end to it now. Let us vote for this bill. Let us vote for the Kelly amendment. Let us vote against the Cannon amendment, which is a poison pill, as we all recognize, any of us who have studied the issue at all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who has conducted extensive hearings on this matter.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the intention of this legislation. Section 4, subsection 2(E)(ix), exempts transactions with a business licensed or authorized by a State from the definition of "bets or wagers" under the bill.

Some parties have raised concerns that this could be read broadly to allow the transmission of casino or lottery games in interstate commerce, for example, over the Internet, simply because one State authorizes its businesses to do so. I want to make clear that this exemption will not expand the reach of gambling in any way. It is intended to recognize current law that allows States jurisdiction over wholly intrastate activity, where bets or wagers, or information assisting bets or wagers, do not cross State lines or enter into interstate commerce.

The exemption would leave intact the current interstate gambling prohibition such as the Wire Act, Federal prohibitions on lotteries, and the Gam-

bling Ship Act, so that casino and lottery games could not be placed on the Internet. Is that correct?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. The gentleman's assessment of the intent is accurate. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join us in standing against illegal Internet gambling. These Web sites are extremely destructive, and it is time we put them out of business.

We all know that illegal money transfer has funded terrorism in this Nation. We need to dry up terrorism's money. Anyone who cares about their personal safety and the safety of the people in this Nation needs to vote for this bill.

This legislation will bar Internet gambling access to the U.S. financial services network by preventing the use of credit cards, wire transfers, or any other bank instrument to fund gaming associations.

Representatives of the offshore casino industry have tried to make the case that Internet gambling is a harmless activity that can easily be brought under control by Federal regulation; but, unfortunately, that is not true on many fronts. It is technologically impossible to create safeguards that will regulate Internet gambling. That means anyone with access to a credit card, including children, can access these sites. Anyone who is a terrorist with a credit card can transfer money this way.

As the FBI closes down on other money-laundering schemes, more illicit funds are expected to move through Internet gambling sites. To stop terrorism, we must dry up their access to funding.

□ 1700

This legislation will help that. The bottom line is, Internet gambling is illegal, and according to the Department of Justice and the FBI there is no effective way to regulate it. The only way to stop it is to cut off the financial flow to the illegal Internet casino industry, which is precisely what this legislation before us does.

Finally, there has been a lot of misinformation spread about this legislation in the past few weeks. Let me be very clear, this legislation does not change current law by defining what is legal or illegal; it simply ensures that we have a mechanism to enforce illegal activity under the Federal law.

Reasonable people can disagree on offering a separate amendment to the committee which makes it absolutely crystal clear that we are not changing anybody's law regarding Internet gambling. I believe that the base text

speaks for itself. But if it needs to be clarified, my amendment makes it absolutely clear: The legislation does not change any law currently in place, Federal, State, or tribal, governing gambling in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation that will give law enforcement an important new tool to fight crime and protect our families in the United States.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat like a skunk at the church picnic, but I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against this senseless and useless piece of legislation.

I know something about gaming and gaming law. I was a gaming attorney for many years before I came to the United States Congress, and I represent Las Vegas. This bill, in spite of what its sponsors say, will not stop illegal Internet gaming, and, if passed, it will have serious unintended consequences.

This legislation, let me reiterate, will not stop Internet gaming. It exists today. There are over 1,600 gaming Web sites offshore already. Americans are playing online now. But instead of playing on well-regulated sites, they are placing wagers on the existing 1,600 offshore unregulated sites which have no requirement to verify the identity, the age, the background, or the location of the person placing the wager.

In most cases, there is no regulation of offshore sites. A child can place a wager on these offshore sites, a compulsive gambler can place a wager on these sites, and there is no guarantee that players will receive their winnings from these offshore sites.

My good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), speaks of mob influence and speaks of protecting children from gambling. There is not one thing in this legislation that will remedy any of the problems that he speaks of.

Let us not be foolish enough to believe that this bill will stop people from gambling online. Despite efforts by every credit card company in the United States to prohibit the use of their financial instruments for Internet gaming, the General Accounting Office predicts that the offshore Internet gaming industry will continue to grow to a \$4.2 billion industry in 2003 with a growth rate of 20 percent per year. Passing this bill will do nothing to impede that growth. Online gaming is here to stay.

If these unregulated and unscrupulous offshore sites continue to flourish, the integrity of the legal gaming industry is also at risk. Instead of prohibiting online gaming, we should be closely examining online wagering to see if it can and should be regulated and taxed as a legal business. No one knows the answer to this, but it might turn out that it may be the only effective way to stop illegal online wagering

and the problems it creates. H.R. 2143 would cut off this option, and we should not pass it.

For those people that are so worried about funding of terrorists, let us have our so-called Saudi allies and our moderate Arab allies, let them stop the money they are flowing into the terrorists, and not kid ourselves to think that stopping online Internet gaming is going to do the trick for us.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, major league baseball, the National Football League, and the NCAA all endorse this legislation. We could have no better representative than the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), who many of us still think of as Coach OSBORNE of the Nebraska Cornhuskers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for this legislation. I support H.R. 2143.

As the chairman mentioned, I spent most of my life working on a college campus. I can attest to the fact that Internet gambling is really hitting our college campuses very hard, because all you have to do is have a computer and a credit card and you are in business. Almost all students have this, so we see an explosion of gambling on the college campuses. Many student athletes are becoming heavily involved. I think someone mentioned earlier a quarterback from Florida State.

The reason that the NCAA, the NBA, major league baseball, all of these organizations are against it, is that once a student athlete becomes heavily indebted, there are really only a couple avenues he can take to get out of the problem. One is to cooperate with gamblers. Another is to shave points. So it tremendously compromises the athletic scene.

According to a 1997 study by Harvard Medical School, students show the highest percentage of pathological gambling. To say that students are not involved is simply inaccurate. For some, as has been mentioned earlier, gambling releases endorphins, much like crack cocaine, so this is a highly addictive activity.

Our society is becoming increasingly dependent on gambling. Individuals try to get out of poverty by winning the lottery or hitting the jackpot. States try to cure economic woes through lotteries and casinos.

Internet gambling does not fix the problem; it makes it worse. Internet gambling provides no useful goods or services. It usually is linked to organized crime. It often results in divorce, suicide, theft, and poverty. It siphons money that would otherwise be spent to buy food, clothing, appliances, housing, and thus hurts the economy. Above all, it hurts our families and it hurts our children.

Please support H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the comments of the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY). I think she gave a really good argument why we should pass this bill. It may not do everything that we want it to do, but right now offshore gambling is illegal.

What we are trying to do in this bill is very simple. It is to shut off the financial spigot. Will it stop it totally? Probably not. Will it make a dent? I certainly hope so. But unless we can shut off that financial spigot, nothing will happen, and it will just continue to grow and take that money out of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas, (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I thank her for her leadership and for her work.

Mr. Chairman, we know that unregulated Internet gambling does hurt. I also believe we as Members of Congress want to do the right thing. I would encourage that we look at the idea of the expanded study of this question to make the right decisions.

I would also like to offer a comment on what I believe will be a very helpful amendment that I will have the opportunity to expand on as we go into the amendments on this legislation.

It is important to note that 8 percent of children under the age of 18 in America have a serious gambling problem, as opposed to a 3 percent number of adults. That is, of course, a distinctive difference between those children under the age of 18.

I would hope that my colleagues would look upon an amendment that hopefully answers that question and provides some of the comparable legislation that was allowed in the Children's Protection Act that dealt with protecting children from accessing pornography on the Internet by utilizing a credit card.

My amendment will allow the use of a credit card in the instance of legal Internet gambling so that it will prevent or prohibit or stop or inhibit 18-year-olds, or those under 18, from using the credit card to access Internet gambling.

What it will do is the fact that a credit card, one, requires one to be at least 18 to secure one. Then, of course, it has a purchasing coding system to alert parents of unauthorized charges. Then it records the information on the charge. These are all ways of providing that extra door, that extra fire door to prevent those youngsters from accessing Internet gambling.

I hope my colleagues will listen to the debate. I expect to listen to the debate so we in Congress can do the right thing, so we can do it together, and do it on behalf of the American people.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise to register my very, very strong support for this bill, and my opposition to the Cannon amendment; not that I oppose the intent of the Cannon amendment, but simply because that is likely to be a poison pill for this bill and result in its immature death. Let me ask a few questions.

Does gambling cause any social good in this country? The answer is absolutely not. It creates a great many social problems but provides no social good.

Does it help when we assess taxes on it? Does that not provide some good? It may salve our conscience a bit, but it certainly does not overcome the problems that arise from gambling.

Is gambling addictive? Yes, without doubt. I can recount an example that was just told me a few weeks ago by one of my constituents, where a gentleman who had been reasonably well off had to go into bankruptcy because his wife had become addicted to gambling. She had very carefully hidden it from him. She had taken out credit cards which he did not know about. The accumulation of debt from her gambling addiction drove them into bankruptcy.

Does gambling attract crime? Yes. Terrorism? Yes. Why? Wherever there are large amounts of cash available with minimal accounting standards, as we have with Internet gambling, we are going to attract crime. We are going to attract terrorism.

What is the worst form of gambling? Internet gambling. It is easy, it is convenient, it is anonymous, and we can do it from our own homes or from a public library or any of a number of other places. It is very tempting for any addicted gambler to use Internet gambling, and use it surreptitiously when necessary, to cover the fact that he or she is addicted.

