



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 2002

No. 78

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, guide your people by the spirit of understanding which will lead them ultimately to eternal wisdom. Since Your servants live in a world of human failure and broken promises, may they be tolerant of the faults of others because they are so aware of their own unfaithfulness. All of us are yet to realize our own full potential as being truly the free children of God.

In this information age, hindsight may give us better sight, but we still live only on fragments of what You would have us judge as truth.

Bless all with a quiet respect for the diversity for opinions. Through honest dialogue and contemplative listening, may Your servants in government search all the avenues open to them to meet today's challenges of integrity and justice.

Through the formulation of law and the formation of public opinion, may this House foster the restoration of credibility in the institutional life of this Nation and this Government by the people and for the people now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCGOVERN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain one-minute speeches today at the end of legislative business.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4019, PERMANENT MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF ACT OF 2002

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 440 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 440

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4019) to provide that the marriage penalty relief provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall be permanent. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the

bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 440 is a modified, closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4019, a bill to provide that the marriage penalty relief provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall be permanent.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule further provides for consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Committee on Rules' report accompanying the resolution if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee.

The substitute shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3515

for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, as with the death tax repeal provisions passed by the House last week, it is necessary for this body to act again today because when Congress enacted the Marriage Penalty Relief of 2001, an arcane procedural rule in the other body required that much-needed relief for married taxpayers be terminated on July 1, 2011. This clearly contradicts the original will of the House as our bill had no sunset provision. We passed marriage penalty relief in the first place because it is unfair and even morally wrong for the Federal Government to tax working men and women at a higher rate if they are married than if they instead choose to remain single while living together. We corrected that inequity because simple fairness demands it. And fundamental fairness also demands that we make that change permanent because to do otherwise means that on January 1, 2011, every married couple in America, every married couple in America, will face a significant tax increase. No one else, just married couples. In fact, failure to act on H.R. 4019 will result in a tax increase of \$42 billion in 2010 and 2011 for low and middle income taxpayers alone.

That is not what this House intended and it is up to us to do something about it. For that reason I am pleased that the Committee on Ways and Means has reported legislation removing the "sunset" provisions of the marriage penalty relief we passed last year. This bill, H.R. 4019, will make the following provisions from last year's law permanent. It will increase the standard deduction for married couples to twice the deduction for single taxpayers. It will increase the width of the 15 percent tax bracket for married couples so that it is twice as wide as the bracket for single taxpayers. It will increase the phaseout range of the earned income tax credit by \$3,000 for married couples and simplifies the earned income tax credit to reduce tax complexity for low income taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, we are only taking up this legislation because of an obscure procedural obstacle in the other body. We have an opportunity today to correct that injustice, and I urge my colleagues to do so by adopting both this rule and the underlying bill H.R. 4019.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, although this rule makes a Democratic substitute in order and I have no problem with the

rule, I believe that this is not the right time to be considering the underlying legislation. Our Nation's fiscal house is not in order, but instead of working to return this country back to the budget surpluses of 3 years ago, the Republican majority continues to dig us further into a deeper fiscal hole. Instead of working together for the good of all Americans, the majority continues to bring legislation to this floor that is politically designed for the November campaign. This body, Mr. Speaker, is sound bite central. Listen to the debate today and get used to the sound bites because the arguments we hear today will sound a lot like tomorrow's campaign ads. There is a time and place for politics but not here and not now.

There is a strong desire for tax relief in both the Democratic and Republican parties, but we have serious disagreements about who should benefit from that relief. Democrats believe tax relief should go to working families trying to make ends meet, not billionaire CEOs and multinational corporations. We all agree that families who are unfairly penalized by the marriage penalty tax deserve relief. We could provide that relief right now, but, Mr. Speaker, the devil is always in the details and the details show that this bill is bad news for the people's budget.

