

For that reason, after this nearly 2-year window of time when we have taken a lot of action in response to September 11, it is important for us to now step back and, in a deliberative manner, to very thoughtfully look at the ways in which we can assure that we proceed with fair and balanced representation to maintain a continuity of our Nation's governance. I believe that we have in this resolution which will establish this joint committee an opportunity to, in a bicameral way, look at this very important question.

As I said earlier, exactly 10 years ago, in 1993, I was privileged to be a co-chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which looked at a lot of the institutional questions that both bodies face. Now we will, in the wake of this very, very serious challenge that we face, have the opportunity to look at those questions which continue.

Obviously, it is important for us to recognize the disparity that exists between the two bodies. The other body is one which has different constituencies than ours, obviously different terms of office and, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has pointed out, different ways for succession.

This institution is known as the People's House. We are the only federally elected officials who must be elected to have the opportunity to serve in our positions. I feel it is very important for us to maintain that status, as James Madison envisaged it over two centuries ago; and I believe that, at the same time, we can, in working with our colleagues in the other body, proceed with a very fair, bipartisan process, which will allow us to address this.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, from having listened to the debate which will simply put into place this joint committee, that there is disagreement. But I believe that as we take the input that has been provided by a wide range of individuals, academics, former colleagues, people who spent a lot of time thinking about this, who will be providing us with recommendations, I am convinced that the work of this joint committee will be among the most important things that this 108th Congress will be able to address.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 4, 2003, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 222, ZUNI INDIAN TRIBE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT AND S. 273, GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 258 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 258

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 222) to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Zuni Indian Tribe in Apache County, Arizona, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 273) to provide for the expeditious completion of the acquisition of land owned by the State of Wyoming within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 258 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of two measures, S. 222, the Zuni Indian Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act, and S. 273, the Grand Teton National Park Land Exchange Act.

The rule provides that S. 222 shall be debatable in the House for 40 minutes, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources. The rule also waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instruction.

The rule further provides that S. 273 shall be debatable in the House for 40 minutes, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

Finally, the rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill

and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, both of the bills covered by this rule were considered by the House under suspension of the rules on June 3. Neither bill was adopted, having failed to receive the required two-thirds of the votes cast, but each bill was supported by a clear majority in the House.

The Zuni Indian Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act approves a settlement of the water rights claims of the Zuni Indian Tribe in Apache County, Arizona. The bill resolves all of the claims of the Zuni Tribe to water rights in the Little Colorado River basin and elsewhere in Arizona. The bill also provides resources to restore riparian wetlands to the Zuni Heaven Reservation that are of great religious and cultural significance to the tribe and its members.

The Grand Teton National Park Land Exchange Act provides for the acquisition of land owned by the State of Wyoming within the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park. These lands, rich in wildlife habitat, will be exchanged for other Federal lands or assets of equal value. In turn, the State will be able to acquire lands that have greater potential to generate revenue for public schools, ensuring that the State of Wyoming meets its constitutional mandate to maximize revenues from its school trust lands.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are forced to take up the valuable time of the House to consider for a second time this week two measures that have been previously approved by a solid majority in this House. The measures have been fully debated.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and pass the underlying bills without further delay.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this morning during the debate on the Check 21 open rule, I warned this body that open rules are a rarity, an endangered species, if you will. Well, here we are about to consider not an open rule but a closed rule on two noncontroversial bills. But what do you expect? This is the norm. This is business as usual in this House.

I also want this Chamber and the American people to remember this moment, because it is historic. This also is a rarity here. We finally have seen a tax cut that the Republicans do not like. In the dead of night, faced with the decision of either providing tax relief for 12 million working families or giving a tax cut to Donald Trump, the Republicans chose Donald Trump and left the children out in the cold.

