

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON PERMANENCY OF PENSION REFORM PROVISIONS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 547, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 544) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on permanency of pension reform provisions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 544

Whereas increasing pension coverage and pension savings is crucial to retirement security;

Whereas the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 provided significant bipartisan pension reforms that would increase pension savings and increase the number of employees covered by employer pension plans;

Whereas these pension reforms are scheduled to expire after 2010;

Whereas a bipartisan majority of the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4931, the Retirement Security Savings Act of 2002, on June 21, 2002 by a vote of 308-70 to permanently extend these important pension benefits;

Whereas failure to enact H.R. 4931 would significantly impact retirement planning and retirement security by eliminating pension reforms that exist under present law; and

Whereas the Senate has not passed the Retirement Security Savings Act of 2002 or equivalent legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should complete action in the 107th Congress on the Retirement Security Savings Act of 2002 and present such legislation to the President for his signature prior to adjournment so that American workers can be assured that the pension reforms under present law will not be eliminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

□ 1845

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a valued member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me time and thank him for his leadership in this very bipartisan effort to increase and protect retirement savings.

Let me, as an aside, tell you that retirement security is very important in my district. I have many Enron workers in my district. Many of them are my neighbors who have lost their jobs, lost their whole retirement savings through no fault of their own. Listen-

ing to the debate tonight, I continue to be ashamed of those in Congress who continue to try to score political points off the misery of our Enron workers and shareholders.

We have an opportunity, both in urging the Senate to take this bill off their calendar and to help us protect retirement savings, and we have it in this resolution as well, where we are trying to protect improvements that have been made to help people save.

We simply do not save enough in America. For the life of me, I do not know why Washington insists on creating obstacles to savings, punishing people for trying to put money aside for their education or their retirement or for health care, for a rainy day. Under the bill that we passed in a very bipartisan way, we helped remove those obstacles.

Unfortunately, unless we make those incentives permanent, in 10 years we are going to make it harder again for people to save. Without the Senate taking this bill from the calendar, where it has remained for quite some time, too long, the maximum amount that you and I can contribute to our IRA each year will be cut from \$5,000 to \$2,000, at a time we need it the most. The most that we can contribute to our savings plans at work will be cut almost \$5,000, again at a time when inflation adds up and we need those savings the most.

This catch-up provision for people, especially women, who worked at home while others set up their business or worked, who can make catch-up retirement contributions, that will be eliminated. Also the portability, which means when people move from job to job, like a backpack they can take their pension retirement with them easily, that will be erased as well.

So we have added expenses and obstacles and disincentives to savings that simply do not belong there. Congress was wise to remove it. We would be much wiser to make it permanent.

I support this resolution, and anyone who truly cares about savings ought to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting, because I do not have anybody that wants to speak. This bill is so meaningless, so irrelevant, so worthless, that not one of my colleagues on our side of the aisle wants to speak. I think the other side probably has two or three, probably because they want to say something, I do not know what. But again, this is a resolution that asks the other body to pass a bill that we passed.

Now, under the rules of the institution, of the Congress, after we pass a piece of legislation we enroll it and then we send it over to the other body so they know they can either take action or take no action. If they decide to take no action, then the next logical thing is, maybe you do not want to walk over there, maybe the 5-minute

walk takes too long, how about just calling them up and saying, hey, what is wrong with the bill we sent over, because we want to move it. Then maybe you can have a discussion. But, instead, we have to pass a resolution, keep all the staff here; and no one really wants to speak about it.

I will tell you why this is so irrelevant. This is unbelievable. It is so irrelevant because this will not take effect until 2010. This will not take effect until the year 2010, 8 years from now. We are not even going to be around here. Maybe that is why we are doing it now, because we want to make sure our legacy is going to be effective in 2010. This is not going to have any effect, even if it became law, until the year 2010.

Well, let me just say this, if I may, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want to get into the substance too much, but I think it does require a little discussion about the substance. In this proposal that was passed by the House, and is not being passed by the other body and will not take effect, at least the extension of this law, for 8 years, 84 months, 8 years, in this proposal we actually make significant changes in the anti-discrimination law, that is a very technical law, and also the top-heavy rules.

I have a letter dated April 11 when the bill was being considered by the House by Daniel Halperin, who just happens to be a professor of law at Harvard University, an expert on pension law; and he says if this bill is allowed to continue and take effect, at that time it had not taken effect, but it is in effect now, it could allow about 80 percent of the ordinary workers of a company that are non-highly compensated to be excluded from the plan, the pension plan. Eighty percent of the workers could be excluded from the pension plan. You just help the high-level employees.