Consider the facts. The marriage penalty tax provisions included in last year's tax cuts don't begin to take effect until 2005 and they don't expire until 2010 and primarily benefit wealthier Americans, not lower and middle income families who should benefit the most from this relief. If the majority is so concerned about tax relief for married couples, why did they not make this relief effective immediately instead of forcing families to wait until 2005? Why is there such a rush to extend these tax cuts beyond any reasonable budget projections? As a result of last year's tax cut, the recession, and the economic consequences of September 11, this country now has a \$200 billion budget deficit. Of course, this deficit comes on the heels of record budget surpluses created during the Clinton administration.

But does the Republican majority do anything to help dig this country out of the fiscal hole we are in? No. Last week this House approved legislation repealing the sunset of the estate tax. This repeal would cost almost three quarters of a trillion dollars. The repeal of the sunset of the marriage penalty will cost another quarter of a trillion dollars over the next 2 decades. Where is this money coming from? How are we going to pay for it? Where are the offsets?

The real answer is disturbingly clear. These repeals will be paid for by dipping into the Social Security Trust fund.

□ 1015

The American people deserve to know that the Republican majority is

spending from the Social Security trust fund until the well is dry. The baby boomers will begin to retire in 2011, and we must prepare for their arrival into the Social Security system. Squandering the Social Security surplus is unacceptable, but that is what is happening here.

Of course, if we were in the mood to be responsible, there are always ways to pay for this bill. We have one very reasonable offset staring us in the face. Certain corporations are fleeing the United States for tax havens overseas, skipping out on their responsibilities. This House has the power to close this tax loophole by approving legislation introduced by our colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY). This legislation would save a minimum of \$4 billion over the next decade.

During the debate on the tax limitation amendment yesterday, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) said, "If you owe tax, pay taxes," and I agree. Corporations must pay the taxes that they owe. Congress should not allow these corporations to set up tax shelters overseas while continuing to operate in this country just to avoid paying taxes. Working families have to pay their taxes. The married couples we are discussing today have to pay their taxes. Why do these corporations not pay their taxes?

But no, every time the Democrats try to offer reasonable ways to pay for these bills, the majority leadership refuses to allow our amendments to even be considered. So what are they afraid of, Mr. Speaker?

The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) will offer a Democratic substitute that will protect Social Security for the next generation. This substitute still permanently extends marriage penalty relief, but it adds a trigger requiring the Office of Management and Budget to certify that this permanent repeal will not raid the Social Security trust fund, and let me repeat that. All this does is require the Office of Management and Budget to certify that this permanent repeal will not raid the Social Security trust fund.

I think almost every Member of this body has voted not to spend Social Security funds on anything but Social Security. We have had votes on lockboxes and everything else, and people have centered all their press releases about how they want to protect Social Security. Here is a way to show it.

Our substitute would protect Social Security for future generations. We owe it to the American people to maintain the solvency of the system, and I urge my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, to support our substitute.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about marriage. All of us support the institution of marriage. All of us believe that married couples should not be unfairly penalized. Rather, this debate is about responsibilities. Are we going to be responsible and pay for the bills we pass,

or are we going to steal from the baby boomers by taking funds from Social Security, one of the most important social programs in the history of the United States?

We are witnessing an incredibly disturbing trend on the part of the majority. A few weeks ago, the Republican leadership buried a huge increase in the debt ceiling in a rule so Members could avoid taking responsibility for their votes, so that no one has to go home and say they voted to increase the debt ceiling, when, in fact, that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House cannot hide forever. The American people know what is going on here. They know that the surplus is gone. They know that to pay for some of these tax measures that we have no offsets for, that we are going to dip into the Social Security trust fund; and they are very much against that. I believe they deserve a heck of a lot better.

We must be fiscally responsible. We must live up to our promises; and in the end, we should defeat this bill and support the Democratic substitute.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), who has been a champion of this issue since he first came to Congress.

