

that. Every time I objected, and finally, finally, when we no longer had the majority in this body, the administration backed down and the President issued his executive order.

There are some functions government performs that can be done by the private sector, and this body has given authority to the executive branch to do that, but I submit that separating aircraft is not one of those functions that should be contracted out. There is a vast difference, a vast difference between a tower with a D-BRITE, a rudimentary means of controlling air traffic, a tower that handles 10 to 15,000 general aviation aircraft in a year in Van Nuys, California and one which has 498,000 operations, complex air space, complexity of operations and is under the control of the southern California TRACON which handles two-and-a-half million operations a year. That is the radar that supports the tower that this proposal once would have subjected to privatization. That is wrong. There is no policy behind it.

I kept telling the Clinton administration, you come up with a policy, let us have a discussion of it, let us have a debate. This is a debate I am sorry we are having here that we should have had in the conference, and we never had. I am offended on process and on substance, and as for allegations made just a moment ago by the Chair of the subcommittee, let me go back to the testimony of the Inspector General at our committee.

In addition to limitations he has already cited about the report that the gentleman has cited, and due to the low number of operational errors at both of these places, I would caution you against concluding that either group has a safer safety record than the other. It is not fair to draw that conclusion. That is the conclusion of the Inspector General.

I rest my case.

□ 1730

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 59, nays 343, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Capuano	Davis (IL)
Allen	Carson (IN)	Davis (TN)
Baldwin	Clay	DeFazio
Ballance	Clyburn	DeLauro
Brown, Corrine	Conyers	Dingell

Doggett	Langevin
Evans	Larsen (WA)
Fattah	Lee
Filner	Lewis (GA)
Frank (MA)	McDermott
Grijalva	McGovern
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Honda	Meek (FL)
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Jones (OH)	Olver
Kanjorski	Pallone
Kaptur	Pascrell
Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Lampson	Sanders

NAYS—343

Abercrombie	Deutsch
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart, L.
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, M.
Andrews	Dicks
Baca	Dooley (CA)
Bachus	Doolittle
Baker	Doyle
Ballenger	Dreier
Barrett (SC)	Duncan
Bartlett (MD)	Dunn
Barton (TX)	Edwards
Bass	Ehlers
Beauprez	Emanuel
Becerra	Emerson
Bell	Engel
Bereuter	Eshoo
Berkley	Etheridge
Berman	Everett
Berry	Farr
Biggert	Feeney
Bilirakis	Ferguson
Bishop (GA)	Flake
Bishop (NY)	Foley
Bishop (UT)	Forbes
Blackburn	Ford
Blumenauer	Fossella
Blunt	Franks (AZ)
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Gallely
Bonilla	Garrett (NJ)
Bonner	Gerlach
Bono	Gibbons
Boozman	Gilchrest
Boswell	Gillmor
Boucher	Gingrey
Boyd	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Goode
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte
Brown (OH)	Gordon
Brown (SC)	Granger
Brown-Waite,	Graves
Ginny	Green (TX)
Burgess	Green (WI)
Burns	Greenwood
Burr	Gutknecht
Burton (IN)	Hall
Buyer	Harris
Calvert	Hart
Camp	Hastings (WA)
Cannon	Hayworth
Cantor	Hefley
Capito	Hensarling
Capps	Herger
Cardin	Hill
Cardoza	Hinchey
Carson (OK)	Hinojosa
Castle	Hobson
Chabot	Hoefel
Choccola	Hoekstra
Coble	Holden
Cole	Holt
Collins	Hooley (OR)
Cooper	Hostettler
Costello	Houghton
Cox	Hoyer
Cramer	Hulshof
Crane	Hyde
Crenshaw	Inslee
Crowley	Isakson
Cubin	Israel
Culberson	Issa
Cummings	Istook
Cunningham	Jackson-Lee
Davis (AL)	(TX)
Davis (CA)	Janklow
Davis (FL)	Jefferson
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins
Davis, Tom	John
Deal (GA)	Johnson (CT)
DeGette	Johnson (IL)
DeLay	Johnson, Sam
DeMint	Jones (NC)

Sandlin
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Solis
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Velazquez
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Woolsey

Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lantos
Latham (CT)
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering

Pitts	Sanchez, Loretta
Platts	Saxton
Pombo	Schiff
Pomeroy	Schrock
Porter	Scott (GA)
Portman	Scott (VA)
Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Pryce (OH)	Serrano
Putnam	Sessions
Quinn	Shadegg
Rahall	Shaw
Ramstad	Shays
Rangel	Sherman
Regula	Sherwood
Rehberg	Shimkus
Reyes	Shuster
Reynolds	Simmons
Rodriguez	Simpson
Rogers (AL)	Skelton
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MI)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)
Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Snyder
Ross	Souder
Rothman	Spratt
Roybal-Allard	Stark
Royce	Stearns
Ruppersberger	Stenholm
Rush	Strickland
Ryan (OH)	Sullivan
Ryan (WI)	Sweeney
Ryun (KS)	Tancredo
Sabo	Tanner

NOT VOTING—32

Akin	Harman	Miller (NC)
Baird	Hayes	Pearce
Bradley (NH)	Hunter	Radanovich
Carter	Kleccka	Renzi
Case	LaTourette	Sanchez, Linda
Delahunt	Lowe	T.
English	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fletcher	McCollum	Stupak
Frost	McCotter	Tauzin
Gephardt	Millender	Whitfield
Goss	McDonald	
Gutierrez	Miller (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1747

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2115, VISION 100-CENTURY OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ), one of the outstanding members of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for bringing this legislation to the floor, and also for his courage and fortitude in standing up over several weeks of sometimes personal attacks. In trying to bring this legislation to the floor, the gentleman has shown remarkable composure and leadership.

As every member of the Subcommittee on Aviation knows, and I hope the Members in this Chamber appreciate, this conference report contains many provisions that will be helpful to the ailing aviation industry. Of particular interest in my district, and districts and airports all over this Nation, is a provision in this bill that sets up an airport security improvement grant program so that airports

can replace baggage conveyer systems, reconfigure terminal baggage areas, pursue projects that will enable the TSA to deploy explosive detection systems, and fund other airport security capital improvement projects.

This grant program allows the TSA to issues letters of intent, or LOIs, so that airports can pursue security projects quickly and efficiently. Denver International, my airport, recently received an LOI in the amount of \$67.5 million. With this LOI, Denver International has aggressively pursued plans to install an in-line baggage screening system. These efforts will improve the safety and efficiency of the airport.

This bill also decreases the LOI local match for Denver from 25 percent to 10 percent reflecting the will of Congress that national security projects should be paid for by the Federal Government. This change in the local share will help the Denver International Airport tremendously.

Finally, with regard to the AIP authorization within this bill, Denver International also receives \$5.3 million per year in AIP allotment. Reauthorizing AIP will allow the airport to address other safety and capacity needs. These are just a few of the reasons why I stand in strong support of the legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for our committee. I have been on this committee for 11 years, and my constituents always ask, how are things going in Washington? I say it is like swimming with the sharks; but today, it is a shark attack. This conference report is a shark attack on the people of this great country.