And who exactly is left behind by this glaring omission? Nearly one in five children of our active duty military. These families are only making around \$27,000 a year. They did not

have the good fortune to be born with the last name of "Gates" or "Buffett" or "Cheney." But they are trying to make a living, and they are doing so by serving their country. These are children of people who are fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq, but the Republicans, in their greed and zeal for tax cuts for their rich friends, decided these families do not need any tax relief.

□ 1400

Now, of course, Republicans claim that they provide tax relief only for people who pay income tax, but we all know people pay more than just income tax. There is a payroll tax. There is property tax. There is a sales tax. But the Republicans in their warped thought process consider payroll tax relief and child tax credit a new form of welfare. We heard this argument earlier this morning, and it is outrageous; and quite frankly, it is insulting to these hardworking Americans.

As we all know, this could not be farther from the truth. It is the Republicans who encourage welfare in the Tax Code by giving tax breaks to corporations that flee this country for tax havens in other countries. Their disingenuous argument does not fly with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative process in this body is broken. There is no excuse for the majority's actions. We are here today to reconsider two bills that should have been passed under suspension of the rules. The bills are not controversial, but the majority's actions are.

As we all know, on Tuesday three bills were defeated under suspension of the rules. House Democrats using one of the few procedural tools at our disposal, voted against these bills, not on their merits but to express our frustration that the House leadership refuses to allow for consideration of a bill that would give our working families the tax relief that they deserve.

So today is also payback day. I think it is shameful and spiteful; and it is, unfortunately, very typical around here. They will not say it on the other side of the aisle, so I am going to say it right here now.

What is the payback? Among other things, showing disrespect for one of the finest individuals ever to grace the halls of Congress. The one bill that was defeated on Tuesday that is not on today's schedule is the bill to name a Federal building in Indianapolis for former Senator Birch Bayh. We should be naming multiple courthouses in this country for Birch Bayh.

Their tactics will not work. We are not going to be intimidated. We are going to keep talking about the issues that matter to working Americans, and issues like tax fairness are high among them. If the Republicans were serious about tax relief and if they were serious about their support for working families, they would schedule a vote to reinstate this provision. That is what

we are fighting for. That is what we are asking for. But they will not, because they are not serious about this. They are merely providing lip service, telling Americans what they want to hear while padding the pockets of their wealthy friends.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this debate on the rule I will ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to provide for the consideration of the Rangel-Davis-DeLauro bill to help the people the Republicans would rather leave behind.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the two bills that are being considered here today were great suspension bills that were on the Journal a couple of days ago. However, Democrats, in an effort to voice our concern about leaving behind millions of Americans who are low-income families, voted against those suspension bills.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, to borrow a recent popular phrase, I am shocked and awed by the consummate arrogance, fiscal irresponsibility, and candid lack of compassion of the Republican lawmakers of this body.

I have been on the floor many times in the past several months expressing my outrage at the unfairness and untimeliness of the various GOP tax plans, and once again I find myself at the podium in a state of disbelief about the efforts of the self-proclaimed "compassionate conservative party" to exclude some of the neediest families in our Nation from tax relief in the tax bill that was signed into law last week.

In an administration that has claimed to want to leave no child behind, we are now realizing that, indeed, 12 million of them were left behind, and 521,000 in my State.

In a time where special attention is being given to our brave men and women of our Armed Forces who served so well in Iraq, I think it is inappropriate to see how these last-minute shenanigans have actually left many of them out. The majority of our military members are in the pay grades of E5 and below. These are the sergeants, petty officers, lance corporals, specialists, and airmen, whose round-the-clock efforts made the military victory in Iraq swift and decisive. But an E5 with 6 years in service makes just \$24,000. His family is left behind.

Mr. Speaker, to borrow a recent popular phrase, I am shocked and awed by the consummate arrogance, fiscal irresponsibility, and candid lack of compassion of the Republican

lawmakers of this body. I have been on this floor many times in the past several months expressing my outrage at the unfairness and untimeliness of the various GOP tax plans, and I again find myself at the podium in a state of disbelief about the self-proclaimed "compassionate conservative" party's efforts to exclude some of the neediest families in our Nation from tax relief in the tax bill that was signed into law last week.