I very strongly support this bill. I hope the Congress will approve it, that the Senate will approve it, that the President will sign it, and it will become law.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) have been fighting this issue and offering legislation for some time. This legislation actually appropriately would bear their names. I commend the gentleman from Virginia. I think no one has done more than he and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for his leadership

on this issue. He has been fighting this for a long time, and I appreciate his efforts to bring forth this legislation.

I am pleased to support it, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, because it is an important first step in the fight against Internet gambling. It hits illegal gambling institutions where it hurts the most: their pockets. By shutting off the financial lifeblood of this illegal industry, this bill will help to starve out unlawful Internet gambling sites and in the process close off opportunities for money launderers, terrorists, and organized crime.

Gambling on the Internet has become an extremely lucrative business. The Internet gambling industry revenues grew from \$445 million in 1997 to an estimated \$4.2 billion this year. Furthermore, industry analysts estimate that Internet gambling could soon easily become a \$10 billion a year industry.

The problems with Internet gambling are many. The instant access to online gambling is particularly disturbing. This illegal activity is available to adults and children alike with the simple click of a mouse.

In addition, the social problems associated with traditional forms of gambling have increased with the proliferation of Internet gambling. Online gambling results in more addictions, more bankruptcies, more divorces, more crime, the cost of which must ultimately be borne by society.

I do believe that more needs to be done in the fight against Internet gambling, including creating stiffer criminal penalties for violators and updating the Federal Wire Act to make it clear that it covers new technologies such as the Internet.

□ 1715

However, H.R. 2143 is an important first step in this fight and I am pleased to support this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and others, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who have helped to lead this effort. This is a great opportunity for us today and I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for it.

The CHAIRMAN. For the record, the Chair announces that the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) has yielded to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) 8 minutes, reserving 4 minutes for herself.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH). Many fine things have been said about the gentleman, that he and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) have been fighting this issue, this problem, and have really brought it to our attention, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I commend him.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a great credit to the gentleman from Ala-

bama's (Mr. BACHUS's) leadership. Also, as indicated, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) have worked on this for years, and I am very grateful for their support.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as it comes before the floor today is, frankly, not as comprehensive as I would have liked. It would have been better if the Committee on the Judiciary had updated the Wire Act. It would have been better if we had been more precise in allowing certain law enforcement ties to the financial system. Nevertheless, this is a very credible first step to slowing the growth of Internet gambling.

The issue has been raised on the floor, and I think it is worthy of serious review, the question of is this an individual issue, a libertarian issue or is it a social issue?

I believe very firmly that it is far more than a libertarian issue. We ignore gambling at our peril. It is simply not good for the American economy to send billions of dollars overseas. It is not good for American national security to allow Internet gambling to provide the ideal basis for money laundering, for narco-traffickers and for terrorists. But most of all it is not good for the American family.

Anyone that gets hooked on Internet gambling or any form of gambling, but particularly Internet which is gambling alone, will lose virtually all of their assets. Anyone that gets hooked will, in all likelihood, lose their family. Divorce is a serious element of the gambling problem. In very many cases the extraordinary circumstance of suicide is contemplated by gamblers that get this as a virtual disease.

It is a libertarian myth that only the individual, only the gambler is affected. Its effects spill over to the financial systems. When there are losses, everybody else has to pay higher interest rates. They spill over to the social welfare system where people have to pick up the costs of broken lives. It spills over to the economy where suffering has to be picked up elsewhere; and they spill over into national security concerns.

Internet gambling serves no social purpose whatsoever. It is a danger to the American family. It is a danger to the American society. It is a danger to the security of the United States. It should be ended, and this is a credible beginning.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, how many more speakers does the gentleman have?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, we have 2 more.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, it has become very apparent to me after listening to this debate that the supporters of this bill not only oppose the Internet gaming, they are opposed to any form of gaming whatsoever. They speak of gaming and they speak of addiction and crime and drugs and suicide.

Well, I grew up in Las Vegas. Las Vegas has 1.5 million residents; 37 million visitors come to our community every year to enjoy our entertainment, and our wholesome family entertainment, I might add.

I grew up in Las Vegas. I represent the good people of Las Vegas who depend on the gaming industry for their livelihood. My father was a waiter when I was growing up. He worked in one of these casinos that you disparage so handily.

Let me state what Las Vegas means to me. On a waiter's salary my father was able to put a roof over our heads, food on the table, clothes on our backs, and two daughters through college and law school. That is not so bad on a waiter's salary. And the reason he was able to do it was because of the strong economy that the gaming industry created.

Las Vegas to me is churches and synagogues and families and Saturday soccer and proms at this time of year and graduations and hopes and dreams and aspirations to millions of people that come to Las Vegas and the 1.5 million people that live there.

And, quite candidly, the people in this Chamber ought to be ashamed of disparaging a community like Las Vegas that I daresay lays shame to all of your own. So please be careful when you speak of my community and the major industry that takes care of the people that live there and provides good educations, good economy, good living conditions, and a quality of life that is the envy of the rest of the United States of America.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for their efforts here.

I want to disagree with the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for a moment. I used to be an FBI agent. And the old saying "It takes money to make money" is as true for organized crime as it is for any other business in America. This is not about Las Vegas. This is about offshore entities; Russian organized crime establishing offshore sites to develop low-cost/high-revenue venues where they can do two things: A, make a tremendous return on their investment; and B, launder money. And they are not laundering money that they have earned by betting or working in legitimate businesses. They are laundering money that they obtained illegally from drug sales, from prostitution rings, from pornography rings, from street gang street tax, from street

taxing businesses who are trying to operate in New York and Miami and Los Angeles.

These are exactly the kinds of activities that this bill will at least attempt to put a tool in the toolbox to stop. The FBI already has several cases today involving organized crime using Internet gambling to launder money. They use this money and turn it around to do pretty awful things, not only in America but now internationally. And they have become very, very sophisticated at how they get there.

It would be sticking our heads in the sand if we do not stand up and say we will not tolerate organized crime using the Internet to negatively influence our communities and our business community all across America.

This is dangerous, dangerous stuff. And to compare this to soccer games in Las Vegas is both naive and short-sighted. I would encourage the gentleman to understand where we seek to go and the very types of people we seek to stop with this bill.

I would also take this opportunity to urge this body to reject the Sensenbrenner and Cannon amendment. We are very, very close here today to taking one step closer to knocking organized crime off their feet. That is a poison pill that may slow that endeavor.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I have the right to close. I do intend to close.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman through with his speakers?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, we have no other speakers, but I do wish to close.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to remind people this is not about legal gambling. This is about illegal gambling. This is about offshore casinos. This is about illegal Internet gambling.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. And I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for all of the hard work, and it has taken more than 1 year that they have worked on this.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to turn this debate into an oversimplification, but I want to remind this entire Chamber that this bill does not in any way prohibit Internet gambling. The bill does not make Internet gambling illegal. This bill quite simply takes Internet gambling that is already illegal, such as offshore gambling, and prohibits financial institutions from funding those transactions. The best way to put it is that this bill will actually enforce existing law, which is something I believe that we all agree on is in this country's best interest.

Finally, I would like to share a couple of quick facts that sum up my sup-

port for this legislation. First, a study released by the American Psychiatric Association concluded that about 20 percent of children-oriented online game sites featured Internet gambling advertisements, 20 percent. Does that make any sense? Offshore illegal Internet gambling sites are advertising to our children and we are not shutting down these offshore illegal Internet gambling sites? That does not make sense to me.

Second, the FBI and the Department of Justice have linked, without question, offshore Internet gambling to organized crime, money laundering and identity theft. Offshore illegal Internet gambling has been linked to organized crime and terrorism and we are not going to shut it down? That does not make sense to me.

It is time to enact legislation that empowers our law enforcement officers to become tough on the existing laws and to put illegal Internet gambling sites out of business once and for all.

Please support H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has tried mightily, Members of this Congress, to pass legislation to protect our children from this organized criminal activity. And it is a criminal activity. To equate this with the lawful supervised gambling in Las Vegas is simply to miss the point.

The fact is the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) said, We do nothing in this bill to make unlawful what is lawful or make lawful what is unlawful.

What we do say is that where there is this criminal activity which is causing such heartbreak and such sorrow and such destruction and really a crime wave in this country, that it is time to put an end to it.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has for years strived to bring the conscience of this Congress to this issue. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for years has brought this issue to our attention. They want stronger measures. I would like stronger measures, I will admit that, but we have to be practical.

We have to get what we can get. And what was the Cannon amendment killed this legislation in the past, and it will be brought up and they will attempt to kill this legislation. I hope that is not the case. I hope that we do not vote for the Cannon, now Sensenbrenner amendment, and again postpone facing this issue.

When it gets to the point that MasterCard, American Express, Visa, and Discover are all urging this Congress to take action to stop the illegal use of their networks, and they have written letters endorsing this legislation that every Member of this Congress has gotten, and they have said it

will be an effective tool to stop the use of our credit cards to this illegal activity, when Citibank, when Morgan Stanley, when the largest banks in this country say give us the regulations, give us the framework to stop this, it is about time that we move.

We have talked about major league baseball, the NFL, and I think that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), more skilled than any of us in college sports, he is the longtime football coach of the Nebraska Cornhuskers, when he says this is undermining the integrity of the sport, it is time for us to take action.

It is time for us to quit this turf fighting where someone tries to expand gambling and someone else tries to limit gambling, and to come forward with a bill to address this, what the FBI calls "mob-drive, crime-controlled activity."