Members travel at least twice a week, sometimes four times a week. We have put a lot of money in the aviation industry. In fact, over \$18 billion.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of good things in this bill, but this privatization of FAA is a poison pill. It is a poison pill for the traveling public. I have one question to ask: I want to know which one of the President's campaign contributors wants to run the national air traffic controller towers, is Halliburton doing the control tower work now?

The American people deserve a clean bill that does not compromise their safety and security. This bill does not do that. I want my colleagues to vote down this very dangerous bill.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this conference report, and I will get to why I am going to do it in a minute, but before I do, I want to talk about the process that has gone on.

When a bill leaves the House in a certain condition, and the certain condi-

tion in this case was the protection of the air traffic control system, and the Senate with the Lautenberg amendment does the same thing and goes a little further. When a bill goes to conference and comes back looking different, we are left on our side with the conclusion that can only come from one place.

As a Member of this body, it concerns me that we need to have, and this message is really for my leadership, we are a coequal branch of the United States Government. And if we are just going to accede to what it is that the administration wants to do, I, as a Republican, have difficulty.

I listened carefully to this debate, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is right, during the Clinton administration the contract tower program was used extensively by the Clinton administration, and under the Bush administration, there have been no privatizations. The executive order that President Clinton issued as he left office, countermanded by President Bush, is why we find ourselves here today.

The contract tower program, if run responsibly, does not mean the death of the aviation system in this country. But I would suggest, and again to my leadership, this is not about, and it never was about, the 69 towers. It is about the belief by Members on the other side of the aisle and by Members on this side, today it is 69 small airport towers, tomorrow it is Davis-Bacon, the next day it is the privatization and contracting out of the Federal workforce. There comes a point where enough has to be enough.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the bill. As to why I am going to vote for the bill, I was asked to get the 69 towers out of the bill, and I am not taking credit for that, but I went to my leadership with others, and this recommendation does that. I gave my word to the leadership, and I am going to keep my word and vote for the bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his conscience-stricken statement and for his ever-conscience-driven conduct in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I think there might be something in this legislation more onerous than the privatization caper, as referred to about a half hour ago, and that is that the FAA reauthorization bill conference report contains a provision that gives foreign airlines, including obviously Air China, virtually total access to the U.S. domestic air cargo markets through the Alaskan gateway, in contravention of the very long-standing policy accepted by both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Here is the catch: There is no reciprocal benefit for American carriers and their employees, nor is there any provi-

sion for the United States to collect one dime in taxes on the millions of dollars of revenue that these foreign airlines will earn by operating in our domestic markets, and that is a fact. There is nothing in the legislation. This is one-sided legislation. It will take our Nation's air transport industry and its employees in the wrong direction. I think it is wrong.

Now, we have heard a lot of pontificating in the last month, particularly from the other side and even from the administration, about let us make trade fair, let us have parity in our commerce with other nations. Where is the parity in this bill? This is another foreign giveaway. Let us call it for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle is good at it, and I have to give them credit. They hide out and speak out of both sides of their mouth about trying to protect American workers, and at the same time we are doing this kind of legislation; that is the onerous part of this legislation. It could be far worse and far more damaging than the privatization issue.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) brought up the name of Alaska, I wish he understood the reasons this is in there. The gentleman talks about jobs. He may not have been to Alaska, but Alaska is in a unique position for refueling. That is something that is very important to my airport. Already, the airlines the gentleman is talking about have gone to Vancouver and solicited bids to land in Vancouver, break down their cargo and ship it to the United States. We are part of the United States.

The difference between survival of the airport in Alaska, in Anchorage, is this part of this amendment. If it was not adopted, we would lose more than 400 jobs, 400 American jobs. And yes, I can say it is not point to point. These planes will come in, the cargo will be broken down and the planes will be refueled and sent back. The shipment will then be taken by Northwest and other airlines to other parts of the United States. It will create jobs, it will not lose jobs in Alaska.

The gentleman talks about foreign. If the gentleman wants them to go to Canada, that is what will happen if Members vote against this bill. My airport will not survive. This is one of the biggest money makers for my airport, and to have someone say this is going to give jobs to foreigners is nonsense.

□ 1800

We are different. We are closer to the Orient. We are not New York or New Jersey, which is about the size, by the way, of Kodiak Island. Our survival is the Orient market. That is what we are working on. This is what this bill does.

By the way, this is not my amendment. I am defending it because my senior Senator insisted upon it in the conference. We are a conference, and this is what this product is all about. Some may not agree with it, but I am saying it is about the survival of my airport.

Just keep in mind, I hear about this, I am concerned about some of the misinformation coming from certain groups about the damage this will do to airlines in this Nation. It will not do so. It will benefit labor. It will benefit the workers in Alaska, and it will benefit my State of Alaska. That is what I am elected for.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. I respect the statement of our chairman of the full committee, but this again is an example of the discussion we could have and should have had in a real House-Senate conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation for the kind of camaraderie we have on the committee. This is out of character for us to be on the floor discussing something in these tones. However, when we do not follow the rules and do not allow people to participate, this is what we get. That is why other committees are like that. I hope we do not continue this, because we have not had this in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme disappointment that this FAA reauthorization bill does not include language to protect the operations and certification functions performed in our air traffic control system. Recommitting this bill was absolutely necessary to fix a fatally flawed conference report that risked the safety of the flying public. Unfortunately, Republican conferees decided not to listen to the will of Congress and excluded language that would protect our Nation's air traffic control system from privatization.

There are two critical functions of the air traffic control system that keep the system safe: certification and operations. Much of the debate on this bill has centered on prohibiting privatization of the operation functions performed by air traffic controllers and employees of 69 VFR towers. Operation of the air traffic control system, however, is only one part of the air traffic control system. In order for our system to remain safe and efficient in this area where we still have a great deal of fear, there must be language included in the bill to protect the certification functions performed by FAA systems specialists.

There are approximately 6,100 FAA systems specialists and technicians who install, repair, maintain, and certify over 50,000 systems and equipment

that make up the air traffic control system. The certification functions performed by the systems specialists are critical to the safety and efficiency of the air traffic control system and, therefore, must be protected from privatization.

Certification is the process that systems specialists and technicians use to ensure that the systems used to separate and control aircraft are working properly and interface correctly with the other 50,000 systems and equipment in the NAS. Only the U.S. government, through its employees, is empowered to certify the air traffic control system. As a result, only FAA personnel with sufficient knowledge of the entire NAS may perform certification.