In an administration that has claimed to want to "Leave no Child Behind," we are realizing that there will indeed be children left behind—12 million of them in fact; 527,000 in my State of Ohio.

In a time where special attention is being given to our brave men and women of the Armed Forces who served so well in Iraq, I think it is appropriate to note how the last minute shenanigans of Republican lawmakers to strip out a provision of their tax bill that would have ensured that families making between \$10,500 to \$26,000 would get the full child tax credit other taxpayers get, will affect our military personnel.

The majority of our military members are in the pay grades of E-5 and below. These are the sergeants, the petty officers, the lance corporals, specialists, and airmen whose round the clock efforts made the military victory in Iraq swift and decisive. But an E-5 with 6 years in the service makes just \$24,000 in base pay per year. An E-2 just new to the military makes just \$15,840 in base pay. And these are just some of the millions of family members who will suffer, and their children will suffer, their spouses will suffer, because of the back door wrangling by Republicans to give even more money to the wealthiest of American taxpayers.

Mr. RANGEL has introduced a fair and responsible alternative to address this injustice, but I am afraid it will be of little avail. Rather than focus on the important issues facing our Nation, the Republican leadership seems intent to focus on solutions in search of problems—such as this week's constitutional amendment to flag desecration. I haven't been made aware that flag desecration is a problem in this country—but every week when I return to my congressional district, I am made keenly aware that the economic health of our country is a problem. Unfortunately, it seems to be a problem some Members of this body choose to ignore.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose a rule that does not allow the House to consider providing working families with the child care credit. The current situation imposes the injury of denying these working families \$400 that they need and then adds the insult of telling these families that they are not taxpayers, so they do not deserve any tax relief. Of course, looking at their paycheck stubs, they see the taxes they are paying.

Allowing corporations to avoid American taxes just by renting a hotel in the Bahamas, \$8 billion; allowing millionaires to pay virtually nothing on their dividend income, \$80 billion;

eliminating the estate tax even on the largest estates, \$138 billion; telling working families that they do not deserve relief and that they are not taxpayers, that is priceless.

There are some things campaign contributions just will not buy. For everything else, there is RepubliCard, accepted at the finest country clubs in the Bahamas. Members will want to get the Deficit Express card, now that the Republican Congress has increased the credit limit to \$12 trillion. The Deficit Express card? Do not leave the House without it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion for the previous question so that we might have the opportunity to amend a rule and to bring to the House legislation that would bring some equity to the recently passed tax bill.

I do not think many Members of the House knew that those that were making the decision would deliberately exclude the benefit of the child tax credit for people making less than \$26,000. I refuse to believe that people can be so callous that they would deliberately try to make adjustments to a tax bill that was geared to, as the leadership would say, those who pay the taxes, and exclude the privilege and the opportunity for people to get credit that are in low income merely because they do not pay "the taxes."

We have 6.5 million working families that do pay taxes, albeit those taxes may be perceived by the majority not to be important. But they do pay taxes, and they have lost the benefits of receiving tax credits for their children.

But Mr. Speaker, even worse than that, yesterday we passed the resolution paying honor to those brave men and women that were placed in harm's way as a result of the so-called "victory" in Iraq. As I said yesterday, parades are important, saluting the flag is important, having a bumper sticker is important; but how we treat these veterans is even far more important.

I know that Republicans do not know, and Democrats are learning, that as a result of so-called tax benefits given to these people that were in combat, that over 200,000 that served in Iraq will be denied the tax credit for their children. Why? Because the language of the tax law is that they have to have taxable income. Out of the benevolence of our hearts we have said that if they served in combat, they do not have to pay taxes.