Then I have a letter from a professor from the University of Alabama named Norman Stein, not a real liberal institution, Alabama; but he indicates that this bill was cobbled together by the pension industry.

Of course, Karen Ferguson, director of a group that makes sure that beneficiaries are adequately taken care of on pension benefits, basically said this bill is really going to do damage to the average worker in America because it is going to create a situation because of the top-heavy rules and anti-discrimination rules where pension benefits are going to be eliminated.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) has said, because I remember the debate he had last time, that, no, what is going on, the reason why Americans are not having more pension benefits is because these rules are too complicated and it does not do enough for the highly compensated employees. So why would a manager, an executive, set up a pension plan if he is not going to benefit?

The reason he does not set up that plan, I say to the gentleman from Ohio,

is because they found a way to get around it. These high-level executives had companies like Arthur Andersen who advised them in tax laws. We know what that is really all about. So what they have done was they set up rules like Ken Lay had in which he was able, without being taxed, to have his deferred compensation placed in an offshore trust account, so that when he finally retired and when Enron went bankrupt and all the employees lost their 401(k) plans, he was able to then get millions of dollars in deferred compensation. So he found a way around dealing with pension benefits. He had a defined benefit plan, and the Enron employees had what is known as a defined contribution plan, subject to the stock market; and they lost everything.

Of course, you have all kinds of gimmicks that insurance companies use, for example the split dollar plan, and we all heard about that, because many folks were worried that was going to be eliminated. So that is another plan that highly compensated employers could engage in.

So they really do not need to set up system-wide plans in companies, because of the fact that they are being taken care of through the Tax Code or through other mechanisms that have been thought through by the Arthur Andersens and all those smart people that know how to deal with tax laws.

What we really should be doing instead of passing meaningless resolutions is really try to deal with the average American's pension benefit. There are only three ways when a person is ready to retire that they think about their retirement. One is personal savings, and we know a great majority of Americans do not have personal savings because they have family responsibilities, kids going to college. So most of the time even families that make \$70,000, \$80,000 a year, spend that money right away on their families, because those are just necessities. So they do not have any savings, except their house. That is the only thing they have.

Then you have 401(k)s. Because we do not have these defined benefit plans in existence anymore, it is basically 401(k) plans. You saw what happened when the market went down 40 percent the last 18 months, since the President was sworn into office. So that obviously is subject to the economy, and subject to the global economy as well.

Of course, the one thing that at least the Enron employees and the WorldCom employees told me when they came to Washington, they said, "At least I have my Social Security benefits." But we know about Social Security benefits, because the President wants to privatize Social Security. The President wants to make Social Security subject to the stock market.

Well, if the President gets his way and if we do not take action on the 401(k)s, if we do not do something about these highly compensated em-

ployers and we extend this law beyond 2010, I think we are going to do major damage to the baby boom population. We have had all kinds of studies in America now that people 45 years and older, they are not going to be ready for retirement. In fact, all they are going to have is maybe \$20,000 or \$30,000 in their 401(k) plans. If they live another 20 years, that is going to be gone within a couple of years. All they have is Social Security, and that may not be secure if the President is successful in privatizing Social Security.

So I have to ask myself, what are we doing here at 7 o'clock in the evening debating a bill that is meaningless and not taking up some of the real important problems of America? Well, it is because you cannot do it. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle cannot pass these other bills that are really critical to the American public. They cannot deal with the national economy. That is why we are fooling around with meaningless resolutions. That is why I have no colleagues that want to speak on this, because it is meaningless.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that perhaps the reason there are not a lot of people who want to speak in opposition is because this has been a very popular piece of legislation. It passed the House by over 400 votes. Even in the context of the tax cut, which was quite a partisan exercise, it passed with 308 votes. It is good legislation.

I would love the opportunity to address some of the concerns that the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) raised, and I would like to do so in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a valued member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who was instrumental in putting together this legislation, particularly with regard to the very important provisions to help multi-employer plans. There was tremendous complexity surrounding these multi-employer plans. Section 415 needed to be reformed, something that had been talked about for years. Finally, with this legislation we got it done. I hope my colleague will address that.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, of course I rise in support of this resolution which, frankly, is very, very important; and I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for the leadership he has given on this issue.

You know, if you listen to the rhetoric of my friends on the other side of the aisle, you can see they are, frankly, laying the groundwork for a tax increase. They opposed permanency of the Bush tax cut, they are opposing permanency of the individual provisions, whether marriage penalty or death tax, and even the most popular provision, which, of course, is the pen-

sion provisions that we have before us today.