□ 1730

When we started this debate, some 4 or 5 years ago, we had less than a half a dozen sites, less than \$300,000 being used. Today, the number of addicted gamblers in this country has grown by 5 million, a great number of them starting in their preteen or early teenage years.

It is time this Congress acted. It is time this Congress rejected the Sensenbrenner amendment in a few minutes and voted for this legislation. If it does not, we are going to be dealing with a \$20 billion industry or \$30 billion industry, and it is bad enough today when we do not know who these people are. They are unregulated. We do not even know where the money that is earned, how much of that money is finding its way back to Washington; but it is a pretty strong indication when we have one so-called faith group that battled for this legislation until a few weeks ago and suddenly turned around 180 degrees and suddenly opposed this legislation; and we find from a California paper that a few years ago they, in fact, took gambling money to fight on behalf of the gambling industry.

The National Council of Churches has written us today, the National Governors Association. The Fraternal Order of Police has urged us to take action to accept no amendments other than the Kelly amendment. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association has written us. They have urged us to take action.

Mr. Chairman, the house is on fire and it is time for this body to wake up and to take action and to protect the youth of this country and the compulsive gamblers.

I close with one fact, and that is from the University of Connecticut Health Center, an extensive survey that said 74 percent of those who have used the Internet to gamble have serious problems with addiction, and many of those have resorted to criminal activities to pay for the habit. On the other hand, those that engage in legal gambling, they find only a third as many have become permanently addicted.

We have a wave in this country which Dr. Schaffer at Harvard Medical School compares to a cocaine epidemic in gambling, a crack cocaine epidemic; and in a few minutes, each one of us will decide to end this addiction and this heartbreak and this threat to not only our sports programs in this country but to our fabric as a Nation, or we will decide to vote for the Cannon amendment and, again, kill this legislation and put it off.

I urge all the Members to take a strong stand against the killer amendments that will be offered, a strong stand for this legislation. Join with the credit card companies, the financial institutions, the many church groups in this country, law enforcement officers, National Governors Association, Attorneys General Association. If there is ever a clear vote in this House, this should be the vote. If there was ever a unanimous vote in this House, this should be the vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am troubled by and opposed to the increasing reliance of government on gambling. We are seeing more evidence of its destructive power, even as the current financial crisis is driving more States to expand their gaming operations.

Gaming has been one of the tools that has enabled Native Americans to regain some economic footing after centuries of neglect, abuse, and broken promises. While this is not my favorite tool for their economic development, I do not favor treating tribal interests differently than we do for other private and State-sponsored gaming. The State exemptions in this bill violate that fundamental principal by regulating tribal gaming differently from State gaming, which is unfair and ultimately an unwise precedent.

I am opposed to illegal offshore betting and I would be happy to regulate internet gambling. I stand ready, if we can ever breach the wide array of vested interests to support legislation that does restrict gaming without singling out Native Americans for unequal treatment. This bill falls short of that mark, and I will not support it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2143 limits the ability of individual citizens to use bank instruments, including credit cards or checks, to finance Internet gambling. This legislation should be rejected by Congress since the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to ban or even discourage any form of gambling.

In addition to being unconstitutional, H.R. 2143 is likely to prove ineffective at ending Internet gambling. Instead, this bill will ensure that gambling is controlled by organized crime. History, from the failed experiment of prohibition to today's futile "war on drugs," shows that the government cannot eliminate demand for something like Internet gambling simply by passing a law. Instead, H.R. 2143 will force those who wish to gamble over the Internet to patronize suppliers willing to flout the ban. In many cases, providers of services banned by the government will be members of criminal organizations. Even if organized crime does not operate Internet gambling enterprises their competitors are likely to be controlled by organized crime. After all, since the owners and patrons of Internet gambling cannot rely on

the police and courts to enforce contracts and resolve other disputes, they will be forced to rely on members of organized crime to perform those functions. Thus, the profits of Internet gambling will flow into organized crime. Furthermore, outlawing an activity will raise the price vendors are able to charge consumers, thus increasing the profits flowing to organized crime from Internet gambling. It is bitterly ironic that a bill masquerading as an attack on crime will actually increase organized crime's ability to control and profit from Internet gambling.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2143 violates the constitutional limits on Federal power. Furthermore, laws such as H.R. 2143 are ineffective in eliminating the demand for vices such as Internet gambling; instead, they ensure that these enterprises will be controlled by organized crime. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. While I support the bill, I am disappointed that the legislation could not be further refined to satisfy the concerns of the Native American gaming community. I firmly believe that in its final form, any legislation must clarify the absolute legality of Native American gaming.

Last Congress, in response to 9/11, the Financial Services Committee passed significant new legislation curbing money laundering. During the course of hearings on the legislation, law enforcement testified that Internet gambling sites are often used for money laundering purposes by drug dealers and potentially by terrorists. As I've often said, criminals are like other business people in that they go out of business if you limit their money. This legislation will give law enforcement important new tools to cut off money laundering.

I also support the legislation because I fear that the explosion of the Internet and the access that young people have to it in their homes and schools creates an opportunity for them to fall victim to online gaming. The best way to keep young people from getting hooked on gambling is to limit their access to it. There is good reason that U.S. casinos do not permit individuals under 21 years of age from entering the premises.

While I support the bill, I am concerned that the concerns of the Native American gaming community have not been fully satisfied. Gaming has raised standards of living and provided economic development money to the Native American community that was missing for too long. Congress must not do anything to imperil gaming as a source of much needed jobs and commerce to reservations. I look forward to working with the Native American community on this issue going forward.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, you might remember a failed experiment the U.S. government tried in the 1920s called Prohibition. Today, Congress is rushing to pass a similar ill-conceived prohibition of Internet gambling. Gaming prohibitionists believe they can stop the millions of Americans who gamble online by prohibiting the use of credit cards to gamble on the Internet. Just as outlawing alcohol did not work in the 1920s, current attempts to prohibit online gaming will not work, either. Let me explain why.

In addition to the problems I addressed earlier, this bill lacks a number of important pro-

tections. It does not require that the businesses getting the special exception be licensed for Internet gambling, any kind of license will do. It does not require that these businesses keep minors from gambling as a condition of the license. It does not even require that these businesses limit the amount that can be gambled to protect problem gamblers.

And what about lotteries? Family values conservatives fight the lotteries in State after State. They say that there is no greater evil than State-sponsored gambling. The Justice Department said in their testimony that this bill would "absolutely" allow Internet gambling on lotteries.

This is not just my interpretation of this bill. The Free Congress Foundation, led by conservative activist Paul Weyrich, says this bill expands gambling. The Traditional Values Coalition, led by the Reverend Lou Sheldon, says this bill expands gambling. The United States Justice Department says this bill expands gambling.

And while many powerful gambling interests receive an exemption, less favored interests get the short end of the stick. Native Americans became more tightly regulated than the horse racing industries. It is unfair and unjustifiable public policy.

Instead of imposing an Internet gambling prohibition that will actually expand gambling for some and drive other types of Internet gambling offshore and into the hands of unscrupulous merchants, I believe Congress should examine the feasibility of strictly licensing and regulating the online gaming industry. A regulated gambling industry will ensure that gaming companies play fair and drive out dishonest operators. It also preserves State's rights.

The rules should be simple: if a State does not want to allow gambling in its borders, a licensed operator should exclude that State's residents from being able to gamble on its website.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1223, the "Internet Gambling Licensing and Regulation Commission Act." The bill will create a national Internet Gambling Licensing and Regulation Study Commission to evaluate how best to regulate and control online gambling in America to protect consumers and prevent criminal elements from penetrating this industry. In addition, the Commission will study whether the problems identified by gambling prohibitionists—money laundering, underage gambling, and gambling addictions—are better addressed by an ineffective ban or by an online gaming industry that is tightly regulated by the States.

Until now, Republicans and Democrats have stood together against those who wanted to regulate the Internet, restrict its boundaries, or use it for some special purpose. Except in the narrow areas of child pornography and other obvious criminal activities, Congress has rejected attempts to make Internet Service Providers, credit card companies, and the technology industry policemen for the Internet. We should not head down this road now.

Attempts to prohibit Internet gambling in the name of fighting crime and protecting children and problem gamblers will have the opposite effect. Prohibition will simply drive the gaming industry offshore, thereby attracting the least desirable operators who will be out of the reach of law enforcement. A far better approach is to allow the States to strictly license

and regulate the Internet gambling industry, to foster honest merchants who are subject to U.S. consumer protection and criminal laws.

There are many different concerns with this bill, some of which I just mentioned. These concerns range from doubts about the desirability of having government regulate the personal behavior of competent adults to the fact that the bill, under the guise of banning Internet gambling, actually enables some favored gambling industries on-line. There are concerns about the bill's fundamental unfairness to native American tribal governments, and concerns about the precedent of deputizing financial institutions to regulate the Internet. For all of these concerns, I urge you to vote, "no" on H.R. 2143.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 2143 is as follows:

H.R. 2143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Internet gambling is primarily funded through personal use of bank instruments, including credit cards and wire transfers.

(2) The National Gambling Impact Study Commission in 1999 recommended the passage of legislation to prohibit wire transfers to Internet gambling sites or the banks which represent them.

(3) Internet gambling is a major cause of debt collection problems for insured depository institutions and the consumer credit industry.

(4) Internet gambling conducted through offshore jurisdictions has been identified by United States law enforcement officials as a significant money laundering vulnerability.