An example of the important functions that systems specialist perform is the work they did for the Department of Defense after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. In the months after September 11th, the DoD realized that they did not have radar capabilities to see or hear air traffic activity within the U.S. borders. FAA systems specialists worked with the DoD to provide additional radar surveillance as well as data and voice communication capability to the military. What's really remarkable about this is that the bulk of the work was completed in only four months. The flexibility of the systems specialist workforce, their extensive knowledge of how the entire air traffic control system works as well as their ability to respond quickly to a problem would be lost if the work is contracted out.

Safety should be the FAA's number one priority. The only way to ensure that this happens is to enact legislation that protects the most safety critical functions from privatization. This means that we must protect all of the functions relating to the control and separation of air traffic—functions performed by systems specialists and air traffic controllers.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), one of the distinguished members of our subcommittee.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and chairman of our subcommittee for yielding me this time. I rise to pay tribute, first of all, to our committee chairman and for his willingness to recommit this bill and deal with the issue, part of which is being discussed today. Secondly, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his willingness to support this bill and addressing the fact that the committee, after the difficulties we had with the first report, addressed the concerns that were expressed.

I want to now express my opinion for a second. I have heard far too often statements made that directly or indirectly seemed to accuse Members of this House of quibbling with the security of the American flying, traveling public. I know that is not really intended, because this bill and this conference report is all about the safety and security of the American traveling public. I respect differences on the tower issue. I respect that. But I know our President and I know no member of our subcommittee and I know every

Member of this House is committed to seeing that air travel in this country is safe, which is why the issues that are never talked about in this debate are so important for me to bring out.

The fact that we have codified and put into statute with this law the reimbursement to our airports and our airlines for the mandated security that is the responsibility to be put in, to see to it that the money is spent, the security is there. We no longer deal with situations like last year where we have emergency supplementals with billions of dollars and people arguing about who should have really paid what. We have issued deadlines for installation of security, for baggage inspection, for all the other things that we are doing. And now through this bill, we are providing the mechanisms and ensuring the framework in which that takes place.

So while I respect the differences that are debated and understand the points on both sides with regard to the towers, you should not throw the baby out with the bath water. This bill is about the safety of the American people and the flying public. This bill is about codifying that which since 9/11 we have grappled with regarding airport security and the installation of additional security. This is about the AIP. This is about the safety of the flying public. This is about an industry that is essential to the economy of the United States of America. I, like the gentleman from Ohio, will vote for this in its final passage because it is about the safety and security of the Americans and the Georgians that I represent flying safely in and out of one of the largest airports in the world, Hartsfield International.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2115, the FAA reauthorization bill. This conference report is an affront to the proper legislative procedures of this body and, worse yet, a threat to our Nation's stellar aviation safety record.

As a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I know firsthand that our committee developed strong, bipartisan legislation that this House almost unanimously passed 418-8 last June. Yet today, we debate a controversial FAA reauthorization conference report that has sparked heated opposition. Why? The answer is simple. By bowing to industry pressure and Bush administration demands and by shutting Democrats out of conference deliberations, Republican leaders have crafted a report that compromises the safety and security of the flying public. In fact, this conference report is proof that the lessons of September 11 have been forgotten. Republican leaders have forgotten that on September 11, air traffic controllers safely landed 4,482 planes within 2 hours without one operation error.

This is a system to protect, not endanger. Yet this conference report does just the opposite.

By allowing for further privatization of the air traffic control system, which is really silent on it and the wording previously was "prohibit," Republican leaders wish to put air safety in the hands of the lowest bidder. That model did not work for airport security, and it will not work for our air traffic control system. In writing this conference report, Republican leaders have also forgotten the September 11 lesson that flight crews are a critical line of defense in aviation security. This report drops a House-passed provision that would require TSA to issue security and antiterrorism training guidelines for our Nation's flight attendants. By making these guidelines optional, the Congress is effectively rejecting calls by flight attendants for greater security training to protect themselves, airline passengers, and the American public.

I cannot in good conscience support this conference report. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Let me just correct the record at this time. I have heard two Members from the minority side cite that on September 11 that some 4 to 5,000 planes that were flying in the air were brought down safely by our air traffic control system. That is correct. But, in fact, some 219 of approximately 470 towers were contract towers, are contract towers, private towers. This is the statement that was put out in a \$7 million NATCA, National Air Traffic Controllers, misinformation campaign. We have a system now today, we had a system on September 11 with contract towers and with fully staffed FAA towers.

So they question the safety and security. We advocate no change. Nada. None. Zip. We have taken any mention of privatization out of this. We are only instituting the status quo, the status quo that we had on September 11.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to again fill out the record, if I may. It is not towers that bring aircraft down. At altitude, at 29,000 feet, the en route center steps aircraft down to 15,000 feet to a point where they are 40 miles out from the airport, at which point the terminal radar control facility takes over and brings aircraft to within 3 miles, at which point the easy part is done by the controllers in the towers. That is the real story. Let us not embellish this event of September 11.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this FAA reauthorization bill. While I know the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. MICA), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) worked hard on this legislation, I rise in opposition to not what they have done in their committee and in the light of day, but in opposition to what the majority party of this Congress, both Houses, has done in back rooms.

Mr. Speaker, as all of us who represent airports know, airport noise is one of the biggest complaints we hear about. It is deafening. As the Congressman for LaGuardia Airport, I represent the largest amount of Americans who are acutely affected by airplane noise. The FAA through the Airport Improvement Program helps to fund noise abatement programs from schools and religious institutions to community centers to private homes. It has let the local airport operating authority set the noise level parameters for communities to qualify.

In section 189 of this bill, the former Senate majority leader thought allowing local airport operating authorities to set their own levels was not good enough. Section 189 says that only people who live in the areas with higher than 65 decibels of aviation noise, the noise of a power lawn mower, will receive funding for noise abatement programs, leaving millions of people without the funding needed to abate their homes.

This was all done without a single vote here on the floor of the House or a single vote on the floor of the Senate. It was done in the, quote-unquote, "conference committee." This is a bad bill. That is just one example. My colleagues have gone through the other issues. This is a bad piece of legislation. This is not the way to make sausage. It is not the way to make legislation, either. It should be done in the light of day and should be done in the democratic way. We should all have an opportunity to vote on these issues before it gets to this point, which is not democratic; and it is not giving us an opportunity to really have an effect on making this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from New York. This provision to which he refers is another example of egregious special interest legislation that was advocated by one airline. It was done without any consultation, without any discussion. It vitiates a signed agreement between an airline in Minnesota and the Metropolitan Airports Commission. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

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

□ 1815

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this conference report on H.R. 2115, which will give the Presi-

dent the freedom to privatize our air traffic controllers.

How does this make Americans safer? We must ask ourselves, how does this make Americans safer? In a post-9/11 world, we must make safety a priority. So I ask again, why are we doing this? Is it cheaper? The answer is no. Privatizing increases our costs. Is this a good policy? The answer is no. Privatizing has failed miserably in other countries.

Approximately 20,000 hard-working men and women of the FAA ensure the safety of more than one million passengers each day, and we should trust them to continue to do the job. This is why I say, nothing has been broken, so why do we need to fix it?