They are opposing it; and, frankly, a vote against this resolution essentially is a vote in favor of a tax increase. As you can see from the rhetoric and their procedural moves that they always take, they are trying to stall, stymie and delay making permanent the Bush tax cuts, because they believe that money can be better spent here in Washington than hardworking Americans can spend it back home. I believe, as I know the majority of my colleagues do, that we should allow working Americans to keep more of what they earn.

Today we are, of course, talking about the opportunity to improve retirement savings. This House passed this with overwhelming bipartisan support. In fact, the Bush tax cut, the final version passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. Unfortunately, it was not permanent; but we passed legislation increasing opportunity for retirement savings, which benefits every American who pays taxes. We increased the opportunity to give a larger amount to your individual retirement accounts, increased that from \$2,000 to \$5,000. We increased what you can put into your 401(k) from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

I would note that there are catch-up provisions. People like my sister Pat, who are out of the workforce for a few years, staying home with the kids, the family income is less and they were not able to set aside much or anything for retirement savings. Now they can make a catch-up contribution once they turn 50, which will be a great benefit to stay-at-home moms and empty-nesters. Thanks to the Bush tax cut, that is now law. Unfortunately, it is temporary.

I would also note, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) pointed out, we had an important reform that benefited over 10 million construction workers, building tradesmen and women, all across this country, who benefit from the removal of the caps put in place under section 415, which affects the multi-employer pension funds, which are basically labor union and building trade pension funds. Those artificial caps have been in place for far too long. Thanks to the Bush tax cut, they have been removed. And for a couple like Larry Kohr of Peru, Illinois, and his wife, he saw his take-home pension that he can live on, now that he has retired, essentially double by removing those artificial caps. There is no science and no reason to have them; nobody had just gone back to fix them.

□ 1900

So that section 415 provision, which claims a lot of bipartisan support unfortunately will expire unless we make it permanent.

That is why I was pleased earlier this year that the House of Representatives passed with a vote of 407 Members, the vast majority of Democrats; only a

very small, narrow group of Democrats voted against making permanent this legislation. Unfortunately, the Senate has not yet taken up this legislation. My hope is that the House and Senate can work together in a bipartisan way and make permanent efforts to eliminate that cap on section 415, as well as increase opportunities for retirement savings. So let us really get to what the real issue is here before us.

The question before us today is, do we make permanent the portion of the Bush tax cut which gives increased opportunity for retirement savings, helping construction workers, helping those who have IRAs or 401(k)s, helping empty-nesters or stay-at-home moms do what we all need to do more of, and that is to set aside more for our retirement savings. Think about this: unless we make it permanent, those opportunities go away. That is a tax increase on savings; that is a tax increase on working Americans. This is a simple vote, and that is if you vote "no," you are voting to raise taxes on all those who wish to save for their retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his resolution before the House.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) is the only other speaker on their side, and I am the last speaker, the only speaker on my side, and if the gentleman is, and we can have some understanding that we are going to kind of keep it light and short, I will yield back the balance of my time, with that understanding.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I do not know about keeping it light, but we will try to keep it short.

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

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

I guess it has been a helpful discussion. What we are doing here today is we are trying to shed light on the fact that the House-passed legislation, which made these good retirement changes permanent, which the other body chose not to do that; it had to be done on a temporary basis, only for the next 8 years.

We think it is very important for the purposes of planning, and what is more important than retirement planning? It is very important to the person who is planning to have some permanency. It is important to the individual worker. People need to plan for their retirement. It is planning for more than 8 years out. We need to know it is going to be there for the baby boom generation; we need to know that it is going to be permanent changes in law. For the employer, particularly the small employer, who is thinking about getting into the pension business for the first time; only 20 percent of those with 25 or fewer employees now offer pensions. For those people, they need to be able to plan. So not to have this be per-

manent is bad policy. It makes no sense at all. That is what we are doing today. We are trying to shine some light on this issue so that our friends in the other body will move.

Now, let me just talk a little bit about what this is all about. It is really three general areas: First, allowing everyone to contribute more to their 401(k)s and their IRAs. This could not come at a more important time. The fact that you can contribute another \$1,000 into your IRA account this year is very important to people, and they are taking advantage of it. In the first 6 months of this year alone, there has been a 25 percent increase in IRA contributions, and it is needed, and never needed more than now.