SEC. 3. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal functional regulators shall prescribe regulations requiring any designated payment system to establish policies and procedures reasonably designed to identify and prevent restricted transactions in any of the following ways:

(1) The establishment of policies and procedures that—

(A) allow the payment system and any person involved in the payment system to identify restricted transactions by means of codes in authorization messages or by other means; and

(B) block restricted transactions identified as a result of the policies and procedures developed pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) The establishment of policies and procedures that prevent the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system in connection with a restricted transaction.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—In prescribing regulations pursuant to subsection (a), the Federal functional regulators shall—

(1) identify types of policies and procedures, including nonexclusive examples, which would be deemed to be "reasonably designed to identify" and "reasonably designed to block" or to "prevent the acceptance of the products or services" with respect to each type of transaction, such as, should credit card transactions be so

designated, identifying transactions by a code or codes in the authorization message and denying authorization of a credit card transaction in response to an authorization message;

(2) to the extent practical, permit any participant in a payment system to choose among alternative means of identifying and blocking, or otherwise preventing the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system or participant in connection with, restricted transactions; and

(3) consider exempting restricted transactions from any requirement under subsection (a) if the Federal functional regulators find that it is not reasonably practical to identify and block, or otherwise prevent, such transactions.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH PAYMENT SYSTEM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—A creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, or money transmitting service, or a participant in such network, meets the requirement of subsection (a) if—

(1) such person relies on and complies with the policies and procedures of a designated payment system of which it is a member or participant to—

(A) identify and block restricted transactions; or

(B) otherwise prevent the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system, member, or participant in connection with restricted transactions; and

(2) such policies and procedures of the designated payment system comply with the requirements of regulations prescribed under subsection (a).

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—This section shall be enforced by the Federal functional regulators and the Federal Trade Commission under applicable law in the manner provided in section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

(2) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In considering any enforcement action under this subsection against any payment system, or any participant in a payment system that is a creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, or money transmitting service, or a participant in such network, the Federal functional regulators and the Federal Trade Commission shall consider the following factors:

(A) The extent to which such person is extending credit or transmitting funds knowing the transaction is in connection with unlawful Internet gambling.

(B) The history of such person in extending credit or transmitting funds knowing the transaction is in connection with unlawful Internet gambling.

(C) The extent to which such person has established and is maintaining policies and procedures in compliance with regulations prescribed under this subsection.

(D) The feasibility that any specific remedy prescribed can be implemented by such person without substantial deviation from normal business practice.

(E) The costs and burdens the specific remedy will have on such person.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) RESTRICTED TRANSACTION.—The term "restricted transaction" means any transaction or transmittal to any person engaged in the business of betting or wagering, in connection with the participation of another person in unlawful Internet gambling, of—

(A) credit, or the proceeds of credit, extended to or on behalf of such other person (including credit extended through the use of a credit card);

(B) an electronic fund transfer or funds transmitted by or through a money transmitting business, or the proceeds of an electronic fund transfer or money transmitting service, from or on behalf of the other person;

(C) any check, draft, or similar instrument which is drawn by or on behalf of the other person and is drawn on or payable at or through any financial institution; or

(D) the proceeds of any other form of financial transaction as the Federal functional regulators may prescribe by regulation which involves a financial institution as a payor or financial intermediary on behalf of or for the benefit of the other person.

(2) BETS OR WAGERS.—The term "bets or wagers"—

(A) means the staking or risking by any person of something of value upon the outcome of a contest of others, a sporting event, or a game subject to chance, upon an agreement or understanding that the person or another person will receive something of greater value than the amount staked or risked in the event of a certain outcome;

(B) includes the purchase of a chance or opportunity to win a lottery or other prize (which opportunity to win is predominantly subject to chance);

(C) includes any scheme of a type described in section 3702 of title 28, United States Code;

(D) includes any instructions or information pertaining to the establishment or movement of funds in an account by the bettor or customer with the business of betting or wagering; and

(E) does not include—

(i) any activity governed by the securities laws (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(47) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) for the purchase or sale of securities (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(10) of such Act);

(ii) any transaction conducted on or subject to the rules of a registered entity or exempt board of trade pursuant to the Commodity Exchange Act;

(iii) any over-the-counter derivative instrument;

(iv) any other transaction that—

(I) is excluded or exempt from regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act; or

(II) is exempt from State gaming or bucket shop laws under section 12(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act or section 28(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

(v) any contract of indemnity or guarantee;

(vi) any contract for insurance;

(vii) any deposit or other transaction with a depository institution (as defined in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

(viii) any participation in a simulation sports game or an educational game or contest that—

(I) is not dependent solely on the outcome of any single sporting event or nonparticipant's singular individual performance in any single sporting event;

(II) has an outcome that reflects the relative knowledge and skill of the participants with such outcome determined predominantly by accumulated statistical results of sporting events; and

(III) offers a prize or award to a participant that is established in advance of the game or contest and is not determined by the number of participants or the amount of any fees paid by those participants; and

(ix) any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized by a State.

(3) DESIGNATED PAYMENT SYSTEM DEFINED.—The term "designated payment system" means any system utilized by any creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, or money transmitting

service, or any participant in such network, that the Federal functional regulators determine, by regulation or order, could be utilized in connection with, or to facilitate, any restricted transaction.

(4) **FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL REGULATOR.**—The term “Federal functional regulator” has the same meaning as in section 509(2) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

(5) **INTERNET.**—The term “Internet” means the international computer network of interoperable packet switched data networks.

(6) **UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING.**—The term “unlawful Internet gambling” means to place, receive, or otherwise transmit a bet or wager by any means which involves the use, at least in part, of the Internet where such bet or wager is unlawful under any applicable Federal or State law in the State in which the bet or wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made.

(7) **OTHER TERMS.**—

(A) **CREDIT; CREDITOR; AND CREDIT CARD.**—The terms “credit”, “creditor”, and “credit card” have the meanings given such terms in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act.

(B) **ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.**—The term “electronic fund transfer”—

(i) has the meaning given such term in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act; and

(ii) includes any fund transfer covered by Article 4A of the Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in any State.

(C) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution”—

(i) has the meaning given such term in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act; and

(ii) includes any financial institution, as defined in section 509(3) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

(D) **MONEY TRANSMITTING BUSINESS AND MONEY TRANSMITTING SERVICE.**—The terms “money transmitting business” and “money transmitting service” have the meanings given such terms in section 5330(d) of title 31, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 108-145. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108-145.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. KELLY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mrs. KELLY:

Page 13, after line 2, [page and line numbers refer to H.R. 2143, as introduced on May 19, 2003] insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. COMMON SENSE RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

No provision of this Act shall be construed as altering, limiting, extending, changing the status of, or otherwise affecting any law relating to, affecting, or regulating gambling within the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, which seeks to cut off the lifeblood of illegal Internet gambling. As we consider this important legislation, I am offering an amendment to clarify the intent of the legislation and to specifically address concerns raised by those who oppose the bill.

Over the last few weeks, there has been a lot of inaccurate and misleading information spread about H.R. 2143. Let us be clear about that, though. This legislation does not change current law by defining what is legal or illegal. It simply ensures that we have a mechanism to enforce illegal activity under the Federal law; but because reasonable minds can disagree, I offer this amendment in an abundance of caution to put concerns to rest that this legislation changes existing law. It does not.

My amendment adds a straightforward section to the bill entitled “Common Sense Rule of Construction” to ensure that there are no carve-outs, no loopholes, no new powers created by any section of H.R. 2143. The amendment clearly states in one sentence that this legislation does not change any law, Federal law, State law or tribal law, governing gambling in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation that will give law enforcement an important new tool to fight crime, stop terrorism, and to protect families across America.

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time otherwise reserved for the opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am supportive of the gentlewoman from New York’s (Mrs. KELLY) amendment. I think it is a great idea that she came up with to make very clear what this bill does and does not do.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, this is one of the simplest amendments I have ever offered on the floor of this Chamber. In one sentence this amendment says the legislation does not change any law governing gambling in the United States of America. It makes clear that the legislation simply seeks to cut off the financial flow to the unlawful Internet casino industry. It guarantees there are no carve-outs in the bill, no loopholes, no new powers created by any section.

I cannot understand why anyone would oppose this amendment unless they want to change current law to open up loopholes for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we put the crooks out of business. We have got to stop the drain of the money-laundering system that terrorists can access. I ask for an emphatic “yes” vote on this amendment and an emphatic “yes” vote on the final passage of this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-145.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 7, strike line 3 [page and line numbers refer to H.R. 2143, as introduced on May 19, 2003] and all that follows through line 6 (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs and any cross reference to any such subparagraph accordingly).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2143 to protect minors from the dangers of Internet gambling. This amendment removes credit card transactions from categories of prohibited financial transactions under the bill. The purpose of removing credit cards from the list of prohibited financial transactions is that credit cards have built-in mechanisms that protect children from the dangers of Internet gambling. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment to H.R. 2143.

A study released by the American Psychological Association finds that pathological gambling is more prevalent among youth than adults. Between 5 and 8 percent of the young Americans and Canadians have a serious gambling problem, compared to 1 to 3 percent of adults. Let me repeat that again, Mr. Chairman. Between 5 and 8 percent of young Americans and Canadians, young people, have a serious gambling problem compared to 1 to 3 percent of adults. The study went on to say that with gambling becoming more accessible in U.S. society it will be important to be able to intervene in children

and adolescent lives before the activity can develop into a problem behavior.

