

Baldacci	Hill	Oberstar
Baldwin	Hilliard	Obey
Barcia	Hinchey	Oliver
Barrett	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Becerra	Hoeffel	Owens
Bentsen	Holden	Pallone
Berkley	Holt	Pascarell
Berman	Honda	Pastor
Berry	Hooley	Payne
Bishop	Hoyer	Pelosi
Blagojevich	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	Israel	Phelps
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Boswell	(TX)	Rahall
Boucher	Jefferson	Rangel
Boyd	John	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Capps	Kaptur	Ross
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Cardin	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick	Rush
Carson (OK)	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clay	Klecza	Sanchez
Clayton	Kucinich	Sanders
Clement	LaFalce	Sandlin
Clyburn	Langevin	Sawyer
Condit	Lantos	Schakowsky
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Coyne	Larson (CT)	Scott
Cramer	Lee	Serrano
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Shows
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Skelton
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
DeGette	Luther	Solis
Delahunt	Lynch	Spratt
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
Dicks	Markey	Strickland
Dingell	Matheson	Stupak
Doggett	Matsui	Tauscher
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McDermott	Thurman
Eshoo	McGovern	Tierney
Etheridge	McIntyre	Towns
Evans	McNulty	Turner
Farr	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Ford	Menendez	Visclosky
Frank	Millender-McDonald	Waters
Frost	Miller, George	Watson (CA)
Gephardt	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Gonzalez	Moore	Waxman
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Green (TX)	Nadler	Wexler
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Woolsey
Hall (TX)	Neal	Wu
Harman		Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Baker	Hilleary	Pitts
Conyers	Lampson	Roukema
Deal	Mascara	Stump
Ehrlich	McKinney	Tanner
Gilman	Murtha	

□ 1707

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of House rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to present a question of privilege to the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

A resolution, in accordance with House Rule IX, expressing a sense of the House that its integrity has been impugned and Constitutional duty hampered by the inability of the House to bring to the floor H.R. 854, legislation that would promote the general welfare of the nation by protecting its health care system.

Whereas President George W. Bush has urged Congress to put Medicare on a “sustainable financial footing” in order to assure Americans of affordable and accessible health care.

Whereas the Administration has failed to take action to protect Medicare and Medicaid programs from severe cuts that threaten basic services to persons in need of health care.

Whereas the Medicaid program is facing significant cuts through reductions in the disproportionate share hospital program, threatening the very financial viability of the nation’s public hospitals.

Whereas the cuts made in order by the Balanced Budget Act were postponed until 2003 by the Benefits Improvement and Protection Act but without further congressional action cuts will be reimposed and have the potential to seriously cripple safety-net public health services in states across the nation.

Whereas, in addition to slashing payments to hospitals the Administration has also eliminated the UPL payments for hospitals, further weakening their ability to provide health care to the indigent and uninsured.

Whereas federal payments to states for this program have been reduced by approximately \$700 million in FY 2002 and will be reduced further by about \$900 million in FY 2003, thus severely restricting public hospitals’ ability to serve persons in need of health care.

Whereas the number of uninsured persons without access to health care has risen in the last year to 41.2 million.

Whereas by failing to act Congress imposes on the states and localities an undue burden to carry health care costs as well as abrogates its responsibility to maintain the general welfare of the country, bringing discredit to this Body and threatening the very well-being of the populace.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should complete action on H.R. 854 or other provider reimbursement legislation before recessing and should insure that Medicare and Medicaid providers have appropriate funds to carry out their health care mandates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is appropriately noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at a time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be heard at the appropriate

time on the question of whether this resolution constitutes a question of privilege.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House rule IX, clause 1, I rise to give notice of my intent to present a question of privilege of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

TRANSPORTATION (AMTRAK) PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

A resolution, in accordance with House Rule IX, expressing a sense of the House that its integrity has been impugned and Constitutional duty hampered by the inability of the House to bring to the floor the Fiscal Year 2003 Transportation Appropriations Act, due to the severe under funding of the National Passenger Rail Corporation (Amtrak) within the President’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget.

Whereas under Article I, Section IX, of the Constitution states no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law.

Whereas it is the fiscal duty of the Congress to appropriate annually the funds needed to support the execution of the programs and operations of the Federal Government.

Whereas to date the House has only considered five Appropriations bills.

Whereas President George W. Bush has ignored the requests of Amtrak for an Appropriation of \$1.2 billion, and has instead proposed only \$521 million in funding.

Whereas the House Appropriations Committee gutted funding for Amtrak with every Republican member on the Committee voting to cut funding, despite the dire impact this will have on their own districts.

