

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003".

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman 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. 5121) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 489, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 49, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie	Cannon	Emerson
Ackerman	Cantor	Engel
Aderholt	Capito	English
Akin	Capps	Eshoo
Allen	Capuano	Etheridge
Andrews	Cardin	Evans
Armey	Carson (IN)	Farr
Baca	Castle	Fattah
Bachus	Chambliss	Ferguson
Baird	Clay	Finer
Baker	Clement	Fletcher
Baldacci	Clyburn	Foley
Baldwin	Coble	Forbes
Ballenger	Combest	Ford
Barcia	Condit	Frank
Barton	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Bass	Cooksey	Frost
Becerra	Coyne	Gallegly
Bentsen	Cramer	Ganske
Bereuter	Crenshaw	Gekas
Berman	Crowley	Gephardt
Biggert	Cubin	Gibbons
Bilirakis	Culberson	Gilchrest
Bishop	Cummings	Gillmor
Blumenauer	Cunningham	Gilman
Blunt	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Boehlert	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Boehner	Davis (IL)	Goss
Bonilla	Davis, Jo Ann	Granger
Bono	Davis, Tom	Graves
Boozman	DeFazio	Greenwood
Borski	DeGette	Grucci
Boswell	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Boucher	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Boyd	DeLay	Hall (OH)
Brady (PA)	DeMint	Hall (TX)
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Hansen
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Harman
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Hart
Brown (SC)	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Bryant	Dooley	Hayes
Burr	Doolittle	Hayworth
Burton	Doyle	Herger
Buyer	Dreier	Hill
Callahan	Edwards	Hilleary
Calvert	Ehlers	Hilliard
Camp	Ehrlich	Hinchey

Hinojosa	McNulty	Schiff
Hobson	Meehan	Schrock
Hoefel	Meek (FL)	Scott
Hoekstra	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Holden	Menendez	Sessions
Honda	Mica	Shaw
Horn	Millender-	Sherman
Hostettler	McDonald	Sherwood
Houghton	Miller, Dan	Shows
Hoyer	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Hunter	Miller, George	Simmons
Hyde	Mink	Simpson
Inslee	Mollohan	Skeen
Isakson	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Issa	Morella	Slaughter
Istook	Murtha	Smith (MI)
Jackson (IL)	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Smith (TX)
(TX)	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Jefferson	Neal	Snyder
Jenkins	Nethercutt	Solis
John	Ney	Souder
Johnson (CT)	Northup	Spratt
Johnson (IL)	Nussle	Stark
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Stenholm
Johnson, Sam	Obey	Strickland
Jones (NC)	Olver	Stump
Jones (OH)	Ortiz	Stupak
Kanjorski	Osborne	Sullivan
Kaptur	Ose	Sununu
Keller	Otter	Sweeney
Kelly	Owens	Tanner
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Tauscher
Kildee	Pallone	Tauzin
Kilpatrick	Pascrell	Taylor (NC)
King (NY)	Pastor	Terry
Kingston	Payne	Thomas
Kirk	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Kleczka	Pence	Thompson (MS)
Knollenberg	Peterson (MN)	Thornberry
Kolbe	Peterson (PA)	Thune
Kucinich	Pitts	Thurman
LaFalce	Platts	Tiahrt
LaHood	Pombo	Tiberi
Langevin	Portman	Tierney
Lantos	Price (NC)	Towns
Larsen (WA)	Pryce (OH)	Udall (CO)
Larson (CT)	Putnam	Udall (NM)
Latham	Quinn	Upton
LaTourette	Radanovich	Velazquez
Leach	Rahall	Visclosky
Lee	Ramstad	Vitter
Levin	Rangel	Walden
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Walsh
Lewis (GA)	Rehberg	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Reyes	Watkins (OK)
Linder	Reynolds	Watson (CA)
Lipinski	Riley	Watt (NC)
LoBiondo	Rivers	Watts (OK)
Lofgren	Rodriguez	Waxman
Lucas (OK)	Rogers (KY)	Weiner
Lynch	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Maloney (CT)	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
Maloney (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Manzullo	Ross	Wexler
Markey	Rothman	Whitfield
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
McCarthy (MO)	Rush	Wilson (SC)
McCollum	Ryun (KS)	Wolf
McCrery	Sabo	Woolsey
McDermott	Sanchez	Wu
McGovern	Sanders	Wynn
McInnis	Sandlin	Young (AK)
McIntyre	Sawyer	Young (FL)
McKeon	Saxton	
McKinney	Schakowsky	

NAYS—49

Barr	Green (WI)	Phelps
Bartlett	Hefley	Pickering
Berry	Holt	Roemer
Blagojevich	Hulshof	Royce
Chabot	Israel	Ryan (WI)
Collins	Kennedy (MN)	Schaffer
Costello	Kerns	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Kind (WI)	Shadegg
Crane	Lucas (KY)	Shays
Deal	Luther	Shimkus
Doggett	Matheson	Stearns
Duncan	Miller, Jeff	Tancredo
Everett	Moore	Taylor (MS)
Flake	Moran (KS)	Toomey
Goode	Norwood	Turner
Goodlatte	Paul	
Green (TX)	Petri	

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett	Bonior	Clayton
Berkley	Carson (OK)	Dunn

Fossella	Lowey	Roukema
Graham	Mascara	Trafficant
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Hooley	McHugh	Wicker
Lampson	Pomeroy	

□ 1821

Mr. EVERETT and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland 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.