Many Internet gambling sites require bare minimum information from gamblers to participate. Security on bets placed over the Internet has proven ineffective; and unlike traditional regulated casinos, Internet operators have no demonstrated ability or requirement to verify a participant's age or identification. Also, an Internet gambling site can easily take a person's money, shut down their site and move on. My amendment will allow the use of credit cards to provide the protections that many Internet gambling sites do not.

As H.R. 2143 is presently drafted, no betting or wagering businesses may knowingly accept credit cards, proceeds of credit, electronic fund transfers, moneys transmitted through a money-transmitting business or a check or similar draft in connection with another person's participation in unlawful Internet gambling.

Allowing credit cards to be used in Internet gambling transactions helps to protect minors. Credit cards, unlike the other methods of payment prohibited in H.R. 2143, provide safeguards to help to ensure minors do not engage in Internet gambling. For example, acquiring a credit card requires the individual to verify he or she has reached the age of 18. Credit cards are an effective method of verifying age because minors are not issued their own accounts. Credit card companies may also conduct a background or credit check to confirm the individual is of age. The procedures help to deter minors from using credit cards to gamble.

In fact, in previous legislation passed by Congress to protect children from harmful Internet sites, credit cards were used as a deterrent in the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, COPPA. Congress specifically allowed the use of credit cards as a method of age verification in order to restrict access by minors to Web sites containing adult material. Does it not seem logical for Congress to follow its own logic? By prohibiting the use of credit cards, H.R. 2143 ties the hands of law enforcement agencies and Federal regulatory agencies like the FTC to ensure sufficient control to identify minors who may attempt to gamble online.

There are also transactional safeguards available from credit card companies that will help prevent Internet gambling by minors. For example, several of the major credit card companies have a coding system that tracks the type of merchandise that is being sold by a merchant. The coding system alerts the credit card company and the credit card owner of purchases and charges that are not typical. For example, if a child steals his parent's credit card and makes several bets on an Internet gambling Web site, the coding system will recognize the new purchases, alert the credit card owner, who in turn can take necessary steps to stop the gambling by the minor.

Just about a year ago, we rewarded credit card companies with respect to a new bankruptcy bill on the issue of credit card debt. Here we can utilize credit card companies to do something effective and good to protect our children.

Mr. Chairman, the age verification and merchandise tracking safeguards provided by credit cards are not sufficient alone to cure the problem of minors engaging in Internet gambling. I know that. However, these safeguards are a step in the right direction, and they will prevent some minors from using the Internet gambling Web sites that remain, even in spite of this bill. If we pass this legislation without this amendment to H.R. 2143, we will eliminate the one proven method of effectively preventing children from accessing Internet gambling Web sites.

For these reasons, I ask that my colleagues enthusiastically join me in amending H.R. 2143 so that credit cards can be used and thereby protect children, America's children, 8 percent of whom are engaged or addicted to gambling from those activities and access to Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2143 to protect minors from the dangers of Internet gambling. This amendment removes credit card transactions from categories of prohibited financial transactions under the bill. The purpose of removing credit cards from the list of prohibited financial transactions is that credit cards have built in mechanisms that protect children from the dangers of Internet gambling. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment to H.R. 2143.

A study released by the American Psychological Association finds that pathological gambling is more prevalent among youths than adults. Between five and eight percent of young Americans and Canadians have a serious gambling problem, compared with one to three percent of adults. The study went on to say that with gambling becoming more accessible in U.S. society, it will be important to be able to intervene in children's and adolescent's lives before the activity can develop into a problem behavior.

Many Internet gambling sites require bare minimum information from gamblers to participate. Security on bets placed over the Internet has proven ineffective. And unlike traditional regulated casinos, Internet operators have no demonstrated ability or requirement to verify a participant's age or identification. Also, an Internet gambling site can easily take a person's money, shut down their sites, and move on. My amendment will allow the use of credit cards to provide the protections that many Internet gambling sites do not.

As H.R. 2143 is presently drafted, no betting or wagering businesses may knowingly accept credit cards, proceeds of credit, electronic fund transfers, monies transmitted through a money-transmitting business, or a check or similar draft, in connection with another person's participation in unlawful Internet gambling.

Allowing credit cards to be used in Internet gambling transactions helps to protect minors. Credit cards, unlike the other methods of payment prohibited in H.R. 2143, provide safeguards that help to insure that minors do not

engage in Internet gambling. For example, acquiring a credit card requires the individual to verify he or she has reached the age of 18. Credit cards are an effective method of verifying age because minors are not issued their own accounts. Credit card companies may also conduct a background or credit check to confirm the individual is of age. The procedures help to deter minors from using credit cards to gamble.

In fact, in previous legislation passed by Congress to protect children from harmful Internet sites, credit cards were used as a deterrent. In the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act ("COPPA") Congress specifically allowed the use of credit cards as a method of age verification in order to restrict access by minors to websites containing adult material. By prohibiting the use of credit cards, H.R. 2143 ties the hands of law enforcement agencies and federal regulatory agencies like the FTC to ensure sufficient controls to identify minors who may attempt to gamble online.

There were also transactional safeguards available from credit card companies that will help prevent Internet gambling by minors. For example, several of the major credit card companies have a coding system that tracks the type of merchandise that is being sold by a merchant. The coding system alerts the credit card company and the credit card owner of purchases or charges that are not typical. For example, if a child steals his parents' credit card and makes several bets on an Internet gambling website, the coding system will recognize the new purchases, alert the credit card owner, who in turn can take the necessary steps to stop the gambling by the minor.

Mr. Chairman, the age verification and merchandise tracking safeguards provided by credit cards are not sufficient alone to cure the problem of minors engaging in Internet gambling. However, these safeguards are a step in the right direction and they will prevent some minors from using Internet gambling websites. If we pass this legislation without amendment, H.R. 2143 will eliminate the one proven method of effectively preventing children from accessing Internet gambling websites. For these reasons, I propose that H.R. 2143 be amended so that credit cards can be used by betting and wagering businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

□ 1745

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and I introduced this legislation, and I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) probably said it best when he described the Jackson-Lee amendment as gutting the bill by removing from it the major source of financing for illegal Internet gambling, and that is credit cards.

What this entire legislation is about is about cutting off the money, because these illegal Internet gamblers are not

offering a public service, they are making money. They are, in fact, making a killing. It is all about money, and the way we address it is by cutting off the money. Removing credit cards from the financial instrument covered under the bill is tantamount to saying we are only going to pretend to address the problem of illegal Internet gambling.

No one should seriously contend that children are not now gambling over the Internet using credit cards in too many instances. How difficult is it to borrow, with or without permission, mom or dad's credit card and gamble over the Internet. College kids are doing it every day; teenagers are doing it every day. How difficult is it for a thief to obtain someone else's credit card number to gamble over the Internet? They steal blank checks, they cash worthless checks, and they steal credit cards, all to feed their addiction. A slew of identity theft cases have hit this country in recent months. Many of those may, in fact, have been driven by this very addiction.

This is a damaging amendment designed to turn a very strong enforcement bill into a weak shadow of itself. I strongly urge a no vote on it. I would like to close by reading a letter from MasterCard because we are told they already have everything they need to do in doing it, and this is a letter to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

"I am now writing to communicate MasterCard's strong support for appropriate measures to combat illegal Internet gambling. In particular, we commend the efforts of you and your colleagues on H.R. 2143. This legislation will build on the rules developed by MasterCard and enable MasterCard to block branded payment card transactions in connection with Internet gambling. These rules have been extremely effective in impeding the use of U.S.-issued MasterCard branded payment cards for Internet gambling transactions. MasterCard believes that H.R. 2143, introduced by Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, would establish a workable framework for combating illegal Internet gambling. We are committed to working with you and your colleagues to further refine and pass this legislation as Congress seeks to provide a legislative solution to this important problem."

MasterCard, Discover, American Express, Visa, the Nation's largest banks, Household Finance, Morgan Stanley, I could go on and on, have all endorsed this legislation because it will work. It will not cut off everything, but the bill as presently constituted covers money orders, it covers e-cash, it covers wire transfers, but it also covers credit cards and it must cover credit cards to be a comprehensive approach.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) said and as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has said, there are more effective things we could do, and hopefully we will to them, but both of them have strongly endorsed this legislation as a first step.

I urge this body to defeat this amendment, defeat the poison pill that will be offered next and vote on final passage of this bill without these killer amendments.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House report 108-145.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

Page 9, line 22, after the semicolon, insert "and".

Page 10, line 17, strike "; and" and insert a period.

Page 10, strike lines 18 and 19.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes of my time be yielded to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and that he may yield blocks of that time as he sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that has been the subject of much name-calling by the proponents of this bill. I ask the membership to look at the amendment. It strikes the carve-out that the authors of this bill put in to exempt horse racing, dog racing, State lotteries and other forms of gambling from the proposed regulations of this bill.

I believe that Internet gambling should be eliminated; but to have a carve-out for horses and dogs and lotteries and jai lai, and Lord knows what else, means that people will be able to use the Internet and use their credit cards to place bets and lose a lot of money.

No, if Internet gambling is addictive, we ought to close the loophole, because minors and others can lose just as

much money on horses and dogs and lotteries and jai lai as they can lose on other forms of Internet gambling. I strongly urge support of this amendment. This is a loophole that is big enough to drive a truck through. By passing the amendment, we close the loophole.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and in support of the base bill before us. The bill before us effectively achieves its purpose, to prevent people from using credit on illegal gambling activities, particularly offshore Internet sites.