Whereas instead of strong support and consistent growth in support for the nation’s passenger rail system the President’s FY 2003 Budget seeks to strangle Amtrak so that the Administration can begin to implement plans to privatize the system.

Whereas Amtrak provided a critical transportation need in the months after the terrorist attacks of September 11th, and has seen consistent growth in ridership despite continued levels of inadequate funding.

Whereas Amtrak serves more than 500 stations in 46 states and employs over 24,000 people, and Amtrak passengers on Northeast corridor trains would fill 250 planes daily or over 91,000 flights each year.

Resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should complete action on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Transportation Appropriations, with an allocation of \$1.2 billion for Amtrak.

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Indiana will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be heard at the appropriate time on the question of whether this resolution constitutes a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be notified of the time so designated.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

CELEBRATING THE MINNESOTA TWINS AND 3M

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, today we would like to talk about a couple of issues that are very important to those of us from Minnesota. One is, of course, what is happening out in Oakland right now and a tremendous story, and I would like to yield to my friend also from the State of Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) to talk a little bit about what is happening in Oakland and what happened this year to a Minnesota team that was not supposed to be playing baseball this year.

I would yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

We have some great baseball going on in Minnesota. I attract the attention of this House that it has only been about a year since Major League Baseball Commissioner Bud Selig announced their decision to contract baseball, which would have been painless for the owners, but would have been very painful for Minnesota, and here we have in that year since a team that has come forth. Not only is this a team that was on the verge of extinction, but this is a team that has a lot of young, fresh-faced players and a cumulative salary that is amongst the lowest in the league.

We have got a great team that is out there scrapping, making all Minnesotans proud. I know my two sons, daughters and our family have always enjoyed the great baseball tradition. I have got my Minnesota Twins hat here. I do not know if I am allowed to sing We Are Going to Win, Twins Are Here, but we in Minnesota are very proud of what the Twins have been doing, and we just want to congratulate them on their success and tell them that we are confident that they are going to have a great way all the way to the World Series and beyond.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is a Cinderella story, and 1 year ago it looked as if that team would not even exist this year, and now here they are in the playoffs. And yesterday was another great story; fell behind early, came back to win in Oakland.

Today my staff is gathered around. They rigged up a way that we can actually listen to the game in the office, and we have a feeling they are going to come back today.

We are also proud and we are here today to talk about something that we in Minnesota are proud of, and that is a Minnesota company called Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, 3M better known, because they are celebrating 100 years of innovation, and it really is one of the most innovative companies.

Several years ago we had one of their researchers come down to Rochester, Minnesota. He gave a speech, and he said something pretty profound. He said that he is talking about basic research, and he said if we knew what we were doing, it would not be research. And there is no other company that I know of that has done so much in terms of developing new products, because many people think of 3M, and they think of Scotch tape or they think of Post-It notes, but truthfully, it started 100 years ago making sandpaper, and now they are a \$1 billion pharmaceutical company.

They are involved in all kinds of things from health care to industrial products, consumer and office products, electrocommunication products and specialty material. They operate in

more than 60 countries. They have 37 international companies within the operation. They have 32 laboratories, and I think last year they were awarded 501 patents. It is an amazing story of innovation, and let me just share one quote, and then I want to yield back to my colleague.

One of their first presidents was a gentleman by the name of William McKnight, and he is the one who ignited the whole notion of innovation and research, but he said, "This higher good, people, leave them alone. If you put fences around people, you get sheep. Give people the room that they need." And he did and built an amazing company and also created an amazing foundation which serves the people of the Upper Midwest and the world even today.

I yield back to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the time, and 3M is certainly one of the jewels of Minnesota, a wonderful company that, as my colleague described, very capably innovates beyond the scale of just about any other company in the world, and they bring out new products all the time that are solving problems that people face.

I had an opportunity just on the energy issues to sit and listen to some of their ideas for how we can be more energy-efficient, whether it be transmitting energy across electric lines, whether it be making the weight of our cars lighter so they can have the same strength but still use less gas. The number of ideas and innovation that comes out of 3M has been awesome, and we are proud to have them in our State.

I am very proud that in my district I have three plants in Hutchinson and New Ulm and Fairmont. I had the opportunity to visit them. They have got great, wonderful workers, and they have got wonderful workers throughout the company. They treat their workers very well, and we are certainly proud of that.

As part of this 100-year celebration, they are going to be here tomorrow in the Cannon Caucus Room, number 345, from 8:30 to 10:00, and I am proud, to be an American enterprise showcase of their technologies, and we encourage all of our Members to come and see the great things that 3M does.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, that is tomorrow in 345 Cannon House Office Building from 8:30 to 12:30. Snacks will be served. It will be a great time.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House has taken little note of what is happening to the economy. Millions of Americans, however, are clamoring for