Stated for:

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 321, final passage of H.R. 5121, Legislative Branch Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2003, I was absent due to a meeting with a constituent.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 2002, I missed rollcall vote No. 321. Had I been able to record my vote, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 321.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2002, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4775, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight, Friday, July 19, 2002, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorists attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5059

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5059.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5120, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 488 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 488

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the

House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5120) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided" on page 12, line 19, through "2003" on line 23; beginning with "Provided" on page 74, line 15, through "law" on line 25; page 81, line 22, through page 82, line 7; page 102, line 19, through page 103, line 10. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole shall accord priority in recognition to Representative Goss of Florida or his designee to offer the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, which may be offered only at the appropriate point in reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendment printed in the report are waived. Except as otherwise specified in this resolution, during consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes 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 purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 488 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 5120, the fiscal year 2003 Treasury, Postal Service appropriations bill. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

H. Res. 488 also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failing to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appro-

priations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, except as specified in the resolution itself.

H. Res. 488 provides that the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole shall accord priority in recognition of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) or his designee to offer the amendment printed in the report.

The rule also waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report. Further, the rule also authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Once H. Res. 488 is approved, the House can begin its consideration of fiscal year 2003 Treasury, Postal Service appropriations bill, which is the fifth regular appropriations bill to come to the House floor.

H.R. 5120 provides roughly \$18.5 billion in funding for a variety of Federal departments and agencies. The committee included funding supporting State and local law enforcement efforts, enhancements in Federal information technology, and homeland security.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule so that the House can proceed with general debate and consideration of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule. My colleagues should know from the very outset of this debate that the vote on this rule is about one simple issue: The issue of corporate accountability. Members must decide if they support giving billions of dollars of taxpayer money to corporations that dodge their taxes by running off to the Bahamas or to Bermuda.

During the Committee on Appropriations' markup of the Treasury, Postal appropriations bill, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) offered an amendment to prohibit government contracts from being awarded to companies that reincorporate overseas to avoid paying U.S. taxes. The Committee on Appropriations approved her amendment by a bipartisan vote of 41 to 17.

But the majority in the Committee on Rules, and I assume in consultation with the Republican leadership, has decided that they do not like the work done by the Committee on Appropria-

tions on this particular issue. This rule leaves the DeLauro amendment vulnerable to a point of order, essentially stripping it from the bill. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and this rule should be defeated because of it.

The DeLauro amendment does not even seek to close the overseas loophole, which we should have done long ago and which Democrats have been trying to do for months. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY) introduced a bill to eliminate the loophole over 4 months ago. It has been languishing in this House ever since. That is why Members right now are signing a discharge petition to free the Neal-Maloney bill from legislative purgatory.

All the DeLauro amendment says is that companies who shirk their responsibilities should not be rewarded with billions of American taxpayer dollars. For the life of me, I cannot figure out what is so controversial about that.

Now, the majority will argue that they are merely using the regular order of the House; that there are jurisdictional issues between the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Government Reform.

□ 1630

Well, I find it extraordinary that the majority has suddenly found religion on the virtues of regular procedure, because for months we have watched them treat regular order like the skunk at the garden party. Major trade legislation has been written by a single Member and then shoved through the House without hearings or proper committee action. Please, do not suddenly proclaim the virtues of following the regular procedures of this House or about the sanctity of committee prerogatives.

Now confronted with an issue that they do not like and that scares the political wits out of them, the Republican majority hides behind a parliamentary smoke screen. Well, I can see through that smoke screen, my colleagues can see through it, and the American people can see through it.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations, to their credit, decided to act in an overwhelming bipartisan way. Sadly, the majority on the Committee on Rules is attempting to dismantle that bipartisan work, once again siding with the greediest and most self-serving of corporate interests.

The Republicans say this issue is complicated. Complicated? What is so complicated about it? What is so hard to understand? What do they not get? Is there ever a point when the leadership on the other side of the aisle says enough is enough?

We can give all of the speeches we want about how concerned we are, but talk is cheap. The time for action is now, not tomorrow, not next week, not after Labor Day, but now. Again, the DeLauro amendment is modest in its scope. It does not even try to close the

loophole that allows companies to renounce their citizenship while continuing to reap the benefits that come with it.

All this amendment says is that those companies do not deserve to be rewarded with billions of dollars in government contracts. They do not deserve a pat on the back for bad behavior. If there are legitimate technical issues with the drafting of this amendment, they can be addressed in the conference committee. This issue is too important to keep sweeping it under the rug.

Mr. Speaker, the families in my district work hard and pay their taxes. The small businesses I represent in Worcester and Attleboro and Fall River pay their fair share. I do not believe that their hard-earned tax dollars should be funneled to corporations that skip out on their responsibilities. This is about fairness. It is about respecting the companies that actually play by the rules.

I say to my colleagues again, this issue is very clear. This vote is very simple. The vote on this rule is a vote up or down on whether these Cayman Island corporations that dodge their tax responsibilities deserve to receive billions of dollars in taxpayer money.

Let us draw the line in the sand against corporate misbehavior. Let us send a signal to the American people that we in this Chamber actually get it, that we are taking steps to fix the problem. No more stalling. I urge Members to vote "no" on this rule.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today advocating a vote against the previous question, and doing so in opposition to a Member pay raise. Today we are considering a bill that is vital for the continued operation of our government, the safety of our citizens, and the security of our economy. But hidden deep within it is another congressional pay raise.

Mr. Speaker, since this session of Congress began, the Dow has lost 15 percent of its value. The Nasdaq has lost almost a third of its value. Unemployment is up. Profits are down. Retirement accounts are down. People are hurting, and we in this Congress should not be raising our pay. We cannot afford it.

Last year's government surpluses are long gone. We are swimming in red ink. We are fighting a war. We should not be asking the taxpayers to pay us more. I urge Members to vote against the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) because corporations are cheating the U.S. out of \$4 billion

in tax revenue by fleeing for international tax havens, and this government rewards these companies with billions of dollars in Federal contracts. This is wrong. This is unpatriotic, and this House should not run away from its responsibility to the fiscal health of this Nation by ignoring this issue.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, do those 30-second editorials work against their time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They certainly do.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, every week when I go home to my district and also here in my office, I talk to business people who work hard, who worry about their communities, their investors, and their workers. They try to produce a good product. They do their duty as citizens. They pay their fair share of taxes and they help pull the wagon, as a Senator from the other body often describes it. They help pull the wagon and meet their share of community and national responsibilities.