With regard to 401(k)s, this year you can put another \$500 in, plus a catch-up, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) talked about, another \$500. Over time, another \$5,000 and \$10,000, up to \$15,000. This is extremely important, again. I would like to accelerate that. I would hope that this House will take that up at some point so that we can immediately allow people to put more aside for their retirement. But at a minimum, let us make what we did permanent.

The catch-up provisions are extremely important to the baby boomers. The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) talked about the baby boom generation not being prepared for retirement. It is true. Seventy-five million people have no retirement plan at all, other than what they might have saved in their own personal savings. They have no access to a 401(k), a simple plan, any kind of plan from their employer. We need to help these people.

We therefore said if you are over 50, you get to put in even more into your retirement plan, which is particularly helpful for women who have taken time out from the workforce to raise a family, and now want to come back in and need to be able to put together that nest egg quickly.

The second general area is portability, enabling people to go from job to job in a seamless way to move their retirement savings.

Finally, we permit for simplification of the plan, to help small businesses to be able to offer these plans. The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) actually talked about it earlier, and I was going to get into it. I would ask the gentleman's indulgence, instead of me getting further into that issue, if I could yield some time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN), who is now here, to speak on the general issue.

I instead will cut my remarks short, except to say this, and that is that this is all about helping people save more for retirement. This House has passed this on a bipartisan basis, over 400 votes. What we are saying here today is it is time to move to make that permanent so people can plan. It is common sense policy. The Senate has not acted,

the House has, the President is ready to sign the bill. Let us move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) as a final speaker.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 544. As a sponsor of this legislation, I feel it is important for Congress to make permanent the Economic Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act passed into law last year. I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), for spending several years crafting this bipartisan legislation.

This measure includes significant pension reforms aimed at modernizing retirement security. The law is scheduled to sunset after December 31, 2010. People throughout the First District of Oklahoma and all across America are restricted in planning for their retirement because of an arcane Senate rule that makes the entire tax relief package, including the retirement savings provisions, expire in just 10 years. Retirement plans are based on rules that need to be consistent over a career, not just 10 years. I do not base my future retirement plans on the next 9 years, so I do not expect to legislate and encourage that standard for my constituents and all Americans. The law, as passed last year, gives employees the additional resources to appropriately plan for their retirement. The act contains many significant provisions that will be extremely beneficial to employees.

First of all, we allowed workers to invest more money into their 401(k) and pension plans, as well as IRAs, from \$2,000 to \$5,000. Secondly, the House modernized pension laws to meet the challenges of an increasingly mobile workforce that is likely to have several jobs during their career. The resolution also allows workers to become vested in their pension plans faster.

In addition, the measure allows workers age 50 and older to make catch-up contributions, a provision that will significantly help women who are more likely to spend more time away from the workforce.

Finally, the bill modernizes pension laws and provides regulatory relief to encourage more small businesses to offer retirement plans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed today in the following order: H. Res. 540, by the yeas and nays; and H. Res. 544, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD COMPLETE ACTION ON H.R. 3762, PENSION SECURITY ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 540, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 15-minute vote followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 152, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

YEAS—258

Aderholt	Cramer	Green (WI)
Akin	Crane	Greenwood
Armey	Crenshaw	Grucci
Baker	Cubin	Gutknecht
Ballenger	Culberson	Hall (TX)
Barcia	Cunningham	Hansen
Barr	Davis, Jo Ann	Hart
Bartlett	Davis, Tom	Hastings (WA)
Barton	Deal	Hayes
Bass	DeLay	Hayworth
Bereuter	DeMint	Hefley
Berkley	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Berry	Dooley	Hill
Biggert	Doolittle	Hilleary
Bilirakis	Dreier	Hobson
Blunt	Duncan	Hoekstra
Boehlert	Dunn	Holden
Boehner	Edwards	Hooley
Bonilla	Ehlers	Horn
Bono	Emerson	Hostettler
Boozman	English	Houghton
Boswell	Everett	Hulshof
Boyd	Ferguson	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Flake	Hyde
Brown (SC)	Fletcher	Isakson
Bryant	Foley	Issa
Burr	Forbes	Istook
Burton	Ford	Jenkins
Buyer	Fossella	John
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Gallely	Johnson (IL)
Cannon	Ganske	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Gekas	Jones (NC)
Capito	Gibbons	Kanjorski
Carson (IN)	Gilchrest	Keller
Carson (OK)	Gillmor	Kelly
Castle	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)
Chabot	Goode	Kerns
Chambliss	Goodlatte	King (NY)
Clement	Gordon	Kingston
Coble	Goss	Kirk
Collins	Graham	Knollenberg
Combest	Granger	Kolbe
Cooksey	Graves	LaHood
Cox	Green (TX)	Larsen (WA)