But if this amendment should be adopted, we might as well just call this bill the "Horse Racing Prohibition Act" because it will literally kill that entire industry. The intent of the amendment is not to prevent illegal activity, rather it is intended to make current legal activities illegal.

If the language regarding State license domestic wagering were eliminated or changed, this legislation would not simply prohibit credit in connection with Internet gambling, it would restrict the day-to-day wagering activities of millions of horse racing fans by limiting financial clearing transactions with domestic wagering facilities. As a result, this would severely curtail simulcast wagering and personal account wagering on any horse race.

Not surprisingly, over 80 percent of the amount bet on horse racing is wagered at locations other than where the race is run. The result of this amendment, should it pass, would be catastrophic to the \$34 billion racing/horse breeding industry, especially to the States that rely on it for tax revenue and the 500,000 full-time jobs it supports.

In Kentucky alone, there are 460 thoroughbred farms, 150,000 horses, 8 tracks and 52,000 jobs which add \$3.4 billion directly to the State's economy. On top of this, the U.S. horse racing industry is already one of the most highly regulated industries in the country, governed by both Federal and State laws.

States like Kentucky have highly sophisticated systems in place to ensure that each transaction is made in accordance with the law. Because of this State regulation, the integrity of gaming site operators, the identity of the participants, consumer fraud and money laundering are not at issue.

It is ironic that this Congress would stand here today and attempt to trample on the rights of States to regulate

their own businesses. The adoption of this amendment would be the triple crown of injustices. It would put hard-working folks out of work, it would take away much-needed revenue from the States, and it would deprive honest folks the fun of putting a couple of bucks down on their favorite horse to win, place, or show. I ask Members to reject the Sensenbrenner amendment and support the bill as written.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what an exciting day on the floor of the House. The Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act just happens to have one problem: It accepts horse racing. Now, can somebody explain to me why that is so? We are going to ban Internet gambling except horse racing. Why?

Well, it is because the horse racing lobbyists and the dog racing lobbyists have said that is what we ought to do. Why did they write a bill like this? This is a bill that expands gambling, expands gambling by accepting two industries.

Now I have been in touch with Reverend Lou Sheldon of the Traditional Values Coalition and Paul of the Free Congress Foundation, and they have told me this is a bad, bad bill, not to do it. We have a wire act from 1961 that has forbidden gambling, and now we are making the exception for horse racing. Can someone suggest why this bill was written this way? Anyone on the floor, I yield.

I did not think so.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to the time left on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) has 4 minutes. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has 7 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 3½ minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I oppose it because it prohibits Americans from using their credit cards for behavior that is entirely legal. Pari-mutuels, horse tracks, dog tracks, and jai lai frontons are all legal in many States. They are heavily regulated. They pay taxes. They provide jobs, and in many communities are an important part of the tourism industry and local culture. That is why the National Governors Association is against this amendment.

□ 1800

Pari-mutuels employ thousands of Americans and provide enjoyment to millions more. The horse racing industry generates \$34 billion a year and creates 472,000 full-time jobs in America. Greyhound racing is a \$2.3 billion industry creating over 30,000 jobs in America. They both provide very needed tax revenue to our States. It makes

no sense for Congress to usurp States' rights with the result being a loss of employment of Americans and State revenue.

The underlying bill rightfully bans credit card use for illegal gambling. Casino-style offshore Web sites are not regulated. They do not pay taxes, and they do not employ Americans. They are illegal, and American banks should not help facilitate them. But the issue here is whether Congress is going to make a policy that says Americans cannot use credit cards to engage in behavior which in their State is legal. Not illegal, but legal.

I would respectfully argue that Congress should do no such thing and should oppose this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his work on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by expressing my great esteem for the proponents of this bill. I believe that they honestly think that this bill will limit or, to some degree, prohibit or slow the growth of the pernicious vice of gambling on the Internet. I am personally not convinced that that will happen; and if I might, I would like to just focus on comments by the last two gentlemen who have spoken.

The gentleman from Kentucky talks about 52,000 jobs in his State that depend upon horse racing, which is currently legal in his State and currently legal in many other States in the Union and around the world. The gentleman from Florida has just talked about 700,000 jobs in the country or more that relate to horse racing and 30,000 jobs that relate to dog racing; and, of course, the other two exceptions that are carved out in the underlying bill are jai alai, which is, of course, a big sport in Florida, and State-run lotteries.

The problem with this bill and the reason we have so much emotion and so much emotional support for the idea that this amendment is bad is that this amendment might make those activities illegal when in fact what this amendment does is eliminate carve-outs and eliminate gambling that is now illegal. The problem for me is that I represent the State of Utah, one of only two States that actually totally prohibits gambling. The other State is Hawaii. From the perspective of our States, and I say this with all due respect, this is not the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, this is Internet Gambling Enabling Act. It actually allows gaming in Utah and will do so in Utah and Hawaii and other States where there are limitations on gambling unless the carve-outs are removed.

The underlying bill provides these major carve-outs, and I think we have broad consensus from those who have actually looked at the bill and under-

stand it. The U.S. Department of Justice and the National Association of Attorneys General have expressed themselves on this issue. In testimony before the Senate Banking Committee, John Malcolm of the U.S. Department of Justice testified that the aforementioned section, the carve-out section, was one of the reasons DOJ could not endorse Senate 627, which is nearly identical to H.R. 21 and now H.R. 2143. Testifying on behalf of the National Association of Attorneys General, Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of Connecticut, warned that under that bill the exceptions could swallow the rule. Certainly in those States where gambling is outlawed or some gambling is outlawed, the exceptions could swallow the rule. In testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciary, when asked if that action would allow lotteries to go online, Malcolm responded, "Absolutely." You cannot do that in Utah today, but you will be able to if this law preempts local State law.

Thus, H.R. 21 is not really an Internet gambling prohibition bill. You might actually consider it an Internet gambling industrial policy bill because we are choosing a favored class of state-sponsored Internet gambling under this bill.

Last year during consideration of a similar bill, H.R. 3215 in the 107th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary voted overwhelmingly against allowing carve-outs in Internet gaming legislation. Last year when the Committee on the Judiciary was considering the Goodlatte Internet gambling bill, which had similar carve-outs, I offered amendments to strike those carve-outs. The amendments were adopted by wide margins, and the bill as modified was reported overwhelmingly by the committee.

The argument that the provisions simply allow States to regulate intrastate wagers does not wash. The provision is an exception from the definition of "bets or wagers." It is not confined to intrastate. It essentially says that state-licensed facilities can do anything their license allows them to do, be it pari-mutuel, casino-style, or any other kind of betting.

This bill is ill considered despite the great intentions of its proponents. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my recorded vote request on the Jackson-Lee amendment. I will work in conference to make sure that children are protected in America.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The request for a recorded vote is withdrawn and, pursuant to the voice vote, the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, as a strong opponent of Internet gaming, I rise in support of the Sensenbrenner-Conyers-Cannon amendment. The Traditional Values Coalition supports this amendment, which removes the exemption that would allow state-licensed or authorized businesses to conduct Internet gambling. The bill does not provide equivalent treatment for tribal governments. If this bill becomes law, the outcome will result in the unequal treatment of Indian tribes because the current Federal law, the Wire Communications Act that prohibits Internet gambling will apply only then to Indian tribes. Only state-licensed businesses will be permitted to conduct Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will actually make it possible to expand Internet gambling rather than prohibit it. This amendment eliminates the special interest exemption for various gambling groups that support the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS), who rises in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, as the cochair of the Congressional Horse Caucus and a Member from Kentucky, I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS). Kentucky is where more thoroughbreds are born each year than in any other State. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, an amendment that seeks to change the very intent of the bill before us. Horse racing is one of the most highly regulated industries, and we do not want to do harm to an industry that employs well over half a million people nationwide.

The title of the bill, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, says it all. The intent is to address the problem of unlawful, unregulated gambling over the Internet. H.R. 2143 does this while respecting existing Federal and State gambling laws.

We have heard supporters of this amendment argue that it is needed because it will keep the bill from expanding Internet gambling. This is just not true. In fact, the bill itself without this amendment deals only with the use of credit cards and other bank instruments in connection with unlawful Internet wagering. The bill does not change any Federal or State gambling provision. It does not make any unlawful gambling lawful. It does not make any lawful gambling unlawful. And it does not override any State prohibitions or requirements.

The National Governors Association is opposed to this amendment because they understand and support this distinction in the bill and its purpose. Governors in States like Kentucky that allow lawful, state-sanctioned and regulated gaming activities such as

pari-mutuel horse racing know the importance of the economic impact of gaming in the form of jobs and tax revenue generated to the State. State governments across the country are grappling with shortfalls.

Regardless of what you hear, that is what passage of this amendment will do. We need to oppose this amendment and support H.R. 2143.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sensenbrenner amendment. The underlying bill, as we know, exempts transactions with a business licensed or authorized by a State from the definition of "bet or wager." This will permit lotteries, horse and dog tracks and other gambling operations to go on the Internet, but does not cover transactions with tribal governments. It is simply unfair not to provide parity for Indian tribes.