When they see corporations maneuver the Tax Code and avoid paying taxes by ostensibly moving their address while they do not move their operations, they move their address to exotic places such as Bermuda, they ask me, What in God's name are you guys doing? When are you going to put a stop to it? They resent carrying their fair share of the load while somebody else is ducking their responsibility to carry theirs.

So the DeLauro amendment which was offered in committee, which I was pleased to cosponsor, simply said, and it is an outrageous idea to some Members, I suppose, it simply said to these companies, Look, buster, if you are going to ignore your responsibilities to this society and the taxpayers who help see to it that you get police protection, the transportation system that you need to sell and move your products, if they see those folks abandoning their duty, they want us to do something about it. And most of all, they do not expect Uncle Sam to be Uncle Sucker by continuing to do business with the companies that refuse to pay taxes to the United States Government.

Now, the rule under which this bill is going to be considered will not protect the language of the DeLauro amendment, so there will be an easy way for this House to avoid bringing those companies to heel. That is why you are going to see a good many of us vote against the rule, because we believe that one of the first responsibilities of the most privileged of the taxpayers among us is to meet their own obligations to this society. It is unpatriotic for those companies to change their address in order to avoid pulling their fair share of the load, and it is out-

rageous that this Congress does not have enough anger and enough guts and enough determination to stand up to those actions and say enough is enough, buster, this is not going to happen any more.

We ought to be taking that stand immediately on this and every other appropriation bill so that no company that welches on their responsibility to this country can do a dime's worth of business with Uncle Sam. Until we take that position, these kinds of outrageous things are going to continue. I hope this House does the right thing on the rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in favor of the rule and the bill itself. I want to say in this time of uncertainty when homeland security is foremost on everybody's mind and agenda, this bill is probably one of the more significant votes we will take this year.

I have often heard Members say I am not going to vote for Treasury-Postal Service because it is Washington, it is bureaucratic, it is something that does not affect my constituents back home; but I want to remind Members about some of the important government functions that are in this bill.

One of the examples is the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which is in New Mexico and Georgia which trains 71 law enforcement agencies in the government, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Secret Service, the Capitol Hill police, who we know and love and work with every single day. All that training takes place because of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which is in this bill. In these times of homeland security, just look at all of the other things.

I am going to sort of bounce around, but this bill affects the Treasury Department; Air Transportation Stabilization; the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; counterterrorism funding; and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. Who would want to vote against that during these times?

The Internal Revenue Service, and I can see why people may not be too fired up about that, but, frankly, Mr. Speaker, we need to have the IRS. Continuing on, the Interagency Crime Drug Enforcement Agency, the Office of Inspector General, the U.S. Mint, the United States Secret Service.

Moving on, the White House is funded in this, and all of the security concerns of the White House to protect the President of the United States is in this bill. The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

What I want to say, Is the rule perfect? No. In my 10th year in Congress, I can say that I have not seen a perfect rule yet. Despite the good work of our very capable Committee on Rules, it is not always the way I would write it.

Is the bill perfect? Certainly not. There again, there are things I would change if I were the only Member of this 435 body. But to nitpick this bill and to nitpick this rule at this time is not the best thing in the security interests of our country because this, as I said before, is probably one of the number one homeland security votes we will take this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the rule, and certainly I am going to support the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on Appropriations adopted a bipartisan amendment that I offered along with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), to prohibit corporate expatriates from winning Federal Government contracts. This rule wrongly strikes the amendment from this legislation.

These are corporations that set up an operation overseas in order to avoid paying U.S. taxes. They enjoy all of the benefits of corporate citizenship in America. They look like U.S. companies. The principal market that their stock is traded on is in the United States. Their physical assets are protected by our police, our firemen, our Armed Forces. They just refuse to pay for the benefits as every other American citizen and company does.

My own State of Connecticut witnessed this firsthand when Stanley Works tried to incorporate itself in Bermuda. They go to Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Switzerland and Luxembourg. Companies who put profit before patriotism, they continue to enjoy one more benefit. They still win hefty Federal contracts. Corporate expatriates benefit from over \$2 billion in lucrative government contracts. That is \$2 billion of taxpayer money going to companies who avoid taxes here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. The government should not be doing business with those who want all of the benefits of citizenship without any of the responsibilities that come along with it. Congress must not allow these companies to leave individual Americans stuck with the tax bill while they put profits over patriotism. All we are saying is pay American taxes on American profits.

The President has told us that we are at a wartime footing, and we are: \$45 billion for defense; \$38 billion we want to spend for homeland security. And when these companies leave the United States, average American taxpayers have to pick up the bill.

□ 1645

I urge my colleagues, stand up to these corporations who are unpatriotic. At a time in our lives when we are asking people to pull together to do what we need to do for America, they take their business offshore and will not pay the taxes that are owed to the Amer-

ican government. Oppose this rule. More importantly, it is about opposing these corporations who truly do not have the well-being of the American people at heart. When they are doing business and enjoying every single benefit, they should not have the benefit of Federal contracts.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time and I rise in opposition to the rule.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) in the last rule talked about a missed opportunity. This is another missed opportunity. We say, all of us, most of the people that I have heard say that the act of moving overseas to avoid participating in supporting the government, our defense, our fight against terrorism, our homeland security is an act which they condemn. Each and every one of us have said that. The American public thinks that that is an unpatriotic effort. The average person in the street is not going to move to Bermuda. The average person in the street is not going to move to some far-off place so that they can avoid taxation.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the debate on the last bill said, "Well, we're changing that. We're changing the death tax, which is why most people move overseas."