I hope Members will consider to speedily bring up my bill so that we can remedy this error that has been made. Nobody thought that by removing tax liability we would be actually taking away the benefit of the child tax credits.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article that appeared in USA Today on this day that says, "Military Kids Get Slighted on Tax Credit."

The article referred to is as follows:

[From USA Today, June 5, 2003]

STUDY: MILITARY KIDS SLIGHTED ON TAX CREDIT

PARENTS EARN TOO LITTLE TO QUALIFY FOR THE PROVISION

(By William M. Welch)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly one in five children of active-duty U.S. military families won't benefit from the increased tax credit signed last week by President Bush because their parents earn too little to qualify, a study being released today concludes.

The finding by the Children's Defense Fund, a liberal advocacy group, comes as Bush and Republican congressional leaders are under increasing fire for agreeing to omit working poor families from the increased child credit included in the \$350 billion, 10-year tax cut plan and aid for states.

Those military families would have received a check of up to \$400 per child under a provision that the Senate added to the bill. But that "refundable" credit to families who pay little or no federal income tax, but do pay payroll taxes, was deleted in final negotiations between Bush and Republican leader of Congress.

Families who have children and earn more than about \$27,000 a year are due to receive checks next month of up to \$400 per child, as an advance on an increase in the credit from \$600 to \$1,000.

The group said 250,000 of the 1.4 million children in active-duty military families will not qualify for the benefit because of the omission.

An additional 750,000 children denied the benefit have parents who are military veterans, the fund concluded. It based its findings on latest U.S. Census data.

Democrats, liberal groups and some moderate Republicans in Congress are trying to build pressure on Bush and GOP leaders to pass legislation quickly extending the credit, to those families that were left out.

Democrats immediately invoked U.S. troops still in Iraq as a political justification for another bill expanding the credit.

"Thousands of military personnel, people who put their lives on the line for our country, won't receive the child credit unless we correct the child credit unless we correct the bill," Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., said.

The \$3.5 billion cost would be paid for by cracking down on business tax avoidance schemes under the Democrats' proposal. They said fast action was needed to assure 12 million low-income families are able to receive a check when the government begins mailing them to more affluent families starting July 1.

Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, R-Tenn., and Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., were negotiating a possible agreement that would permit the Senate to vote, perhaps this week, on competing proposals aimed at providing just such a remedy to the working poor.

Republican leaders of the House of Representatives are resisting the move. They say Bush didn't propose giving the added credit to the working poor as part of his original economic stimulus plan, and that sending tax refunds to people who pay no federal income tax may be bad policy.

"This is something that has been blown out of proportion," said Rep. Rob Portman,

R-Ohio, who is on the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee. "It was not part of the original bill, nor was it part of the bill in the House. . . . We never debated it. . . . It is a new idea, and it is one we ought to think about."

In another effort to build pressure, a coalition of liberal groups today begins airing TV ads in Washington blasting Bush for leaving the working poor out of the child credit benefit increase.

The Center for Community Change is buying a relatively modest amount of airtime, but it is encouraging hundreds of like-minded groups to air the same ad in other cities.

The ad shows two children: one too poor to qualify for the increased credit and another, whose parents make more money, who receives it. "President Bush chose the most fortunate to get the most," an announcer says.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because working families should be our priority today, families like Cori's. Cori came to a local Head Start in my district at a low point in her life. She was a single parent without any support system and very little money and very little self-esteem. She had just completed a recovery program and was seeking to put her life back together.

Cori went on to volunteer for Head Start, completed an AA degree in early childhood development, and now Cori is a Head Start employee for the past 3 years and wants to get her bachelor's degree. Mr. Speaker, Cori and her two daughters will be denied the child tax credit, while those making more than \$1 million a year receive overall tax cuts totalling \$93,500.

Our priority today should be, must be, the Rangel-Davis-DeLauro bill, which will expand the child tax credit and marriage penalty relief for lower-income working families. Passing it can be the first step to reversing the wrong done to these hard workers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of heated debate about this issue all morning, but I think there is a basic undisputed fact that frankly should rise above the fray: there was no effort to limit this tax break until the end game of the conference report process, when the administration and those who were shaping the tax cut needed to find \$3 billion.