The safety and security of the American people should not be the responsibility of the low bidders. It is the core responsibility of our American Government to make sure the safety is there. We must make sure that democracy is there. We have not allowed democracy by allowing this bill to come before us, and we should make sure that we vote no on this.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and leader for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to this bill. Many have spoken against the provisions that privatize part of our Nation's air traffic control system. Others have objected to the failure to direct the certification and training of flight attendants. Others have condemned the process that seems to have shut out Democrats, particularly our leader, from participating in the drafting of this agreement. As much as we respect the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), we know that he could have added a great deal so we would not have had this contentious argument.

I have one more reason to oppose it. In 1986, the Congress made an agreement with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to cede operational control and financing of our airports to our regional authority. The Metropolitan Washington Region has maintained our part of the bargain. This conference report breaks that agreement by adding 20 more flights and going beyond the 1,250 mile perimeter rule. That is not right. It increases the safety concerns at National Airport.

For this and many other reasons, I oppose this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference agreement.

Many here have already spoken against provisions in this bill that would allow privatization of our nation's air traffic control system, others have objected to this agreement's failure to direct the certification and

training of flight attendants and still others have condemned a process that has shut out Democrats from participating in the drafting of this agreement.

Let me add one more reason to vote against this bill.

I object to this bill because it continues to intrude in the operations of this region's local airports.

While I appreciate the good efforts of the chairman to restore general aviation at National, to compensate businesses injured by the current shutdown, and assist hometown carrier, U.S. Airways, operate quieter, more efficient regional jets, I cannot support the heavy hand of this Congress in violating two longstanding agreements and mandating that National accommodate more flights and flights outside the current perimeter rule restrictions.

The agreement before us today continues to violate a promise this institution made to this region back in 1986.

In 1986, Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, President Reagan's Secretary of Transportation, helped broker an agreement between the federal government, the Congress, the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to cede control of National and Dulles Airports to a regional authority that would have, in the words of current law, "full power and dominion over, and complete discretion in, operation and development of the airports."

In return, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Maryland agreed to accept operational control of the airports and raise the money necessary to modernize National and Dulles airports.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia have upheld their part of the bargain. Congress, however, has not honored its part of the deal.

At least once every three years since this transfer took effect, Congress has tried to intervene and micro manage the operations of the two airports.

There may be a federal interest, and I recognize that both commercial airports are still owned by the federal government, but should Congress really be trying to determine what are clearly economic and business decisions on what carriers fly where?

With the bill before us today, Congress is once again telling the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to waive its existing rules and allow certain carriers more flights.

Mr. Speaker, these additional flights take us further down a controversial road whose final destination will make few carriers happy and cause real economic harm.

Three years ago, I spoke on the House floor opposing an FAA authorization bill that added more flights at National.

At that time I warned that breaking the 1986 deal would bring us down a dangerous path in which every FAA authorization bill would become a vehicle for further tinkering and interference by Congress.

Obviously not enough Members were sufficiently satisfied with the flights added in the last FAA reauthorization bill or we would not be back here again today with more changes.

Who is happy with the proposed changes? Not U.S. Airways, Delta or United, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority nor the residents of this region.

In fact, there is no solution that will satisfy everyone.

But, continue down this path of forcing more flights and there will be some real economic consequences that will ultimately undermine both the quality and quantity of air service this region is fortunate to now receive.

The point is being reached in which operational and safety constraints imposed by the type of runway and the number of gates, not slots, will limit the number of flights the airport is capable of handling.

Once this threshold is crossed, both the quality and quantity of flights will be compromised.

we risk:

(1) Losing direct air service to many smaller cities, those that can least afford a disruption from an economic development standpoint,

(2) We risk a reduction in international air service that may result in this region being bypassed in favor of other east coast airports with better transcontinental connections. (Hundreds of millions of dollars that have been invested to make Dulles an international gateway will have been imprudently invested), and

(3) We risk more delays and congestion as operational limitations and space cause delays throughout the system, something LaGuardia encountered when its slot rule was repealed.

(4) And, adding one more slot, one more flight, is one more than Washington area residents bargained for.

I know the support isn't there to rollback the 20 new slots, 8 inside the perimeter and 12 outside, in this bill.

But why pile it on with an additional provision that gives Congress yet another opportunity to tinker again with the operation of these two airports?

Why create the added burden and economic uncertainty that this bill invites by denying these two commercial airports the ability to receive any new Airport Improvement Program grants or new Passenger Facility Charges beginning in 2008?

Why single out and suspend federal assistance to just these two airports?

I thought an understanding had been worked out when Delegate NORTON offered her amendment earlier this year on the House floor that this obnoxious provision would be removed in conference.

Congress doesn't need this provision.

There is already sufficient oversight over the airports to ensure that any federal interest is protected.

We've got the FAA reauthorization bill.

In addition, there's the authority's own board of directors that must include 3 presidential appointments approved by the Senate.

In the past former Members of Congress have served on this board, and the GAO has unique statutory authority to audit the activities and transactions of the board.

Mr. Speaker, Congress, visitors to the nation's capital, businesses and local residents have all benefited from the capital improvements that have occurred at the airport since the regional authority took over control.

Let's not place \$100 of millions in future development at risk.

Let the two airports continue to be treated like all other commercial airports for purposes of receiving improvement grants and new passenger facility charges.

Reject this agreement.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, safety is not just one issue. Safety is a multiplicity of over-

lying redundancies. Safety depends on the interaction of the human and the technological.

What I object to in this proceeding is the lack of process, a lack of opportunity for debate on the future of the air traffic control system. Make no mistake about it, this debate is about the future of air traffic control in America. This is about how our air traffic control system will be managed in the future and by whom. It should be done in the public interest, not in the private interest. All that stands between the traveling public and a failure at seven miles in the air or on the ground is our air traffic controller and the equipment he will or she operates. We must keep it in the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do sincerely believe that what is at stake here is the future integrity of the air traffic control system in the United States. There is none better in the world. I fear that in the future, fragmentation of that system, taking major control towers and putting them into the private for-profit sector, will bring pressures to bear that will ultimately cause a catastrophe.

Look at Europe. Just last year, a midair collision. We have not had a midair collision in a really long time in the United States of America.

This is not about making the system safer, it is not about making it more efficient. The Europeans, the Canadians and others admit that our traffic controllers are 75 percent more productive than their's. So it is not about making it more productive. It is not about making it safer.

The only reason that we are opening the door here, and we are blasting the door open here by removing any restriction on privatization, as was in the original bill, this White House has shown it will fight to privatize. They have already threatened to veto the bill unless we inserted the specificity of 71 towers. So they are clearly going to go ahead with privatization.

Now, they are going to go ahead, not because they think it will be safer, not because it will be more efficient. I do not even believe it will be less expensive. The other failed air traffic privatizations around the world have actually cost the taxpayers more, and they have had to be bailed out in England and in Australia.