The average taxpayer, who does not have any liability for the death tax, has to pay a FICA tax, the average working guy, and 50 percent of them pay more FICA tax, Social Security tax, than they do income tax. They cannot move overseas to avoid that and, in fact, they do not. They pay their fair taxes. They do not want to pay more than their fair share, but they pay their fair share.

But what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is speaking to and what this amendment speaks to is saying that we are not going to tolerate in America people who earn their money here, become rich here, successful here, to move overseas to avoid participating in continuing to make this country strong and free. We ought not to miss that opportunity. I would tell my friends in this body that this amendment was adopted overwhelmingly and bipartisanly in the Committee on Appropriations.

Reject this rule. Adopt a new one. Let us pass the DeLauro amendment.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rule that will allow the DeLauro amendment on corporate expatriates to be struck on a point of order even though it passed the Committee on Ap-

propriations by a decisive vote of 41-17. Why should we allow companies to move offshore to avoid Federal taxes but nonetheless receive the benefits of future government contracts? That is not right, Mr. Speaker.

It is unconscionable that the Committee on Rules would refuse to protect the DeLauro language from being struck on a point of order. If any Member of this House believes that companies who incorporate outside the United States to avoid taxes should nonetheless receive Federal contracts without limitation, then they should offer an amendment to strike the DeLauro language from this bill and we should debate and vote on that particular amendment.

Instead, the Committee on Rules proposes to protect Republican Members who oppose controlling this type of corporate abuse from casting the politically difficult vote that would be required if they offered an amendment to strike the DeLauro language. It is understandable why Members who want to allow corporations to continue this type of tax abuse would want to remain faceless and anonymous. What is not understandable, Mr. Speaker, is why any of us who want to pass a rule that would assist them in doing so. This rule is an act of cowardice.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, I would like to be able to support the rule so that we could move to consideration of our bill that deals with so many extremely important issues, ranging from homeland security to tax collection, Federal employee benefits and election reform, but I cannot be a party to such fundamental unfairness.

I say to all the Members, if you truly believe that the DeLauro language is improper, offer an amendment to strike it and let us debate and vote on it. Defeat this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

The silence on the other side is deafening. I submit for insertion in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in today's New York Times entitled Congressional Cowardice.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 2002]

CONGRESSIONAL COWARDICE

While a panicky Congress has rushed in recent days to reform the business world, it has not entirely lost its well-developed instinct for catering to special interests. On two issues critical to cleaning up corporate malfeasance, Congress has opted to put the preferences of big business—and big campaign contributors—ahead of the public good.

The first involves the notorious Bermuda tax loophole that allows companies to avoid paying taxes by nominally moving their headquarters to Bermuda, even while they continue to operate from the United States. This is a blatant scam that should be eliminated. Closing the loophole would bring in an estimated \$6.3 billion over 10 years.

Democrats and Republicans in the House have introduced dueling bills. The Republican version would temporarily close the tax loophole, but it is also larded with special-interest tax breaks that add up to almost 10 times the amount that would be realized from doing so. General Motors and Ford would be among the big winners under the Republican bill, which would make it easier to accumulate untaxed profits overseas.

Congress is also fearful of challenging corporate practices in the awarding of stock options, intimidated by the possibility that wealthy corporate executives will withhold campaign contributions from lawmakers who dare to tinker with the current system. Now that Coca-Cola and a few other companies are moving to reform the system themselves by counting stock options as an expense, Congressional action could speed the changeover to a more responsible approach.

Senator CARL LEVIN, Democrat of Michigan, introduced an amendment that would require the Financial Accounting Standards Board to review the issue within a year. It is likely that the standards board, which sets the rules for corporate accounting practices, will force companies to report options as expenses. But amid intense lobbying by corporations—particularly Silicon Valley companies, which rely heavily on options—the Levin amendment was blocked earlier this week.

The Senate majority leader, TOM DASCHLE, has promised an eventual vote on the Levin amendment. That is a good start, but some Democrats who normally support the leadership, like Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, are opposed to expensing stock options. If the amendment fails to pass backers of tougher reform can add the Senate Democrats to the list of politicians caving in to pressure from big campaign contributors.

It is always troubling when special interests call the shots on Capitol Hill, but it is particularly disturbing that they are being allowed to hijack significant reform legislation. On matters like taxation, what's good for General Motors may not necessarily be good for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, silence is the only defense that our Republican colleagues can offer on this rule because a vote for this rule is a vote for more permissiveness, to condone those corporations that abandon our country, and it is nothing but a vote in favor of the same kind of permissive atmosphere that has resulted in investors, retirees and the Federal Treasury all suffering as a result of ongoing corporate corruption.

Seven years ago, I stood here at this same podium to challenge the Gingrich "Contract on America" as protection for plutocrats. Today, little has changed, because our Republican colleagues through this rule are rushing to defend corporations who have fled to Bermuda and other isles in the Caribbean, maintaining that these tax dodgers deserve contracts with America.

If in a time of war these corporate citizens must put profits over patriotism and cash over country, then we need to talk to them in the only language that they understand and that is money. They add insult to injury by not only refusing to pay their fair share but for asking for your share

that you contribute, turning around and asking for government business after they have refused to help finance the government and our national security and our schools and all of our other needs in this country.

I presented this same language in the Committee on Ways and Means on another bill and the Bush administration was there, just like our Republican colleagues, opposing that and defending these corporations that flee our country but ask for more money from the government. I believe we need to take a pro-business stance. We need to level the playing field so that the thousands of businesses that stay here and pay their fair share are not put at a competitive disadvantage by those who flee to other shores and still have a hand out asking for assistance to work on government business.