If this bill becomes law, the outcome will result in unequal treatment of Indian tribes because the current Federal law that prohibits Internet gambling will only apply to Indian tribes. With this bill, only state-licensed businesses will be permitted to conduct Internet gambling. The gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment, with the gentleman from Michigan, ensures fairness for everyone, placing tribes and States on a level playing field. Indian gaming, as we know, has provided tribal communities with economic self-reliance; and it has also helped to create jobs in surrounding communities, not just for tribes but for other people in the surrounding communities. It is simply unfair not to provide parity.

I would ask my colleagues to vote in favor of the Sensenbrenner amendment if they feel strongly that there should be parity for Indian tribes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) in opposition to the Cannon-Sensenbrenner amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Sensenbrenner amendment. There has been a lot of talk on the floor and sometimes what appears to be is not to be. It is very, very confusing to somebody who is watching it. Simply, it is a poison pill. The Sensenbrenner amendment is a poison pill. If you want to kill the bill, vote for Sensenbrenner. It looks good. It looks good, but it will hurt the effort. Many people, particularly young people, will be hurt by the failure of this bill to pass.

If you want this bill to pass, if you are opposed to Internet gambling, if you care about the future of these young people, I ask you to vote against the Sensenbrenner amendment and vote in support of the base bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, unequal treatment of American Indians and American Indian tribes is not an American value. I have great respect for those who resist this amendment because I believe they are acting in sincere good faith and trying to establish American values. But we need to pass this amendment to assure that the American value of fair treatment of American Indians, which has been denied them in certain times in our history, to our great shame, is not repeated in this bill.

This amendment, when passed, will assure that we do not have special interest legislation just for non-Indian Americans. Indian and non-Indian Americans ought to be treated the same. That will not happen unless we pass this amendment.

I will tell Members why I feel so strongly about this. About a year ago, I was driving through the Tulalip Indian reservation by Marysville, Washington. I spent a lot of time in my youth there. I noticed a new building that had just gone up. It was the first Boys and Girls Club on an Indian reservation in America. Today as we speak, there are kids there who are learning teamwork and new skills and getting new job training at that Boys and Girls Club. The reason that club is there is because of this industry, this legal industry.

Let us not hearken back to the dark days of treating Indian tribes with less respect of law than other industries in America. Let us pass this amendment. Let us do what is right for a lot of folks, including the Boys and Girls Club and the Tulalip Indian reservation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from the United Methodist Church, the National Council of Churches, and four other faith-based organizations and a letter from the National Governors Association in opposition to the Sensenbrenner amendment.

JUNE 3, 2003.

*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a diverse bipartisan coalition of family and faith-based organizations, we are very concerned with the effects of gambling on our society and the well-being of young people and families. We write to strongly support the passage of H.R. 2143, To Prevent the Use of Certain Bank Instruments for Unlawful Internet Gambling, and for Other Purposes. Internet Gambling is already against the law in all 50 states, yet offshore gambling interests continue to operate without any accountability and are available in every state by utilizing the Internet. We urge you to support H.R. 2143 and reject any amendment or proposal which would weaken the bill or hinder its enforcement according to current federal law.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission Report presents a disturbing and devastating picture of the effect of gambling on families. Some crucial points to consider in this report as it relates to Internet gambling are:

• Gambling costs society \$5 billion a year in societal costs including, job loss, unemployment benefits, welfare benefits, poor physical and mental health, and problem or pathological gambling treatment, bankruptcy,

arrests, imprisonment, legal fees for divorce, and so forth.

Because the Internet can be used anonymously, the danger exists that access to Internet gambling will be abused by underage gamblers, our children and youth.

The high-speed instant gratification of Internet games and the high level of privacy they offer may exacerbate problem and pathological gambling.

Lack of accountability also raises the potential for criminal activities, which can occur in several ways. First, there is the possibility of abuse by gambling operators. Most Internet service providers hosting Internet gambling operations are physically located offshore; as a result, operators can alter, move, or entirely remove sites within minutes. Furthermore, gambling on the Internet provides an easy means for money laundering. Internet gambling provides anonymity, remote access, and encrypted data. To launder money, a person need only deposit money into an offshore account, use those funds to gamble, lose a small percent of the original funds, then cash out the remaining funds. Through the dual protection of encryption and anonymity, much of this activity can take place undetected.

Computer hackers or gambling operators may tamper with gambling software to manipulate games to their benefit. Unlike the physical world of highly regulated resort-destination casinos, assessing the integrity of Internet operators is quite difficult.

Please support H.R. 2143 and reject the spread of a predatory industry, which is contrary to the well-being of individuals and all of society.

Sincerely,

Christian Coalition of America, Concerned Women for America, Family Research Council, General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion (NCAGE), National Council of Churches.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2003.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Ranking Member, House Financial Services Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE FRANK: On behalf of the National Governors Association, we are writing to express our interest in H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. We appreciate your efforts to address the troubling problems posed by Internet gambling, while recognizing the authority of states to regulate gambling within their own borders.

We urge you to maintain the exemption currently included in H.R. 2143 for Internet transactions with businesses licensed or authorized by a state such as a state lottery. We understand that there may be efforts to strip the bill of this provision, and we encourage you to oppose such attempts. An incursion into this area with respect to online gambling would establish a dangerous precedent with respect to gambling in general as well as broader principles of state sovereignty.

Sincerely,

Governor MIKE JOHANNIS,
Chair, Committee on Economic Development and Commerce.

Governor JAMES E. MCGREEVEY,
Vice Chair, Committee on Economic Development and Commerce.

□ 1815

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who, second to none, has led the fight against this illegal Internet gambling.

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, for his leadership on this legislation, which is a big step forward in the fight against Internet gambling. This amendment, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) described, is indeed a poison pill. The reason is, it does not have any effect on the lawfulness or the unlawfulness of gambling, the provision that they want to pull out. That provision simply protects the rights of States to regulate gambling.

Historically, that is what we have always done in this country. Gambling has always been the province of the States. They regulate gambling, and this amendment would change that. This amendment would take away from the States the right to do that.

We are simply attempting to maintain the status quo with respect to underlying Federal and State substantive law on gambling. We are not tilting the playing field one way or another unfairly, we are simply trying to address the problem of unlawful gambling, as the title of the bill suggests. I would love to do more on these other issues, but this is not the bill, this is not the place to do it.

The term "lawful" is included in this provision of the bill to indicate that no transaction will be exempted from the effect of the bill unless that transaction complies with all other State and Federal laws. The amendment already adopted offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) makes that even clearer, so the complaints of the gentleman from Utah, whose State I have great admiration for in terms of their efforts to combat gambling, need have no fear of this legislation. This does not open up Utah to any new forms of gambling. It will tighten it down.

There are plenty of people in Utah today who pull up a chair in front of their computer in their living room and go on and place a bet, using a credit card or wire transfer or some other form of financial transfer, that this legislation will stop. We should not allow a poison pill to prevent this legislation from moving forward to accomplish that.

In addition, States have traditionally had the power to decide whether to allow gambling within their borders. We should not put into question the authority of those States to decide these matters for themselves. Utah, Virginia, or any other State in the country, they ought to be able to make that decision, and we ought not interfere with it. Striking this provision of the bill would eliminate a provision

that reinforces the rights of the States to decide whether or not to prohibit gambling, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—186

Abercrombie	Gutknecht	Olver
Akin	Harman	Ortiz
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Ose
Baird	Hayworth	Owens
Baldwin	Herger	Pallone
Ballance	Hinches	Pastor
Ballenger	Hinojosa	Payne
Bartlett (MD)	Hoefel	Pearce
Becerra	Hoekstra	Pelosi
Bell	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Bereuter	Hostettler	Pombo
Berkley	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berman	Hunter	Price (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Inslee	Rahall
Blackburn	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Bono	(TX)	Rehberg
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Renzi
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (CT)	Reyes
Cannon	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Capps	Jones (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Royce
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Rush
Case	Kilpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kind	Ryan (WI)
Clyburn	King (IA)	Sanchez, Linda
Cole	Kleczka	T.
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Cox	Lampson	Sanders
Crane	Langevin	Schiff
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Cunningham	Levin	Shays
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Simmons
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Solis
DeFazio	Lynch	Souder
DeGette	Majette	Stark
Delahunt	Markey	Stenholm
DeLauro	Marshall	Stupak
Deutsch	Matheson	Tancredo
Dicks	Matsui	Tauscher
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McDermott	Tiahrt
Dreier	McGovern	Towns
Edwards	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Millender-	Visclosky
Filner	McDonald	Wamp
Flake	Miller (NC)	Watson
Fossella	Miller, George	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moore	Waxman
Frost	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Gallegly	Murtha	Weldon (FL)
Gingrey	Napolitano	Weldon (PA)
Granger	Neal (MA)	Wilson (NM)
Green (TX)	Nethercutt	Woolsey
Green (WI)	Ney	Wynn
Grijalva	Oberstar	Young (AK)
Gutierrez	Obey	Young (FL)