This is a ticking time bomb that I believe one day will kill Americans, and I just cannot believe that we are going ahead in this form without the proper consultation, without a conference, but vitiating all the rules of the House, just so someone might be able to make a little bit of money on something that is run so well by the government today.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close the debate on the conference report on H.R. 2115.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, this legislation is important to the success of aviation in this country. This particular industry is one of the great job creators, and no nation relies on safe and independent operation of aircraft more than the United States.

I disagree on the point that has been raised here in closing. We do not change in any way the current status of contract towers. We do not mention privatization. We have taken out some 69 airports that were identified in the previous conference report.

I believe that this bill strikes many carefully proposed compromises that address the many needs of our aviation system while providing for its future. I believe that this will also be a boon to many of our communities, to restore jobs, to provide economic opportunity in an industry that has been hard hit by the effects of September 11.

So we have an opportunity to help small communities. We have an opportunity to continue a safe and cost-effective system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Members on the other side of the aisle for their cooperation. I know that there is one issue in particular that has brought us apart, but eventually it would lead to this debate and to this day. I think this has been a healthy debate, and I think that will be resolved by the vote that is to take place.

The U.S. aviation industry is the strongest in the world, and I am committed to keeping it that way. H.R. 2115 and this conference report provide stability and funding to ensure that our Nation will continue to lead. I urge all Members to put aside partisan politics and to vote to pass this conference report for H.R. 2115.

Again, I thank my colleagues and the staff for their fine work, and especially the Members of the minority.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the conference report for H.R. 2115.

I am deeply disappointed that despite this Congress's actions to recommit the bill to the conference committee, we are still dealing with a flawed bill. Over three months ago, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee passed a good bill out of committee, a bill that had my strong support.

Two times, this bill has come out of Conference Committee, and both times the resulting product has been unacceptable. This bill contains significant changes from the committee passed bill—changes that have not previously been approved by the House or the Senate. I believe it is telling that not a single Democrat in the House or the Senate signed onto the conference report either time because of these egregious changes.

The version of the bill that we are considering today removes the language that would allow the FAA to contract out the operation of air traffic control towers at 69 towers nationwide. However, this is not an improvement over the previous version of the bill. Simply striking the provision does nothing to ensure that our nation's air traffic control system will not be contracted out to the lowest bidder. In fact, this bill would make it easier to privatize

the air traffic control system by not prohibiting future privatization. We know that the administration supports privatization, as demonstrated by their many outsourcing initiatives and the reclassification of air traffic control as a "commercial activity." Every tower in this Nation is now at risk for privatization.

In addition, this bill fails to address concerns that were in the previous version of the bill, which include allowing China essentially open access to our cargo markets, modifications to the Essential Air Service program requiring small communities to pay a substantial sum for their air service, and changes to the flight attendant training programs that basically gut the requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the rule accompanying the Conference Report for the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. I also oppose the Conference Report, itself. The rule would allow the Republicans to get away with passing a Conference Report without ever holding public meetings to work out an acceptable compromise.

And, Mr. Speaker, passing the rule ultimately allows the Republicans to get away with defying the will of the House. They excluded the minority Party from the conference, and they wrote a brand new bill out of thin air that contradicts the bills that passed out of both chambers.

One example of this slight-of-hand relates to the Essential Air Services program, which has ensured federal funding since airline deregulation to ensure that rural communities can continue to be included in the national aviation system. In the original House bill, some Members wanted to impose a local match provision, which would have required local communities to subsidize the federal government by paying to qualify for air service. Others, like myself, pointed out that doing this would kill air travel in small communities across more than 35 states.

In my own district in West Virginia, this local match provision would have applied to Bluefield Airport, serving the Bluefield and Princeton areas. Thankfully, the House deleted the local match requirement on the floor to guarantee that rural communities continue to be included in the national aviation system.

Unfortunately, the Republicans on the Conference Committee, who apparently don't care about maintaining a truly national air system, decided to reinsert the local match provision in secret, and to subject my rural West Virginia constituents to hardship.

They also inserted other provisions in the dark of night that are not consistent with the House and Senate bills' provisions aimed at ensuring safety. The Republicans secretly made it possible for the Bush administration to privatize uniquely-skilled air traffic control jobs at 69 airport across the country. It should also be noted that 11 of the airports on the Republicans' hit list for possible privatization are included among the 50 busiest towers in the country.

Although our highly-skilled air traffic controllers guided 5,000 planes to safety after one call from the Secretary of Transportation, on September 11, 2001 while our Nation was under attack, the Republicans think we should replace many of these skilled workers with

companies whose only bottom line is pure profit.

Then, because they knew the Conference Committee Democrats, like myself for instance, would object to their brand new bill, they didn't bother to properly hold meetings in accordance with the rules. Instead, we had to find out through the media that they drafted a sham Conference Report, which they all signed. As a result, this bill has gone nowhere since July.

Now, amazingly, the Republicans come to the floor after this bill has lingered for months, and they say that we exaggerate the impact of their revisions. Then, they try to assure us that they have revised the bill again to eliminate the objectionable provisions that they added. And, they say we should just take their word for it and go ahead and pass the bill today, even though we haven't had meetings to review this bill that has supposedly been revised yet again without our involvement.

This partisan hijacking of the bill to ruin rural air travel and increase profits at the expense of safety is grotesque. Didn't we learn anything at all about the importance of a reliable and safe national air travel system from September 11?

The reauthorization of this bill offers us the opportunity to improve upon our current system while addressing areas of need. We should go back to work to accomplish that goal by finalizing a bipartisan bill that reflects the shared interests of the House and the Senate, and the American people. I urge Members to vote against the Rule. This bill should be sent back to the Conference, and conference meetings to work out a good bill should be held after all.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the FAA conference agreement. While the conference report does remove the air traffic control privatization language from the report, that action is completely inadequate. Because the Administration has been so outspoken about moving forward with its plans to privatize air traffic controllers in airports across the country, there must be a clear prohibition on any such privatization in this bill. One of the airports targeted by the Administration is in my district, the Hayward Executive Airport. I will not support a bill that fails to protect my community from the threat of privatization.

Members of both the House and the Senate voted overwhelmingly to stop the privatization of our nation's air control towers through directive language. Both chambers also voted to require the Transportation Security Administration to establish mandatory guidelines for antiterrorism training for flight attendants. These and other important issues were simply overturned by Republican Congressional leaders and the White House—without even a perfunctory meeting of the FAA Conference Committee which is supposed to be in charge of revising the legislation.

The Federal Aviation Administration declared air traffic control services a "commercial activity" presumably to avail air traffic safety to private market interests. This is a completely misguided approach to air traffic safety in light of the events of September 11. Congress must do all it can to ensure that the safety of air traffic remains in the skilled hands, and under the close scrutiny, of our government. It is as much a public safety concern as are police or firefighters and no one is advocating turning their jobs over to the private sector.