Do not support those that give up on America. Reject this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to note that the permissiveness that led to such problems in this country with WorldCom and Enron and others was the permissiveness of the 1990s, and we know who was in charge of the institutions of regulation during that time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in the 1,300 days that you have been Speaker, you will not let us vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, yet you have added through your leadership \$511,040,208,939 to the Federal debt. That is more debt than was accumulated from the day this Republic started to 1975.

You will not give us an up-or-down vote on base closure. And now you will not give us an up-or-down vote on whether or not you want to reward your buddies who move their corporations overseas in a paper transaction, so while the average Joe in Mississippi pays his taxes, your big contributors do not have to pay theirs.

That is just one more reason why you should not be Speaker.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me again remind my colleagues what this vote is about. Essentially this vote says that no government contract shall be awarded to corporate tax dodgers who go to Bermuda or the Cayman Islands in order to escape paying U.S. taxes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, next week we are supposed to have completed the work on the new homeland security agency. Is the gentleman aware that there are lobby disclosure

reports that have been filed right here in the Capitol by Pricewaterhouse Consulting which declared a new day in the Caribbean by calling itself Monday, has fled, is not paying its fair share of taxes but has filed a lobby disclosure report that it is up here lobbying ultimately for business from the new homeland security agency that we were told originally would cost no new dollars but now is apparently going to cost at least 3 billion new dollars? And apparently though they do not want to pay for our homeland security, they have already got their hand out looking for some business from the taxpayers with that new government agency.

Are you aware of that?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for making us all aware of that. I should also point out that since he brought up PricewaterhouseCoopers, on March 27, 2002, PricewaterhouseCoopers fled from New York for Bermuda, but this company continues to receive taxpayer dollars from the IRS, the Treasury Department, the GSA and the Postal Service, including three contracts worth up to \$35.5 billion.

Mr. DOGGETT. Under the amendment that the gentleman is trying to get added that our colleagues, a vote in favor of this rule will be a vote to approve, of course, Pricewaterhouse, now called Monday, and all of these other corporations that will not pay their fair share, if you vote for the rule, you are voting to do that, but under the amendment, the reasonable amendment that you are advancing, that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) have advanced, we do not punish those corporations, we simply say, if I understand it correctly, that they would not be able to seek help from the government and do business with the government at taxpayer expense if they did not want to contribute to the cost of the government.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The gentleman is correct. The DeLauro amendment, which was approved by a bipartisan vote in the Committee on Appropriations, which the majority is now attempting to strip out of the bill, basically refuses to reward bad corporate behavior. A vote for this rule would strip out of the bill the DeLauro language which says that we will not give government contracts to corporate tax dodgers, plain and simple. That is what this debate is all about.

So if you vote for this rule, you are voting to strip out that provision from this bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. One of these companies, Stanley Flees is the way one of my neighbors refers to Stanley Tool Company that has left, moved its mailbox from Connecticut to Bermuda, they would be under this amendment in no way restricted from doing business with the government of their fellow citizens in Bermuda or if they moved to Luxembourg or Lichtenstein

or one of these other tax havens, you would not restrict them from doing business there, would you?

Mr. MCGOVERN. The gentleman brings up Stanley Tools. I should also point out for my colleagues that that is a company that left the U.S. in 1997 to deprive the U.S. of \$30 million every year. These funds could be used to pay for the salaries and other costs of the Secret Service as a result of the September 11 attacks.

We need to get serious about holding some of these corporations responsible. These corporations that open up these little tax havens in Bermuda or in the Cayman Islands and in other countries, they still take advantage of all the benefits of this country. They still enjoy all the benefits that this country has to offer, but they are not paying their fair share. In this time of war when we are all being asked to sacrifice, and everybody is sacrificing, I do not think it is too much to ask that these big corporate interests pay their fair share. That is what this is about, fairness.

Mr. DOGGETT. When I offered this same language in the Committee on Ways and Means, there was such concern by the chairman of that committee that he accepted the amendment. He did not want any Republican member on record against the amendment. Perhaps they will try to hide, saying this is a procedural vote, but there will probably not be another vote on the floor of this House other than this vote that is about to occur on which Members can so clearly record their views on whether they approve of corporations fleeing to Bermuda or Jamaica or Barbados.

□ 1700

I think there was a Beach Boys song about this some time back, but where they flee to one of these Caribbean islands that they will be able to still do business here on unfair competitive grounds against those companies that have stayed here. There will not be a clearer vote, will there, that we can foresee?

Mr. MCGOVERN. This vote is crystal clear; there is no confusion. A vote for this rule is a vote for rewarding corporate misbehavior, it is a vote to reward these corporations that dodge paying their fair share of U.S. taxes. There is no other way that this vote can be interpreted.

The Committee on Rules could have protected this language from a point of order like they do so many other provisions, not only in this bill, but in other bills, but they chose not to. I think it is unconscionable that after a strong vote in the Committee on Appropriations, that this language is being scuttled. I think it is wrong. I think the American people would be outraged over the fact that this language is being stripped from this bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is okay for these corporate executives to

head off to the Caribbean Isles and get a tan, but not a tax break or a government contract. I certainly applaud the gentleman's leadership and his work to see that this is done.

It is not just corporations in the Northeast that have taken advantage of this loophole. We had one down in Houston, Texas that did the same thing, and it was the president of a competing company who recently wrote me to express his outrage, because he is loyal to this country. His workforce is here; his executive offices are here. He is willing to pay his fair share, but thinks it is mighty unfair that this Congress will not stand up and level the playing field and give his company the same fair basis for competing as those who fled and have decided they will not contribute their share of taxes.