When they needed to do that, they did not search the high end of the bracket; they did not search the offshore loopholes. They went into the pockets of people who need tax relief more than anyone else. That was a choice of priorities. It was a statement that the people who do the hardest work in this country are, frankly, the ones who would be asked to sacrifice first.

I wonder what the people of this country will think, what our constituents will think, when they hear that

under the rules of this House they do not even deserve a vote. I wonder what the people who work every single day will think when they hear that a child tax break for them will be welfare. I wonder what these individuals who bear the brunt of payroll taxes will think when they hear that they do not need a tax credit because they really are not taxpayers. I wonder what the parents in my district, who begin paying taxes in the State of Alabama at \$4,000, will think when they hear that they do not need tax relief.

This plan, as we knew from the beginning, strikes the wrong priorities. It leaves out people who are most in need of help, Mr. Speaker. I think that it is incumbent on us as a matter of conscience that we correct this imbalance.

This is the work that we ought to do for the people, that of correcting imbalances where they exist and that of correcting inequities where they exist, and not looking into the pockets of our weakest people to balance our budget.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the new unemployment numbers come out, and we are probably close to nearly 3 million people that will have lost their jobs in the last 2 years. We have added \$3 trillion to the Nation's debt. That has been the end result of this economic plan.

Now, what we are looking for here is 12 million children of working parents to get a tax cut and be treated like the rest of America's children. These are children of working people. Some, as the Children's Defense Fund report shows, are the children of our Armed Forces. They are also children of the law enforcement community, firefighters, first-year teachers, people who work in security in our office buildings across this country, people who work day in and day out putting their hours in and trying to teach their children right from wrong.

What has gone on here is what is wrong with this House today. We came here not just to be votes but to give voice to our values. I know there are good people with good values on the other side of the aisle. There is nothing just in the notion of denying 12 million children, 6½ million families who work full-time, denying those children who are also America's children a tax cut. We can depreciate the machinery of our corporations, depreciate the value of their machinery; but we cannot appreciate America's children.

I was part of an administration that created and extended the \$500-per-child tax credit and gave health insurance to 10 million uninsured children whose parents worked full time.

□ 1415

We balanced the budget. We also provided tax cuts in capital gains, but we

balanced the budget. It was in balance with our values. These are not the values we espoused on Memorial Day when we welcomed home our veterans and remembered them for what they had done for this country. This vote should also be remembered.

We can do right. We can correct the wrong, hold our heads up high, not wear this in shame for what it does.

These are 12 million of America's children. Let us do right. Let us remember them as we do every day, trying to do right by our values.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out for my friends on the other side of the aisle that I was prepared, as were my colleagues earlier this week, to vote in favor of this bill and suspension that would protect lands around the Grand Tetons, Wyoming. In fact, my in-laws are homesteaded around the Grand Tetons in Wyoming and I know they were very much in favor of seeing this land preserved for ages to come, including my children and their grandchildren.

We voted to strike it down to make a point, that there are 12 million children who would not be served by the recent tax cut that you imposed upon this country. In fact, in USA Today today, there is an article that says one out of five of those 12 million children who will not be getting a benefit, the families that will get a benefit of the child tax credit, are serving in our military today. Their parents are serving in the military, the same military that brought us the victory and did so much to preserve what this country stands for in the conflict in Iraq.

I have news for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Working people, believe it or not, working people have children. Working people have children. Working people make and made this country what it is today. Do not forget the working people of this country.

Do not forget the working people of this country. They deserve and need a child tax credit just as much as the wealthiest people in this country. They are the men and women who, day in and day out, provide for this country, for the backbone of this country.