The United States air traffic control system handles more than half of the world's air traffic cargo, and it is the safest in the world. The FAA air traffic controllers serve as the lynchpin of this system. These dedicated federal employees ensure the safety of nearly one million passengers every day. Their professionalism and skill was tested under uncertain circumstances on September 11, 2001. FAA air traffic controllers successfully landed 5,000 planes in two hours. They accomplished a feat that no one ever thought possible, and a task that no one wishes to repeat. The magnitude of that one accomplishment is testament to a system that works beyond anyone's comprehension.

Our air traffic control system is the envy of the world. Other nations that have privatized their air traffic control systems have encountered unending difficulties and problems. Canada, Great Britain and Australia have experienced questionable safety standards, increased delays, financial bailouts from the government, and plummeting staff morale.

Privatization of air traffic control is a big mistake and this conference report does nothing to prevent the Bush Administration from making the mistake anyway. We must learn from the lessons of other nations, and give credit to a system that has performed above and beyond expectations.

I urge my colleagues to reject privatization of our nation's air traffic system and vote no on the FAA conference report.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the FAA Conference Report now under consideration.

This bill contains billions of dollars in vital funding for America's airports and air traffic control system, which the Administration is insisting on holding hostage to a seriously flawed plan to privatize this nation's air traffic controllers.

Decisions made behind closed doors by a handful of conferees have thwarted the will of both Houses of Congress and placed the flying public in grave danger, by allowing for privatization of our air traffic control system and eliminating requirements that flight attendants receive vital anti-terrorism training.

As a representative from Long Island, New York, I have had the opportunity to meet many of the controllers who live in my district and who work at the nearby New York TRACON and New York Air Route Traffic Control Center. These dedicated public servants monitor nearly 2 million flights each year, with only two concerns in mind: the safety of passengers and the efficiency of air travel in the region.

We already know from the list of intended privatization sites misleadingly pulled from this bill that the Administration hopes to privatize one major airport on Long Island. We simply cannot begin down a road that would put profit above safety and cost-cutting above hiring the most qualified employees.

We also must not abandon flight attendants, many of whom lost their lives on September 11, bravely fighting the terrorists who took over their planes. We must do everything we can to act on the lessons learned that terrible day, and provide all flight attendants with the crucial training they need to deal with any future terrorist threats aboard their planes. It defies logic that conferees stripped language from this bill that would have prepared flight attendants to serve as a line of defense in the event of a future attack.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate passed fair, bipartisan FAA reauthorization bills by a combined vote of 512–8. I am deeply disappointed that Majority party conferees took the unprecedented step of ignoring the will of both chambers and all Democratic conferees.

I am left with no choice but to oppose this flawed bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out against this conference report for H.R. 2115, Flight 100—Century of Aviation-FAA Reauthorization Act. This rule waives all points of order against the conference report, including the rule that a conference must hold at least one public meeting before filing its report.

Yesterday, the Republican Leadership after nearly 5-weeks of delay finally brought the rule to recommit the seriously flawed conference report on H.R. 2115. The House voted overwhelmingly to recommit the conference report, by a vote of 407–0. The new conference did not hold any public meeting and did not give Democratic Members of the conference any opportunity for input or to offer any amendments to the conference. In fact, Democratic Members of the conference were never notified of any action by the Republican conferees until after the conference was filed.

The new report was filed less than 24 hours after it was recommitted to conference. Once again, the report was not signed by any Democratic conferees in either the House or the Senate.

The new conference did not even address 3 of the 4 most controversial issues contained in the first conference report. It made only one change regarding the air traffic control matter. The only change to the original conference was to strike out the section of the bill (section 230) that allowed for immediate privatization of 69 air traffic control towers. The Republican and the Administration will claim that striking out this section would simply reinstate current law and that it gives air traffic controllers the same status they had under the Clinton Administration. This is not the case.

Under the Clinton Administration, controllers were considered "inherently governmental." In June of 2003, President Bush reversed that standing in an Executive Order and air traffic control was officially declared to be a "commercial activity" on February 6, 2003 by the Department of Transportation FAIR Act list. This means that virtually any airport tower in the nation can be privatized by the FAA without any Congressional action or approval. This is in spite of language that was contained in both the House and Senate passed versions of this bill which prohibited privatization of the air traffic control system.

Furthermore, the new conference report makes no changes in the so called "cabatoge" issue allowing foreign airlines to carry cargo between cities in Alaska and other cities in the U.S., policies that have been used both for national security and competition. Additionally, the 2nd conference still makes the mandatory requirements of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 that TSA issue security and anti-terrorism training guidelines for flight attendants discretionary (the mandatory language was in both the House and Senate bills). And the conference report does not delete the requirement for certain communities to pay a local share for essential air service. An amendment to the conference report to fix all of these con-

cerns was offered in the Rules Committee last night but was defeated on a party line vote.

I am also troubled that a provision I wrote in the House-passed bill has been deleted from the Conference Report. Right now, American pilots between the ages of 60 and 65 are forbidden to fly commercial airliners. This is despite the fact that these pilots are forced to pass physical and skills tests every six months. The reason for this is that the FAA feels that these pilots pose a risk to the flying public. However, foreign pilots from international airlines are allowed to fly in U.S. airspace. If these pilots are unsafe, they should not be flying. If they are safe, American pilots should be afforded the same opportunities. All my provisions did was to require the FAA to do a study on whether foreign pilots over the age of 60 are unsafe. This would give Congress necessary clarification and a scientific basis for this policy. The provision passed in the House Science Committee, but was struck out in Conference. This does not make sense to me.

The aviation system in our country is far too critical to the safety and security of our nation and its people to be manipulated by irresponsible partisan politics. Members of the House and the Senate voted overwhelmingly to stop the privatization of our the nation's air control towers. Both Houses voted to require the TSA to establish mandatory guidelines for antiterrorism training for flight attendants. These and other important issues were simply overturned by the Republican Leadership in the House and the Senate and by the White House. Such actions are a dangerous precedent.

I will vote "no" for this conference report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBERSTAR. In its present form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Oberstar of Minnesota moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2115) to the committee of conference with the following instructions to the managers on the part of the House:

(1) Insist that a meeting of the conferees take place pursuant to clause 12 of Rule XXII.

(2) Insist that section 624 (relating to transfer of certain air traffic control functions prohibited) of the Senate amendment to the bill be added at the end of subtitle B of title II in the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference and be redesignated as section 230.

(3) Disagree to section 408 (relating to EAS local participation program) of the conference substitute.

(4) Insist that in section 603 (relating to crew training) of the conference substitute, in the matter proposed to be inserted as section 44918(a)(4) of title 49, United States

Code, the phrase "the Under Secretary may establish minimum standards" be changed to read "the Under Secretary shall establish minimum standards".