I think it is also important to note that those who want to hide behind the fiction that this is just to avoid double taxation on foreign earnings need look no further than the prospectus on the Stanley Tool, or Stanley Flees, Company to note that they are planning to save much more in taxes than they pay in foreign taxes. I just really thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. As always, he says it like it is.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to say to my colleagues that this vote turns on a very simple issue: Do you believe that companies that incorporate in other countries to avoid U.S. taxes deserve billions of dollars in taxpayer money or not? I believe they do not. We are at war, Mr. Speaker. All of us need to contribute our fair share, and that includes big corporations. There has been a lot of rhetoric and a lot of talk about corporate responsibility and the need for Congress to act. Well, the time has come for this Congress to back up its rhetoric with real action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this very fair and balanced rule which will allow us to proceed with the very important work that we have of appropriating the dollars that are necessary for our homeland security, among other things.

Let me say to my colleagues that as I have listened to this debate, I think that some might conclude that we are dealing with something other than an appropriations bill here. This is one of the 13 appropriations bills that must pass the House of Representatives and

the Senate and get to the President's desk for signature. This is one of the most important. It is the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. It deals with Customs, Secret Service; it deals with a wide range of very important issues that must be addressed.

Now, I sort of inferred from the debate that I was listening to that we were discussing a bill that will, at some point, possibly come from the Committee on Ways and Means. As I have listened to a number of my colleagues argue that this has to do with corporate greed and rewarding people who are less than patriotic, it is absolutely ridiculous.

If one looks at what has been described by even people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, as a less than perfectly crafted amendment, this measure, as was pointed out to me by the chairman of the subcommittee just a few minutes ago, deals not with corporations, but with a subsidiary of that corporation here. So I think that the language in the amendment itself makes it very clear that the Committee on Ways and Means has to continue the work that it has already begun.

Now, when I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, talk about the fact that if we vote for this rule, we are somehow voting to reward corporate greed and all of this sort of stuff, I cannot help but think about the fact that we have taken very strong and vigorous action here to deal with an issue that the President is outraged about and that both Republicans and Democrats are outraged about, and that happens to be corporate mismanagement and corruption that has taken place within the corporate community. We know it is there.

I will tell my colleagues, corporate CEOs, the President of the United States, Members of Congress, the American people are outraged at those who, in fact, have been responsible for wrongdoing. They need to be convicted, they need to do jail time. And guess what? By a vote of 391 to 28, we voted in this House 2 days ago to move ahead with language to do that. Back on April 24, just a few weeks after the President asked us, as a Congress, to step up to the plate and deal with the issue of corporate accountability, we passed a very good and a very strong bill in this House that will deal with the issue of transparency. I am very happy, while it took several months, the United States Senate has now acted and, just last night, the Speaker of the House appointed conferees who will be dealing with this issue.

So to somehow say that because we are proceeding with what is the proper order here; we are allowing committees of jurisdiction to deal with this very important question and doing it in a proper way is the right thing to do. Why? Because we do not want to jeopardize the free market process.

I will tell my colleagues that as angry as we are at those corporate

CEOs who are responsible for wrongdoing, we do not want to penalize the job-creators in this country. We do not want to paint with a broad brush everyone who happens to believe in the free market process. That is why proceeding with the language that was proposed and passed in the Committee on Appropriations would be very irresponsible. I will tell my colleagues that even my very good friend from Maryland, who is the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, said that it is his intent to work with the Committee on Ways and Means to make sure that we craft the kind of language that is addressed here.

So even he is acknowledging that this kind of work needs to be done in the Committee on Ways and Means. So that is why we are doing exactly what the Framers of our Constitution wanted. They wanted this to be a deliberative body. We can act quickly when we need to, but let us do it through the legislative process itself. We need to support this rule. It is a very balanced measure; it is the right thing to do. Let us get our appropriations work done on this measure so that we can proceed with the proper homeland security that we need to ensure that we will never face the kind of threat again that we faced this past September 11.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for his fine work on this.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

During committee consideration of this important legislation, my colleague from Connecticut added an that would prohibit the awarding of Federal contracts to corporate expatriates who move their legal headquarters to a foreign tax haven. The rule before us today will allow my colleagues from the other side of the aisle to strip this provision from the underlying legislation.

I fail to see why the House would allow companies who abandon their corporate responsibilities to our country to continue to be awarded Federal contracts. Corporate expatriates benefit from over \$2 billion in lucrative government contracts, from large consulting deals with U.S. government agencies, to equipping airport screeners, to helping the IRS collect taxes. They turn their backs on America at the same time that they reach their open hands out to America. Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous!

Because of the efforts to stifle consideration of this important issue on the floor of the House, I filed a discharge petition yesterday, and I urge those who have not already signed it to do so. To those who have signed it, thank you. The discharge petition will force a straight up or down vote on the Corporate Patriot Enforcement Act, H.R. 3884, introduced by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL.

Vote on the resolution and tell tax evaders that they will no longer be able to feed at the Federal trough. If you leave this country to evade your tax obligations, you are no longer eligible to benefit from Federal contracts.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule which prohibits important amendments from being fairly de-

bated and voted on. However, I support the underlying bill and thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for continuing contraceptive coverage for all Federal employees. This important provision ensures that prescription contraceptives are covered by government employees' health plans, while it respects the rights of religious organizations.

Eighty-seven percent of Americans support access to birth control because it's smart policy. Though I support this language, I regret that it does not cover all necessary medical procedures. Similar women in the military, Federal employees, are prevented from access to coverage for abortion.

As the Nation's largest employer, I hope that the Federal Government will continue to work to consider all of the needs of its employees and their families.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express very serious concerns about one provision in the legislation that affects the consumers of financial services.

I am troubled by the restrictions this bill places on the First Accounts grants program. The First Accounts program provides grants to financial institutions and community groups to help bring the millions of un-banked American families into the financial mainstream. This Treasury Appropriations legislation sets a completely arbitrary per account limit of \$100 for these grants. If this restriction were in place in FY 2002, 13 of this year's 15 recipients would not have been eligible for grants.