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this rule. I stand in strong support of the basic bill that will come before this House. I urge bipartisan opposition to the substitute and motion to recommit that will be offered today and ask bipartisan support for permanent elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

We are already hearing in the debate that has begun basically the excuses. We have to remember as we look back over the previous times we debated eliminating the marriage tax penalty there were always those on the other side of the aisle who used every procedural trick they could come up with or argument to oppose eliminating the marriage tax penalty because that is what it is all about here in Washington. It is who controls those dollars and whether they are going to be spent here in Washington or spent back home.

That is part of the fundamental debate we have today in this issue of the marriage tax penalty. Unfortunately, because of an arcane rule in the Senate, marriage tax penalty relief, which was included in the Bush tax cut, was provided for on a temporary basis; and unfortunately when it expires, it will amount to a \$42 billion tax increase on 36 million married working couples who suffer what we call the marriage tax penalty.

Let me explain what the marriage tax penalty is. That is when there is a

husband and wife who are both in the workforce, and because when they marry they jointly combine their income, and that is what their taxes are based on, that historically has pushed them into a higher tax bracket, forcing married working couples to pay higher taxes. And that is a pretty important question: Do we believe it is right, do we believe it is fair that married couples, married working couples, a man and woman, both in the workforce, should pay higher taxes just because they are married? Is it right that under our Tax Code, that our Tax Code punishes society's most basic institution? I think not.

I have been proud that this House has led the fight in eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Every House Republican has voted to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, even 60-some Democrats joined with us because they recognize that it is wrong to impose taxes on marriage; and today, we are going to hear from those who fought every step of the way our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, and they are going to say just about anything, even saying Social Security is somehow in jeopardy, if we eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I would note that, by law, the assets in the Social Security trust fund cannot be spent on anything but Social Security, regardless of what the rest of the budget looks like for that given year.

Let me give my colleagues an example of a couple back in my district that I represent who benefit from what we call the Bush tax cut, who benefit from our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I have here before us Jose and Magdalena Castillo and their children Eduardo and Carolina. Jose and Magdalena are a working couple from Joliet, Illinois. Jose has an income of about \$57,000. Magdalena has an income of \$25,000. Because they are married, they file jointly. Their marriage tax penalty was \$1,125 before the Bush tax cut was signed into law a year ago, and if we fail to make permanent marriage tax relief once again, the Castillo family will suffer the marriage tax penalty, and in their case, that is \$1,125.

Think about it. Here in Washington, \$1,125 is pocket change, when we are talking in millions and billions and trillions, the big numbers we talk about; but for a working couple, the 36 million married couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty, it is real money. That \$1,125 is several months of day care for little Carolina and Eduardo. It is a couple of months' worth of car payments. It is a down payment on a home or a new car. It is money that can be set aside in education savings accounts for Eduardo and Carolina and for their future plans and their future years, but it is real money for real people.

We worked to eliminate the marriage tax penalty in several ways, and President Bush signed into law our legislation last year which helped those who

do not itemize their taxes, which are 20 million married couples suffering the marriage tax penalty, by doubling the standard deduction to twice that for single filers. That benefits 20 million couples who do not itemize their taxes. For those who do, middle-class couples suffering the marriage tax penalty who happen to be homeowners or give to their church, their charity or synagogue or institution or organizations of faith, homeowners that itemize, we widen the 15 percent tax bracket so they can earn twice as much income as a joint filer as a single person could make and still pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. That benefits 21 million married working couples in the middle class.

Also, we help the working poor. There are 4 million working-poor married couples who now qualify for the earned income tax credit, the EIC, because of the marriage tax relief that we provide. As a result of that, we benefit 36 million married working couples. Think about that. What would happen to these 36 million working couples if we failed to make marriage tax penalty relief permanent? They are going to pay a \$42 billion tax increase in the first 2 years.