It is interesting that there was a move on earlier this week as well and a bill that was supposed to come before us today that would have eliminated comp time as well. This week has been an attack upon the working families of our Nation, and the Republican party should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the very real concerns of the Zuni tribe and its children.

This bill would provide critical access to the Little Colorado River Basin

to allow the Zuni Indian Tribe acquisition of surface water rights and development of groundwater. The acquisition of water rights and associated lands are vital to the Zuni Indian Tribe's future economic development; and, along those same lines, the child tax credit is critical in helping low-income families, including Zunis, achieve some level of economic security.

This bill secures tribal rights to assured water supplies for present and future generations, while at the same time providing for the sound management of an increasingly scarce resource. Because of the importance and sacredness all forms and sources of water, all prayers and songs of the three major components of the Zuni religion contain language asking for rain and snow to ensure that all crops have enough water to finish their life paths to provide sustenance for their Zuni children. Likewise, enduring access to the child tax credit will help Zuni families provide economic sustenance to their children.

By now, the whole Nation knows what happened 2 weeks ago. They know that a tax credit which would have helped nearly 12 million children from 6.5 million low-income families, including Zuni families, was secretly eliminated by the administration and the gentleman from Texas' (Mr. DELAY) Republican majority.

These families, these Zuni families earn between \$10,500 and \$26,625 per year, families who really need this tax cut and, yes, they do pay taxes and they are important.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said we have more important matters. These Zuni children are important. In Arizona, 138,000 families with children, 21 percent of the families in the State, are not helped by the child tax credit increase because of the Republicans' last-minute actions. 403,000 Arizona children would be eligible if the child tax credit were made fully refundable, with an additional \$259,000 million in credit going to families in the State.

This House ought to be about the working families in this country, those who are Zunis and those who are not. We promised them a child tax credit, and this majority removed it to provide the opportunity for \$93,000 in tax cuts to the richest 184,000 millionaires in the country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my Republican colleagues in this House. Why would you, in a fit of anger because you were not able to get the size of the tax cut you wanted, hold poor little children hostage in order to extract a larger tax cut for those who were already wealthy?

It is a fair question.

In the middle of the night, over one-half million Ohio children were excluded from this benefit. Those are

children who have moms and dads who are working but their incomes are so low that they may not be required to pay income taxes. But let me tell you, they pay property taxes. They pay Social Security/payroll taxes. They pay all kinds of other taxes. Oh, it is very clever of you to say they do not pay income tax.

I am absolutely disgusted with what has happened in this House. CNN reported that the conservative leader of your party, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), brushed aside criticism that the tax bill did not expand the child tax credit and make it available to millions of poor families. But, he said, House Republicans might support doing so if it prodded senators to vote for a broader tax package. In other words, you may be willing to help the poor kids if it means you can get more money for your rich friends. It is as simple as that, as simple as that.

These are just not the rantings of a Democrat. Let me tell you what Senator JOHN MCCAIN said about it. Senator MCCAIN said, My God, what kind of message are we sending when we leave out low-income families, exactly those who are in that category of the enlisted men and women who are fighting for us in Iraq today? It is beyond belief.

And it is beyond belief, but you have got time to redeem yourself. You have got time to change this policy and take care of the kids, 500,000 in Ohio, who need your help.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Members should refrain from quoting members of the other body.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how many speakers does the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) have to discuss this issue?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The issue, of course, we are discussing is the rule for the two suspension bills that we, unfortunately, had majority vote earlier this week but, unfortunately, did not have the two-thirds. But we may have, counting myself, two speakers between now and the time we close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want to use some of his time now?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we have used up several speakers. I think for balance, if one of the gentleman's speakers is here, they could go.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

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

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

I wanted to say to my colleagues in the House, I certainly intend to stay on the subject matter of this rule equally as much as all the Democrats who have been speaking at least.