Latham	Pickering	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pitts	Smith (WA)
Leach	Platts	Snyder
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Stearns
Linder	Portman	Stenholm
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Sullivan
Lucas (KY)	Putnam	Sununu
Lucas (OK)	Quinn	Sweeney
Luther	Radanovich	Tancredo
Maloney (CT)	Ramstad	Tanner
Manzullo	Regula	Tauzin
Matheson	Rehberg	Taylor (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Reynolds	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Riley	Terry
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Thomas
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Thune
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Mica	Ross	Tiberi
Miller, Dan	Royce	Toomey
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Miller, Jeff	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Moore	Saxton	Upton
Moran (KS)	Schaffer	Vitter
Morella	Schrock	Walden
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Nethercutt	Sessions	Wamp
Ney	Shadegg	Watkins (OK)
Northup	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Norwood	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Nussle	Sherwood	Weldon (PA)
Osborne	Shimkus	Weller
Ose	Shows	Whitfield
Otter	Shuster	Wicker
Oxley	Simmons	Wilson (NM)
Pence	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Peterson (MN)	Skeen	Wolf
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	Wu
Petri	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Phelps	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NAYS—152

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Neal
Ackerman	Harman	Oberstar
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Andrews	Hilliard	Ortiz
Baca	Hinchee	Owens
Baird	Hoeffel	Pallone
Baldacci	Holt	Pascrell
Baldwin	Honda	Pastor
Barrett	Hoyer	Paul
Becerra	Inslee	Payne
Bentsen	Israel	Pelosi
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Blumenauer	(TX)	Rangel
Boucher	Jefferson	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roemer
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Capuano	Kildee	Rothman
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kind (WI)	Rush
Clayton	Klecza	Sabo
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sanchez
Condit	Lampson	Sanders
Conyers	Langevin	Sandlin
Costello	Lantos	Sawyer
Coyne	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lee	Schiff
Cummings	Levin	Scott
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Davis (FL)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Solis
DeFazio	Lowe	Spratt
DeGette	Lynch	Stark
DeLaunt	Marky	Strickland
DeLauro	Matsui	Stupak
Deutsch	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Dicks	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Tierney
Doggett	McNulty	Towns
Doyle	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Engel	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Etheridge	Menendez	Waters
Evans	Millender	Watson (CA)
Farr	McDonald	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Miller, George	Weiner
Finler	Mollohan	Wexler
Frank	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Frost	Nadler	Wynn
Gephardt	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus	Bonior	Callahan
Bishop	Borski	Ehrlich

Gutierrez	McKinney	Stump
Hinojosa	Mink	Thompson (CA)
LaFalce	Murtha	Thurman
Maloney (NY)	Obey	Waxman
Mascara	Roukema	
McDermott	Slaughter	

□ 1932

Mr. DICKS and Mr. LAMPSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GREEN of Texas, PHELPS, BOYD, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from "nay" 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for the next electronic vote.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON PERMANENCY OF PENSION REFORM PROVISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 544, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 118, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

YEAS—291

Aderholt	Cantor	Duncan
Akin	Capito	Dunn
Armey	Capps	Edwards
Baird	Capuano	Ehlers
Baker	Cardin	Emerson
Baldacci	Carson (IN)	Engel
Ballenger	Carson (OK)	English
Barcia	Castle	Etheridge
Barr	Chabot	Everett
Bartlett	Chambliss	Fattah
Barton	Clement	Ferguson
Bass	Coble	Flake
Bentsen	Collins	Fletcher
Bereuter	Combest	Foley
Berkley	Condit	Forbes
Biggert	Cooksey	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cox	Frelinghuysen
Blagojevich	Cramer	Frost
Blumenauer	Crane	Gallely
Blunt	Crenshaw	Ganske
Boehlert	Cubin	Gekas
Boehner	Culberson	Gibbons
Bonilla	Cummings	Gilchrest
Bono	Cunningham	Gillmor
Boozman	Davis (CA)	Gilman
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Goode
Boucher	Davis, Jo Ann	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	Davis, Tom	Gordon
Brady (TX)	Deal	Goss
Brown (SC)	DeGette	Graham
Burr	DeLay	Granger
Burton	DeMint	Graves
Buyer	Diaz-Balart	Green (TX)
Calvert	Dooley	Green (WI)
Camp	Doolittle	Grucci
Cannon	Doyle	Gutknecht
	Dreier	Hall (TX)