There are those in Washington who we are going to hear from today who are going to say we should let it expire; we need that money to spend here in Washington. Well, I believe a majority of this House will side with the Castillo family today. I believe that a majority of the House, in a bipartisan way, is going to side with hardworking, middle-class families, like the Castillos, and say, let us protect that marriage tax relief.

Let us make it permanent to ensure that couples like Jose and Magdalena are able to use that money for their own needs back at home and take care of little Carolina and Eduardo, because that is what this is all about. We want to make our Tax Code more fair; and of course, we were successful last year in eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Unfortunately, because of an arcane rule in the Senate, it was temporary. And it is funny: here in Washington it is so easy to pass a permanent tax increase. It is so easy to pass a permanent spending increase, but there are people here in Washington that will fight tooth and nail every effort to help working families like the Castillos by providing permanent marriage tax relief.

Let us work in a bipartisan way. Let us work to help good hardworking people like the Castillos keep their own hard-earned dollars. Why should they pay higher taxes just because they are married? Often, it is asked in this debate who most benefits from tax relief. Well, if we look at the statistics, those who earn between \$20,000 and \$75,000, middle-class families are those who are hardest hit by the marriage tax penalty.

So if we all claim to be friends of the middle class, we should want to make

permanent marriage tax relief, and I know we are going to hear from the excuses caucus who are going to come up with every excuse to oppose this legislation. Let us move in a bipartisan way. Let us have bipartisan support for this rule. Let us move for permanent marriage tax relief.

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

I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that families like the ones he mentioned, Jose and Magdalena, deserve relief, and we all want to work to provide them that relief; but what we are simply saying here is we need to make sure we properly pay for that relief. I am sure that that family would not appreciate knowing that we are paying for some of these tax cut bills by dipping into the Social Security trust fund.

Every time that we pass an education measure here, we have to find an offset. Every time we pass a bill to protect a park or to improve our environment, we need an offset. Every time we have a health care measure on the floor, we need an offset; and yet what we are asking for here is where are the offsets to pay for all of this.

The American people do not want to go further into debt. The American people do not want to jeopardize the Social Security trust fund. They want us to be responsible, and I think working in a bipartisan way we could provide marriage tax relief and at the same time pay for it; but for whatever reason, the other side does not want to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This 15-minute vote on agreeing to the resolution will be, followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on approving the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 22, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—385