One of the keys to the long-term economic security of lower- and middle-income families is easy access to affordable mainstream financial institutions and community oriented financial institutions. American families who operate outside of the financial services mainstream are forced to rely on high-cost alternative financial services companies, which often subject these families to predatory and abusive practices. Research suggests that once an un-banked family enters the door of a mainstream institutions for account services, they often become customers of the institution for loans and other services, and they begin to save and accumulate assets. That is why we should support programs like the First Accounts program, which provides critical financial support for efforts to bring America's un-banked families into the financial mainstream.

There has been no evidence of abuse of First Account grants or other problems with the program that would justify the restrictive language of this bill. I hope that these restrictions will be eliminated before the legislation is sent to the President.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MATHESON. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 156, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—258

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Oliver
Akin	Goodlatte	Ortiz
Andrews	Goss	Owens
Armey	Granger	Oxley
Baca	Green (TX)	Pallone
Ballenger	Greenwood	Pascrell
Barcia	Grucci	Pastor
Barr	Gutierrez	Payne
Barton	Gutknecht	Pelosi
Bass	Hall (OH)	Pence
Becerra	Hansen	Pombo
Bentsen	Harman	Portman
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Berman	Hefley	Putnam
Biggert	Herger	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hilliard	Radanovich
Bishop	Hinchey	Rahall
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Rangel
Blunt	Hobson	Regula
Boehlert	Hoefel	Rehberg
Boehner	Hoekstra	Reyes
Bonilla	Honda	Reynolds
Bono	Horn	Rodriguez
Borski	Houghton	Roemer
Boyd	Hoyer	Rogers (KY)
Brady (PA)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Brown (OH)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (SC)	Istook	Rothman
Burr	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Burton	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Buyer	(TX)	Sabo
Callahan	Jefferson	Sanders
Calvert	John	Sawyer
Camp	Johnson, E. B.	Saxton
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Schakowsky
Cantor	Jones (OH)	Schrook
Capuano	Kanjorski	Scott
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Serrano
Clay	Kerns	Sessions
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Shadegg
Combest	King (NY)	Shaw
Condit	Kingston	Shays
Conyers	Kirk	Sherman
Cox	Klecza	Sherwood
Coyne	Knollenberg	Simpson
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Skeen
Crowley	LaFalce	Skelton
Cubin	Lampson	Slaughter
Culberson	Lantos	Smith (MI)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Davis (FL)	Lee	Solis
Davis (IL)	Levin	Souder
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Stark
Deal	Lewis (GA)	Stenholm
DeGette	Lipinski	Sununu
Delahunt	Lofgren	Sweeney
DeLauro	Lucas (OK)	Tancred
DeLay	Manzullo	Tauscher
Diaz-Balart	Markey	Tauzin
Dicks	Matsui	Taylor (NC)
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCrery	Thompson (MS)
Dooley	McDermott	Thornberry
Doolittle	McKeon	Tiberi
Doyle	McNulty	Towns
Dreier	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Dunn	Meeks (NY)	Vislosky
Ehlers	Menendez	Walsh
Engel	Millender	Waters
Eshoo	McDonald	Watkins (OK)
Farr	Miller, Dan	Watson (CA)
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Filner	Mollohan	Watts (OK)
Foley	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Frank	Morella	Weiner
Frelinghuysen	Murtha	Weldon (FL)
Frost	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Gallegly	Nadler	Weller
Ganske	Neal	Wexler
Gephardt	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Ney	Wicker
Gillmor	Oberstar	Wilson (NM)
Gilman	Obey	

Wilson (SC) Woolsey Young (AK)
Wolf Wynn Young (FL)

NAYS—156

Abercrombie Hall (TX) Osborne
Aderholt Hart Ose
Allen Haynes Otter
Bachus Hayworth Paul
Baird Hill Peterson (MN)
Baker Hilleary Peterson (PA)
Baldacci Holden Petri
Baldwin Holt Phelps
Bartlett Hostettler Pickering
Berry Hulshof Pitts
Blagojevich Inslee Platts
Boozman Isakson Pomeroy
Boswell Israel Price (NC)
Boucher Jenkins Ramstad
Brady (TX) Johnson (CT) Riley
Bryant Johnson (IL) Rivers
Capito Jones (NC) Ross
Capps Kaptur Royce
Carson (IN) Keller Ryan (WI)
Castle Kelly Ryun (KS)
Chabot Kennedy (MN) Sanchez
Chambliss Kildee Sandlin
Clement Kind (WI) Schaffer
Coble Kucinich Schiff
Collins LaHood Sensenbrenner
Cooksey Langevin Shimkus
Costello Larsen (WA) Shows
Cramer Latham Shuster
Davis (CA) Leach Simmons
Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (KY) Smith (WA)
DeFazio Linder Snyder
DeMint LoBiondo Spratt
Deutsch Lucas (KY) Stearns
Duncan Luther Strickland
Edwards Lynch Stupak
Emerson Maloney (CT) Sullivan
English Maloney (NY) Tanner
Etheridge Matheson Taylor (MS)
Evans McCollum Terry
Everett McGovern Thune
Ferguson McIntyre Thurman
Flake McKinney Tiahrt
Fletcher Meehan Tierney
Forbes Mica Toomey
Ford Miller, Jeff Turner
Gekas Mink Udall (CO)
Gibbons Moore Udall (NM)
Goode Moran (KS) Upton
Gordon Napolitano Vitter
Graham Northup Walden
Graves Norwood Wamp
Green (WI) Nussle Wu

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett Fossella McInnis
Berkley Hastings (FL) Miller, Gary
Bonior Hooley Roukema
Carson (OK) Lowey Stump
Clayton Mascara Thomas
Crane McCarthy (NY) Traficant
Ehrlich McHugh