(5) Disagree to section 808 (relating to United States presence in global air cargo industry) of the conference substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit is nondebatable.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the question of adoption of the conference report, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 409 previously postponed.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 219, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 591]

YEAS—197

Abercrombie	Eshoo	Lynch
Ackerman	Etheridge	Majette
Alexander	Evans	Maloney
Allen	Farr	Markey
Andrews	Fattah	Marshall
Baca	Filner	Matheson
Baird	Ford	Matsui
Baldwin	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)
Ballance	Frost	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Gonzalez	McDermott
Bell	Gordon	McGovern
Berkley	Green (TX)	McIntyre
Berman	Grijalva	McNulty
Berry	Hall	Meehan
Bishop (GA)	Harman	Meek (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Blumenauer	Hill	Menendez
Boswell	Hinchee	Michaud
Boucher	Hinojosa	Millender-
Boyd	Hoeffel	McDonald
Brady (PA)	Holden	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Holt	Mollohan
Capps	Honda	Moore
Capuano	Hooley (OR)	Moran (VA)
Cardin	Hoyer	Murtha
Cardoza	Inslee	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Israel	Napolitano
Carson (OK)	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Clyburn	(TX)	Obey
Conyers	Jefferson	Olver
Cooper	John	Ortiz
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Pallone
Crowley	Kanjorski	Pascarell
Cummings	Kaptur	Pastor
Davis (AL)	Kennedy (RI)	Payne
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Pelosi
Davis (FL)	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)
Davis (IL)	Kind	Pomeroy
Davis (TN)	Kleczka	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kucinich	Rahall
DeGette	Lampson	Rangel
Delahunt	Langevin	Reyes
DeLauro	Lantos	Rodriguez
Deutsch	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Rothman
Dingell	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Levin	Ruppersberger
Dooley (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Doyle	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Edwards	Lofgren	Sabo
Emanuel	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Engel	Lucas (KY)	Sanders

Sandlin	Stark
Schakowsky	Stenholm
Schiff	Strickland
Scott (GA)	Tanner
Scott (VA)	Tauscher
Serrano	Taylor (MS)
Sherman	Thompson (CA)
Skelton	Thompson (MS)
Slaughter	Tierney
Smith (WA)	Towns
Snyder	Turner (TX)
Solis	Udall (CO)
Spratt	Udall (NM)

NAYS—219

Aderholt	Gillmor
Bachus	Gingrey
Baker	Goode
Ballenger	Goodlatte
Barrett (SC)	Goss
Bartlett (MD)	Granger
Barton (TX)	Graves
Bass	Green (WI)
Beauprez	Greenwood
Bereuter	Gutknecht
Biggett	Harris
Bilirakis	Hart
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)
Blackburn	Hayes
Blunt	Hayworth
Boehkert	Hefley
Boehner	Hensarling
Bonilla	Herger
Bonner	Hobson
Bono	Hoekstra
Boozman	Hostettler
Brady (TX)	Houghton
Brown (SC)	Hulshof
Brown-Waite,	Hyde
Ginny	Isakson
Burgess	Issa
Burns	Istook
Burr	Janklow
Burton (IN)	Jenkins
Buyer	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Jones (NC)
Capito	Keller
Carter	Kelly
Castle	Kennedy (MN)
Chabot	King (IA)
Chocola	King (NY)
Coble	Kingston
Cole	Kirk
Collins	Kline
Cox	Knollenberg
Crane	Kolbe
Crenshaw	LaHood
Cubin	Latham
Culberson	LaTourette
Cunningham	Leach
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)
Deal (GA)	Linder
DeLay	LoBiondo
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo
Doolittle	McCrery
Dreier	McHugh
Duncan	McInnis
Dunn	McKeon
Ehlers	Mica
Emerson	Miller (FL)
English	Miller (MI)
Everett	Miller, Gary
Feeney	Moran (KS)
Ferguson	Murphy
Flake	Musgrave
Foley	Myrick
Forbes	Nethercutt
Fossella	Neugebauer
Franks (AZ)	Ney
Frelinghuysen	Northup
Gallegly	Norwood
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Gerlach	Nussle
Gibbons	Osborne
Gilchrest	Ose

NOT VOTING—18

Akin	Gephardt
Bradley (NH)	Gutierrez
Brown (OH)	Hunter
Cannon	McCollum
Case	McCotter
DeMint	Miller (NC)
Fletcher	Pearce

Van Hollen	Velazquez
Velazquez	Visclosky
Waters	Watson
Watt	Weiner
Wexler	Woolsey
Wu	Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1847

Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the conference report.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 207, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