I want to talk to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about this child tax refundable credit which they are so indignant about. Because I want to remind them, you all had nothing to do with putting it on the books, nothing. We were glad that you like it because it was a Republican idea, but every single one of you, every single one of your speakers has voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to help you a little bit out here and just kind of remind you so far we have heard from the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), all good folks. However, they have all voted against this refundable tax credit, May 16, 2001, when the Republicans put it on the books. I do not know what you were thinking.

This thing that you were pretending to champion, you voted against. It was a Republican idea. Where were you when the battle was being fought? I am going to review a little bit of history, and let me say to this, you all are looking around stunned which I understand.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if it was such a good idea, number one, why did you remove it? Number two, I do not recall us ever having voted on this in the House. It was inserted in the Senate. Let us be accurate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, let me jog the gentleman's memory. Here is what the situation was, and the gentleman is a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules and has lots of bills that pass through his desk, so I will not hold you responsible for knowing everything.

Prior to 2001, the child tax credit was \$500 per child. It was passed under a Republican bill and, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) pointed out, it was signed by President Clinton. So you can claim a little bipartisanship there, even though that was passed by Republican votes when it was

in the House, but prior to 2001 the child tax credit was \$500. The credit was not refundable for most families. However, for a family with three kids or more, the credit was refundable; and it was not offset by the earned income tax credit. That was prior to 2001.

Now enter President Bush and the 2001 tax cut. Under that, the proposal was to increase the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000. The credit was \$600 for the year 2003, and it was scheduled to reach \$1,000 per child in 2010. That law made the child tax credit partially refundable for all families with children, not just those who had three kids or more.

Now, we had the vote on that May 16, 2001, and I have got the Roll Call from that, and at that time every one of you all voted against it. As a matter of fact, 197 Democrats voted against this.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats come out here looking for some rhetoric, and the big rhetoric of the Democratic party this year really that has been led by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is, we could have torn that statue down a lot cheaper.

I know a lot of folks are against the war. And then it was, well, the plan is not working when we were going up the Euphrates. And then as soon as they tore down the statue, I know a lot of folks on the left, and I want to say not all the members of the Democrat party but a lot of folks on the left were disturbed that a 23-year-old Marine corporal who was in theater had the audacity of hanging an American flag on a Saddam Hussein statue. Of course, he was denounced in the liberal, left-wing community for doing that.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, that is a little unfair. I do not think anyone objected to flags being flown and so forth. You make a good point on some of the other things, but that is a little unfair on the flag.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say to my friend from Tennessee, that is why I said not all the Democrats but a lot of folks on the left denounced the fact that that flag was hung.

Mr. FORD. That is unfair.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would also point out that you were not one of them.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. That is outrageous.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I will yield further to you in just one second.

I am very pleased that you all are listening. Let me do this, because I am being generous here, but my ranking member of the Committee on Rules says that maybe we should do this a little bit more on your time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me say for the record what I am outraged at what is in the paper today, that nearly one in five children of U.S. military families will not benefit from the increased tax credit signed by President Bush.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am glad that not only does the gentleman listen to fine speeches like mine, but he also reads the paper, which is very good.

□ 1430

I suspect it is probably The New York Times or The Washington Post.

Let me just say this, does that article point out that my colleagues voted against phasing in the tax cut, the refundability, in 2001? That is all I want to say.

What I would love to hear from our Democrat colleagues, Mr. Speaker, who are saying I voted against this tax cut and a tax cut which was a jobs bill, took 3 million working families off the tax roll, 3 million, and I understand they wanted them on. We thought it would be helpful for the working families of America to get off the tax roll. The reality is they voted against it. They wanted to keep them on. I understand that. I just wish they would acknowledge in the year 2001 that they voted against the child tax refundability clause, and I have the vote in my hand; and I can submit it for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, and do that.

If my colleagues want to be helpful, what they ought to do on some of these tax bills that are aimed at creating jobs is say, hey, we want to amend the bill and we will do this. We will do this in a spirit of a democratic, small D, democratic House and process. We are going to vote for the bill if we put in some of their ideas, because this is the way it really should work, the best of their party and the best of our party combined together to put out just the best thoughts and do what is right for working families.