□ 1740

Messrs. COOKSEY, LINDER, MORAN of Kansas, LEACH, SULLIVAN, JEFF MILLER of Florida, TIAHRT, GIBBONS, TANNER, PETRI, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, OSBORNE, RILEY, SIMMONS, SCHAFFER, BACHUS, Ms. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, and Messrs. DICKS, BROWN of Ohio, WELLER, ROHRABACHER, and WALSH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 188, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—224

Abercrombie Goodlatte Pallone
Akin Goss Pascarell
Andrews Graham Pastor
Armey Granger Paul
Bachus Graves Pence
Baldacci Green (WI) Peterson (PA)
Ballenger Greenwood Petri
Barr Grucci Pickering
Bartlett Gutierrez Pombo
Barton Gutknecht Portman
Bass Hansen Pryce (OH)
Bereuter Hart Putnam
Berman Hastings (WA) Quinn
Biggart Hayes Radanovich
Bilirakis Hayworth Regula
Blunt Hefley Rehberg
Boehrlert Herger Reynolds
Boehner Hilleary Riley
Bonilla Hobson Rogers (KY)
Bono Hoeffel Rogers (MI)
Boozman Hoekstra Rohrabacher
Brady (PA) Horn Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX) Hostettler Rothman
Brown (SC) Houghton Royce
Burr Hulshof Ryan (WI)
Burton Hunter Ryun (KS)
Buyer Hyde Saxton
Callahan Isakson Schrock
Calvert Issa Sensenbrenner
Camp Istook Sessions
Cannon Jenkins Shadegg
Cantor John Shaw
Capito Johnson, Sam Shays
Castle Kanjorski Sherwood
Chambliss Keller Shimkus
Collins Kelly Shuster
Combest Kennedy (MN) Simpson
Cooksey Kerns Skeen
Costello King (NY) Smith (NJ)
Cox Kingston Smith (TX)
Crane Kirk Souder
Crenshaw Knollenberg Stupak
Cubin Kolbe Sullivan
Culberson LaHood Sununu
Cunningham Latham Sweeney
Davis, Jo Ann LaTourette Tancred
Davis, Tom Leach
Deal Lewis (CA)
DeLay Lewis (GA)
DeMint Lewis (KY)
Deutsch Linder
Diaz-Balart Lofgren
Dingell Lucas (OK)
Doolittle Manzullo
Dreier Matsui
Duncan McCrery
Dunn McDermott
Ehlers McKeon
Emerson Menendez
English Mica
Everett Miller, Dan
Fattah Miller, Jeff
Ferguson Mink
Fletcher Moran (KS)
Foley Morella
Forbes Murtha
Frelinghuysen Myrick
Gallegly Nethercutt
Ganske Ney
Gekas Northup
Gibbons Norwood
Gilchrest Nussle
Gillmor Osborne
Gilman Ose
Goode Oxley

NOES—188

Ackerman Blagojevich Cardin
Aderholt Blumenauer Carson (IN)
Allen Borski Chabot
Baca Boswell Clay
Baird Boucher Clement
Baker Boyd Clyburn
Barcia Brown (FL)
Becerra Brown (OH)
Bentsen Bryant
Berry Capps
Bishop Capuano

Crowley Kind (WI) Rangel
Cummings Kleczka Reyes
Davis (CA) Kucinich Rivers
Davis (FL) LaFalce Rodriguez
Davis (IL) Lampson Roemer
DeFazio Langevin Ross
DeGette Lantos Roybal-Allard
Delahunt Larsen (WA) Rush
DeLauro Larson (CT) Sabo
Dicks Lee
Doggett Levin Sanchez
Dooley Lipinski Sanders
Doyle LoBiondo Sandlin
Edwards Lucas (KY) Sawyer
Engel Luther Schaffer
Eshoo Lynch Schakowsky
Etheridge Maloney (CT) Schiff
Farr Maloney (NY) Scott
Filner Markey Serrano
Flake Matheson Sherman
Ford McCarthy (MO) Shows
Frank McCollum Simmons
Frost McGovern Skelton
Gephardt McIntyre Slaughter
Gonzalez McKinney Smith (WA)
Green (TX) McNulty Snyder
Hall (OH) Meehan Solis
Hall (TX) Meek (FL) Spratt
Harman Meeks (NY) Stark
Hastings (FL) Millender Stearns
Hill McDonald Stenholm
Hilliard Miller, George Strickland
Hinchey Mollohan Tanner
Hinojosa Moore Tauscher
Holden Moran (VA) Taylor (MS)
Holt Nadler Thompson (CA)
Honda Napolitano Thompson (MS)
Hoyer Oberstar Thune
Inslee Obey Thurman
Israel Oliver Tierney
Jackson (IL) Ortiz Towns
Jackson-Lee Otter Turner
(TX) Owens Udall (NM)
Jefferson Payne Velazquez
Johnson (CT) Pelosi Visclosky
Johnson (IL) Peterson (MN) Waters
Johnson, E. B. Phelps Waxman
Jones (NC) Platts Weiner
Jones (OH) Pomeroy Wexler
Kaptur Kennedy (RI) Price (NC) Whitfield
Kildee Rahall Woolsey
Kilpatrick Ramstad Wu

NOT VOTING—22

Baldwin Fossella Miller, Gary
Barrett Gordon Neal
Berkley Hooley Roukema
Bonior Lowey Smith (MI)
Carson (OK) Mascara Stump
Clayton McCarthy (NY) Traficant
Ehrlich McHugh
Evans McInnis

□ 1752

Mr. BLUMENAUER changed his 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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2002, TO FILE PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION AND REPORT

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and with the concurrence of the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking minority member on the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct be permitted to submit a privileged resolution and report to the House by midnight, Friday, July 19, 2002.