NOES—237

Ackerman	Bachus	Beauprez
Aderholt	Baker	Berry
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Bigert
Allen	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Bass	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY) Greenwood
Blunt Hall
Boehlert Harris
Boehner Hart
Bonilla Hastings (WA)
Bonner Hayes
Boozman Hefley
Boswell Hensarling
Boucher Hill
Boyd Hobson
Bradley (NH) Holden
Brady (PA) Holt
Brady (TX) Hooley (OR)
Brown (SC) Hulshof
Brown-Waite, Ginny Hyde
Burgess Isakson
Burns Israel
Burr Issa
Burton (IN) Istook
Buyer Janklow
Calvert Jenkins
Camp John
Cantor Johnson (IL)
Capito Johnson, Sam
Capuano Jones (NC)
Cardoza Kaptur
Carter Keller
Castle Kelly
Chabot Kennedy (MN)
Chocola King (NY)
Coble Kingston
Collins Kirk
Cooper Kline
Costello Knollenberg
Cramer Kolbe
Crenshaw LaHood
Crowley Latham
Davis (AL) LaTourette
Davis (FL) Leach
Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (CA)
Davis, Tom Lewis (KY)
Deal (GA) Linder
DeLay Lipinski
DeMint LoBiondo
Diaz-Balart, L. Lucas (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M. Lucas (OK)
Dooley (CA) Maloney
Doolittle Manzullo
Doyle McCarthy (MO)
Duncan McCarthy (NY)
Dunn McCotter
Ehlers McCreery
Emanuel McHugh
Emerson McClinnis
Engel McKeon
English McNulty
Everett Meek (FL)
Feeny Mica
Ferguson Michaud
Foley Miller (FL)
Forbes Miller (MI)
Ford Miller, Gary
Franks (AZ) Mollohan
Frelinghuysen Moran (KS)
Garrett (NJ) Murphy
Gerlach Musgrave
Gibbons Myrick
Gilchrest Nadler
Gillmor Neugebauer
Gonzalez Northup
Goode Norwood
Goodlatte Nunes
Goss Nussle
Graves Osborne
Otter

NOT VOTING—11

Cubin Gordon
Eshoo Houghton
Fletcher Lantos
Gephardt Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1848

Messrs. GILCHREST, UPTON, GREENWOOD, KIRK, DEMINT, DOOLITTLE, TAYLOR of Mississippi, FRANKS of Arizona, BOSWELL, FRELINGHUYSEN, CAMP, RYUN of Kansas, VITTER, NUSSLE, BURNS,

GOSS, PORTMAN, JANKLOW, TAYLOR of North Carolina, ROGERS of Alabama, FORBES, WILSON of South Carolina, PITTS, BOOZMAN, and ISSA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, RODRIQUEZ, OWENS, BECERRA, MARSHALL, VISCLOSKEY, WYNN, BEREUTER, FOSSELLA, MENENDEZ, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1850

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 263, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 252.

The vote to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 110 will be postponed until tomorrow.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 319, nays 104, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—319

Aderholt	Ballenger	Bereuter	Greenwood	Northup
Akin	Barrett (SC)	Berry	Gutknecht	Norwood
Alexander	Bartlett (MD)	Biggert	Hall	Nunes
Allen	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis	Harman	Nussle
Bachus	Bass	Bishop (GA)	Bonner	Obey
Baird	Beauprez	Bishop (NY)	Boozman	Ortiz
Baker	Bell	Blackburn	Boswell	Osborne
			Boucher	Ose
			Boyd	Otter
			Bradley (NH)	Oxley
			Brady (PA)	Pascarell
			Brady (TX)	Pearce
			Brown (OH)	Pence
			Brown (SC)	Peterson (PA)
			Brown, Corrine	Petri
			Brown-Waite, Ginny	Pickering
			Burgess	Holden
			Burns	Platts
			Burr	Portman
			Burton (IN)	Price (NC)
			Calvert	Pryce (OH)
			Camp	Putnam
			Cantor	Quinn
			Capito	Radanovich
			Cardin	Rahall
			Cardoza	Israel
			Carson (IN)	Issa
			Carter	Istook
			Case	Jackson (IL)
			Castle	Janklow
			Chabot	Renzi
			Chocola	Jenkins
			Coble	John
			Cole	Johnson (CT)
			Collins	Johnson (IL)
			Cooper	Johnson, Sam
			Costello	Jones (NC)
			Cox	Kanjorski
			Cramer	Kaptur
			Crane	Keller
			Crenshaw	Kelly
			Crowley	Kennedy (MN)
			Culberson	King (IA)
			Cunningham	King (NY)
			Davis (AL)	Kingston
			Davis (FL)	Kirk
			Davis (IL)	Kline
			Davis (TN)	Knollenberg
			Davis, Jo Ann	Kolbe
			Davis, Tom	LaHood
			Deal (GA)	Lampson
			DeGette	Langevin
			DeLauro	Latham
			DeLay	LaTourette
			DeMint	Leach
			Deutsch	Levin
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (CA)
			Dingell	Lewis (KY)
			Doggett	Linder
			Dooley (CA)	Lipinski
			Doolittle	LoBiondo
			Doyle	Lowey
			Duncan	Lucas (KY)
			Dunn	Lucas (OK)
			Edwards	Lynch
			Ehlers	Majette
			Emanuel	Maloney
			Emerson	Manzullo
			English	Marshall
			Etheridge	Matheson
			Everett	McCarthy (MO)
			Fattah	McCarthy (NY)
			Feeny	McCotter
			Ferguson	McCreery
			Filner	McHugh
			Foley	McInnis
			Forbes	McIntyre
			Ford	McKeon
			Franks (AZ)	McNulty
			Frelinghuysen	Meek (FL)
			Gallely	Meeks (NY)
			Garrett (NJ)	Mica
			Gerlach	Michaud
			Gibbons	Millender
			Gilchrest	McDonald
			Gillmor	Miller (FL)
			Gingrey	Miller (MI)
			Gonzalez	Miller (NC)
			Goode	Miller, Gary
			Goodlatte	Mollohan
			Gordon	Moore
			Goss	Moran (KS)
			Granger	Moran (VA)
			Graves	Murphy
			Green (TX)	Murtha
			Green (WI)	Musgrave
				Neugebauer
				Walden (FL)
				Weldon (PA)
				Wexler
				Whitfield
				Wicker

Wilson (NM) Wolf
Wilson (SC) Wu

NAYS—104

Abercrombie Hinchey
Ackerman Holt
Andrews Honda
Baca Insee
Baldwin Jackson-Lee
Ballance (TX)
Becerra Jefferson
Berkley Johnson, E. B.
Berman Jones (OH)
Bishop (UT) Kennedy (RI)
Blumenauer Kildee
Bono Kilpatrick
Cannon Kind
Capps Kleczka
Capuano Kucinich
Carson (OK) (WA)
Clay Lee
Clyburn Lewis (GA)
Conyers Lofgren
Cummings Markey
Davis (CA) Matsui
DeFazio McCollum
Delahunt McDermott
Dicks McGovern
Dreier Meehan
Engel Menendez
Evans Miller, George
Farr Neal (MA)
Flake Nethercutt
Fossella Ney
Frank (MA) Oberstar
Frost Olver
Grijalva Owens
Gutierrez Pallone
Hastings (FL) Pastor
Hayworth Paul

NOT VOTING—11

Buyer Gephardt Smith (WA)
Cubin Houghton Tierney
Eshoo Lantos Toomey
Fletcher Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1906

Messrs. WELLER, GUTIERREZ, and HOLT changed their 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IN ITS EFFORTS IN WTO TO END THE EUROPEAN UNION'S TRADE PRACTICES REGARDING BIOTECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 252, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.R. 252, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 80, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

YEAS—339

Ackerman Etheridge
Aderholt Evans
Akin Everrett
Alexander Feeny
Bachus Ferguson
Baker Flake
Ballance Foley
Ballenger Forbes
Barrett (SC) Ford
Bartlett (MD) Fossella
Barton (TX) Franks (AZ)
Bass Frelinghuysen
Beauprez Frost
Becerra Gallegly
Bell Garrett (NJ)
Bereuter Gerlach
Berman Gibbons
Berry Gilchrist
Biggart Gillmor
Bilirakis Gingrey
Bishop (GA) Gonzalez
Bishop (UT) Goode
Blackburn Goodlatte
Blumenauer Gordon
Blunt Goss
Boehlert Granger
Boehner Graves
Bonilla Green (WI)
Bonner Greenwood
Bono Gutknecht
Boozman Hall
Boswell Harris
Boucher Hart
Boyd Hastert
Bradley (NH) Hastings (WA)
Brady (PA) Hayes
Brady (TX) Hayworth
Brown (SC) Hefley
Brown-Waite, Hensarling
Ginny Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Insee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourrette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowe
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)

Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Mushgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood

NAYS—80

Abercrombie Hastings (FL)
Allen Hinchey
Andrews Honda
Baca Jackson (IL)
Baird Jackson-Lee
Baldwin (TX)
Berkley Jefferson
Bishop (NY) Jones (OH)
Brown (OH) Kaptur
Brown, Corrine Kennedy (RI)
Capps Kildee
Carson (IN) Kilpatrick
Clyburn Kleczka
Conyers Kucinich
Davis (IL) Langevin
DeFazio Lee
DeGette Lewis (GA)
Delahunt Lipinski
DeLauro Majette
Doggett Maloney
Engel Markey
Farr McCollum
Fattah Miller, George
Filner Nadler
Frank (MA) Oberstar
Green (TX) Olver
Grijalva Olver
Gutierrez Owens

NOT VOTING—16

Cubin Harman Manzullo
Davis, Tom Herger Sessions
Doolittle Houghton Smith (WA)
Eshoo Lantos Toomey
Fletcher Larson (CT)
Gephardt Leach

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1915

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 256 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today, Tuesday, June 10, 2003, to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 252, 253, 254, 255 and 256 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

“No” on rollcall vote No. 252 on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 263, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2143, To prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes;

“No” on rollcall vote No. 253 on H. Res. 263, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R.