Ackerman	Allen	Baca
Aderholt	Andrews	Bachus
Akin	Armey	Baird

Baker	Flake	LoBiondo
Baldacci	Fletcher	Lofgren
Baldwin	Foley	Saxton
Ballenger	Ford	Lucas (KY)
Barcia	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Barr	Frank	Luther
Barrett	Frelinghuysen	Lynch
Bartlett	Frost	Maloney (CT)
Barton	Gallegly	Maloney (NY)
Bass	Gillmor	Manzullo
Becerra	Ganske	Markey
Bentsen	Gekas	Mascara
Bereuter	Gephardt	Matheson
Berkley	Gibbons	Matsui
Berman	Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)
Berry	Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)
Biggett	Gilman	McCollum
Bilirakis	Gonzalez	McCrery
Bishop	Goode	McGovern
Blumenauer	Goodlatte	McHugh
Blunt	Gordon	McIntyre
Boehlert	Goss	McKeon
Boehner	Graham	McKinney
Bonilla	Granger	McNulty
Bonior	Graves	Meehan
Boozman	Green (TX)	Meek (FL)
Borski	Green (WI)	Meeks (NY)
Boswell	Greenwood	Menendez
Boucher	Grucci	Mica
Boyd	Gutierrez	Millender-
Brady (PA)	Gutknecht	McDonald
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Miller, Dan
Brown (FL)	Hansen	Miller, Gary
Brown (OH)	Harman	Miller, George
Brown (SC)	Hart	Miller, Jeff
Bryant	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Mollohan
Buyer	Hayes	Moore
Callahan	Hayworth	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Hefley	Moran (VA)
Camp	Herger	Morella
Cannon	Hill	Murtha
Cantor	Hinojosa	Myrick
Capito	Hobson	Napolitano
Capps	Hoeffel	Neal
Capuano	Hoekstra	Nethercutt
Carson (IN)	Holden	Ney
Carson (OK)	Holt	Northup
Castle	Honda	Norwood
Chabot	Hooey	Oberstar
Chambliss	Horn	Obey
Clay	Hostettler	Oliver
Clement	Hoyer	Ortiz
Clyburn	Hulshof	Osborne
Coble	Hunter	Ose
Collins	Hyde	Otter
Condit	Inslee	Oxley
Cooksey	Isakson	Pallone
Costello	Israel	Pascarell
Cox	Issa	Paul
Coyne	Istook	Payne
Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Crenshaw	(TX)	Pence
Crowley	Jefferson	Peterson (PA)
Cubin	Jenkins	Petri
Culberson	John	Phelps
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Pickering
Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Davis (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Davis (IL)	Jones (NC)	Pombo
Davis, Jo Ann	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Davis, Tom	Kaptur	Portman
Deal	Keller	Pryce (OH)
DeGette	Kelly	Putnam
Delahunt	Kennedy (MN)	Radanovich
DeLauro	Kerns	Rahall
DeLay	Kildee	Ramstad
DeMint	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Diaz-Balart	Kind (WI)	Regula
Dicks	King (NY)	Rehberg
Dingell	Kingston	Reyes
Doggett	Kirk	Reynolds
Dooley	Knollenberg	Riley
Doolittle	Kolbe	Rivers
Doyle	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Dreier	LaHood	Roemer
Duncan	Lampson	Rogers (KY)
Dunn	Langevin	Rogers (MI)
Edwards	Lantos	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Ross
Engel	Latham	Rothman
Eshoo	LaTourette	Roukema
Etheridge	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Evans	Levin	Royce
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (WI)
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Ferguson	Linder	Sanchez
	Lipinski	

Sandlin	Souder	Udall (CO)
Sawyer	Spratt	Udall (NM)
Saxton	Stearns	Upton
Schaffer	Stenholm	Velazquez
Schiff	Strickland	Visclosky
Schrock	Stump	Vitter
Scott	Stupak	Walden
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Walsh
Serrano	Sununu	Wamp
Sessions	Sweeney	Watkins (OK)
Shadegg	Tancred	Watson (CA)
Shaw	Tanner	Watts (OK)
Shays	Tauscher	Waxman
Sherwood	Tauzin	Weiner
Shimkus	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shows	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Shuster	Terry	Weller
Simmons	Thomas	Wexler
Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Skeen	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Skeltan	Thornberry	Wilson (NM)
Slaughter	Thune	Wilson (SC)
Smith (MI)	Thurman	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Woolsey
Smith (WA)	Tiberi	Wu
Snyder	Toomey	Wynn
Solis	Turner	Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Abercrombie	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky
Cardin	Klecza	Sherman
Conyers	Kucinich	Stark
Cummings	Lee	Tierney
DeFazio	Nadler	Waters
Filner	Pastor	Watt (NC)
Hilliard	Sabo	
Hinchey	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—27

Blagojevich	Forbes	Nussle
Bono	Hall (OH)	Owens
Burton	Hilleary	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Houghton	Price (NC)
Combest	Johnson, E. B.	Quinn
Crane	Jones (OH)	Smith (TX)
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Towns
Ehrlich	McDermott	Trafficant
English	McInnis	Young (AK)

□ 1054

Messrs. WATT of North Carolina, STARK, SHERMAN, CONYERS, KUCINICH, Ms. LEE and Mr. SANDERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HOLT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. TANCREDO changed his vote from “present” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 13, 2002, my vote was not recorded on rollcall vote No. 226. Had my vote been recorded, it would have been in the following manner: Rollcall vote No. 226—H. Res. 440 providing for the consideration of H.R. 4019—“aye.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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