AYES—211

Aderholt	Duncan	King (IA)
Bachus	Dunn	King (NY)
Baker	Ehlers	Kingston
Ballenger	Emerson	Kirk
Barrett (SC)	Everett	Kline
Bartlett (MD)	Feeney	Knollenberg
Barton (TX)	Ferguson	Kolbe
Bass	Flake	Latham
Beauprez	Foley	LaTourette
Bereuter	Forbes	Leach
Biggett	Fossella	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Blackburn	Gallegly	LoBiondo
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas (OK)
Boehkert	Gerlach	Manzullo
Boehner	Gibbons	McCrery
Bonilla	Gilchrest	McInnis
Bonner	Gillmor	McKeon
Bono	Gingrey	Mica
Boozman	Goode	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Brown (SC)	Goss	Miller, Gary
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Moran (KS)
Ginny	Graves	Murphy
Burgess	Green (WI)	Musgrave
Burns	Greenwood	Myrick
Burr	Gutknecht	Nethercutt
Burton (IN)	Hall	Neugebauer
Buyer	Harris	Ney
Calvert	Hart	Northup
Camp	Hastert	Norwood
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Capito	Hayes	Nussle
Carter	Hayworth	Osborne
Castle	Hefley	Ose
Chabot	Hensarling	Otter
Chocola	Herger	Oxley
Coble	Hobson	Pence
Cole	Hoekstra	Petri
Collins	Hostettler	Pickering
Cox	Houghton	Pitts
Crane	Hulshof	Platts
Crenshaw	Hunter	Pombo
Cubin	Hyde	Porter
Culberson	Isakson	Portman
Cunningham	Issa	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Jo Ann	Istook	Putnam
Deal (GA)	Jenkins	Quinn
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart, L.	Jones (NC)	Regula
Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller	Rehberg
Doolittle	Kelly	Reynolds
Dreier	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY) Simmons
 Rogers (MI) Simpson
 Rohrabacher Smith (MI)
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NJ)
 Royce Smith (TX)
 Ryan (WI) Souder
 Ryun (KS) Stearns
 Saxton Sullivan
 Schrock Tancredo
 Sensenbrenner Tauzin
 Sessions Taylor (NC)
 Shadegg Terry
 Shaw Thomas
 Sherwood Thornberry
 Shimkus Tiahrt
 Shuster Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Green (TX) Maloney
 Green (WI) Manzullo
 Greenwood Markey
 Grijalva Marshall
 Gutknecht Matheson
 Hall Matsui
 Harman McCarthy (MO)
 Harris McCarthy (NY)
 Hart McCrery
 Hastings (FL) McDermott
 Hastings (WA) McGovern
 Hayes McHugh
 Hayworth McInnis
 Hefley McIntyre
 Hensarling McKeon
 Herger McNulty
 Hill Meehan
 Hinojosa Meek (FL)
 Hobson Meeks (NY)
 Hoefel Menendez
 Hoekstra Mica
 Holden Michaud
 Holt Millender-
 Honda McDonald
 Hooley (OR) Miller (FL)
 Hostettler Miller (MI)
 Houghton Miller, Gary
 Hoyer Miller, George
 Hulshof Mollohan
 Hunter Moore
 Hyde Moran (KS)
 Inslee Moran (VA)
 Isakson Murphy
 Israel Murtha
 Issa Musgrave
 Istook Myrick
 Jackson (IL) Nadler
 Jackson-Lee Napolitano
 (TX) Neal (MA)
 Janklow Nethercutt
 Jefferson Neugebauer
 Jenkins Ney
 John Northrup
 Johnson (CT) Norwood
 Johnson (IL) Nunes
 Johnson, E. B. Nussle
 Johnson, Sam Oberstar
 Jones (NC) Obey
 Jones (OH) Olver
 Kanjorski Ortiz
 Kaptur Osborne
 Keller Ose
 Kelly Otter
 Kennedy (MN) Owens
 Kennedy (RI) Oxley
 Kildee Pallone
 Kilpatrick Pascrell
 Kind Pastor
 King (IA) Payne
 King (NY) Pelosi
 Kingston Pence
 Kirk Peterson (MN)
 Kleczka Peterson (PA)
 Kline Petri
 Knollenberg Pickering
 Kolbe Pitts
 Kucinich Platts
 LaHood Pombo
 Lampson Pomeroy
 Langevin Porter
 Lantlos Portman
 Larsen (WA) Price (NC)
 Larson (CT) Pryce (OH)
 Lee Putnam
 Levin Quinn
 Lewis (CA) Radanovich
 Lewis (GA) Rahall
 Lewis (KY) Ramstad
 Linder Rangel
 Lipinski Regula
 LoBiondo Rehberg
 Lofgren Renzi
 Lowey Reyes
 Lucas (KY) Reynolds
 Lucas (OK) Rodriguez
 Lynch Rogers (AL)
 Majette Rogers (KY)
 Ros-Lehtinen Rogers (MI)
 Young (FL) Rohrabacher
 Young (FL) Ros-Lehtinen

Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Sabo
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrock
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Skelton
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Sullivan
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Towns
 Turner (OH)
 Turner (TX)
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velazquez
 Velosky
 Vitter
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (FL)

NOES—207

Abercrombie Hill
 Ackerman Hinchey
 Alexander Hinojosa
 Allen Hoefel
 Andrews Holden
 Baca Holt
 Baird Honda
 Baldwin Hooley (OR)
 Ballance Hoyer
 Becerra Inslee
 Bell Israel
 Berkley Jackson (IL)
 Berman Jackson-Lee
 Berry (TX)
 Bishop (GA) Janklow
 Bishop (NY) Jefferson
 Blumenauer John
 Boswell Johnson (IL)
 Boucher Johnson, E. B.
 Boyd Jones (OH)
 Brady (PA) Kanjorski
 Brown, Corrine Kaptur
 Capps Kennedy (RI)
 Capuano Kildee
 Cardin Kilpatrick
 Cardoza Kind
 Carson (IN) Kleczka
 Carson (OK) Kucinich
 Clay LaHood
 Clyburn Lampson
 Conyers Langevin
 Cooper Lantos
 Costello Larsen (WA)
 Cramer Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lee
 Cummings Levin
 Davis (AL) Lewis (GA)
 Davis (CA) Lipinski
 Davis (FL) Lofgren
 Davis (IL) Lowey
 Davis (TN) Lucas (KY)
 Davis, Tom Lynch
 DeFazio Majette
 DeGette Maloney
 Delahunt Markey
 DeLauro Marshall
 Deutsch Matheson
 Dicks Matsui
 Dingell McCarthy (MO)
 Doggett McCarthy (NY)
 Dooley (CA) McDermott
 Doyle McGovern
 Edwards McHugh
 Emanuel McIntyre
 Engel McNulty
 Eshoo Meehan
 Etheridge Meek (FL)
 Evans Meeks (NY)
 Farr Menendez
 Fattah Michaud
 Filner Millender-
 Ford McDonald
 Frank (MA) Miller, George
 Frost Mollohan
 Gonzalez Moore
 Gordon Moran (VA)
 Green (TX) Murtha
 Grijalva Nadler
 Harman Napolitano
 Hastings (FL) Neal (MA)

□ 1857
 Mr. HOUGHTON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
 So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPUDIATING ANTI-SEMITIC SENTIMENTS EXPRESSED BY DR. MAHATHIR MOHAMAD, OUTGOING PRIME MINISTER OF MALAYSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 409.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 409, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie Burton (IN)
 Ackerman Buyer
 Aderholt Calvert
 Alexander Camp
 Andrews Cantor
 Baca Capito
 Bachus Capps
 Baird Capuano
 Baker Cardin
 Baldwin Cardoza
 Ballance Carson (IN)
 Ballenger Carson (OK)
 Barrett (SC) Carter
 Bartlett (MD) Castle
 Chabot Chabot
 Bass Chocola
 Beauprez Clay
 Becerra Clyburn
 Bell Coble
 Bereuter Cole
 Berkeley Collins
 Berry Conyers
 Biggett Cooper
 Bilirakis Costello
 Bishop (GA) Cox
 Bishop (NY) Cramer
 Bishop (UT) Crane
 Blackburn Crenshaw
 Blumenauer Crowley
 Blunt Cubin
 Boehlert Culberson
 Boehner Cummings
 Bonilla Cunningham
 Bonner Davis (AL)
 Bono Davis (CA)
 Boozman Davis (FL)
 Boswell Davis (IL)
 Boucher Davis (TN)
 Boyd Davis, Jo Ann
 Brady (PA) Davis, Tom
 Brady (TX) Deal (GA)
 Brown (SC) DeFazio
 Brown, Corrine DeGette
 Brown-Waite, Delahunt
 Ginny DeLauro
 Burgess DeLay
 Burns DeMint
 Burr Deutsch

Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dooley (CA)
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Flake
 Foley
 Forbes
 Ford
 Fossella
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gingrey
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Gordon
 Goss
 Granger
 Graves

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—22

NOT VOTING—17
 Akin Fletcher
 Bradley (NH) Gephardt
 Brown (OH) Gutierrez
 Cannon McCollum
 Case McCotter
 English Miller (NC)

Pearce
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Stupak
 Waxman
 Whitfield

Brown (OH)
 Cannon
 Case
 Fattah

Fletcher
 Gephardt
 Gutierrez
 Hinchey