Let me point out that a family of four making \$11,000 a year pays no income tax, pays about \$842 in payroll taxes and receives \$4,140 under the earned income tax credit. We think that is good. We think it also would be helpful, though, if my colleagues could join us in making these child tax credits permanent because their idea that they are concerned about now might have some merits. Why do they not join us in saying we are going to make these child tax credits permanent? We are not going to do a bait and switch, when in the year 2011 they are gone.

While we are at it, because we all know that a family of mom and dad have great potential for stability, why do we not end the marriage tax penalty together? Again, I throw out an olive branch to my colleagues, could they join us in making the marriage tax penalty permanent? That would be very helpful for the working poor. There are so many things that we could do together.

Another idea is the 10 percent tax bracket, the 10 percent rate. Could my

colleagues join us in making that permanent? These are all things that could help the working poor.

We are not going to say we have the franchise on helping the working poor just because we voted to take 3 million off the payrolls and my colleagues voted against it. We are saying maybe they can join us on the next job creation package and come up with something that is in the best interest of all of us.

I would love to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, but we are getting to the point we have got a lot of Members who want to go ahead and have a vote, and I am a little concerned about that.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a quick question?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, what is the problem then if my colleagues believe in removing all these taxes, which I think there is a lot of merit to, I am a big tax cutter like the gentleman is? I support those ideas. How is that consistent with the taking 3 million, or I should say up to 12 million, children or removing them from the target of a tax cut which my colleagues did, they voted for it?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say this. Our objective is to get people working, and that was the real goal of this to get folks working.

Let me say this to my friend from Tennessee: if the gentleman wants to join us in making the child tax credit permanent; the marriage tax penalty, eliminate it permanently; the 10 percent tax credit, make that permanent, he and I need to get together because I think we can move the ball down the road, and that is all we want to do.

I am just saying that the planned, orchestrated campaign of the Democrat Party to denounce something that they all voted against in the year 2002, I just wish the speakers would say I voted against this in 2001, but it is a great idea and now I am mad that the Republicans are not doing it this way; I want it done even though I did not share any of the burden by being responsible and voting for it.

I want to end with this. There are a lot of differences between the Democrat and the Republican parties. They seem to be the group of frivolous lawsuits and starving trial lawyers. We are the party of tort reform, ending frivolous medical liabilities, making health care affordable and accessible. They seem to like unemployment checks and government handouts. We like paychecks, jobs and opportunities.

They like welfare and low expectations. We like welfare reform, jobs.

Mr. FORD. . . .

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Tennessee is definitely out of order, has not been recognized, and the Chair would appreciate it if the gentleman would not speak when the other gentleman has the time.

Mr. FORD. . . .

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is not recognized. The Chair would ask the gentleman to take his seat. The Chair would ask the gentleman to take a seat. The gentleman from Georgia may continue.

Mr. FORD. . . .

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, here is the situation with welfare reform, Mr. Speaker. We passed welfare reform at a time when there were 14 million people on welfare. At that time, we were called all kinds of names, and they were saying it was heartless and we were mean-spirited and everything else and that these folks were unable to help themselves. What is interesting is in 1996 when we passed welfare reform, we had 14 million people on welfare. Today, that number is down to 5 million people, too high; but we need to continue working on that. The 9 million people are now tax paying, working, enjoying the opportunity, sharing in the American Dream. They are glad that we passed welfare reform.

There is a component in this that the Democrats are proposing which is simply welfare, and I think there may be some merit in that. I have no trouble at all in a healthy discussion on tinkering with welfare reform. This is good for everybody, but what our tax package was about was creating jobs, and we are going to continue to be the party of welfare reform, jobs and opportunity.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

CHILD CREDIT REFUNDABILITY FACT SHEET

What was the child credit prior to 2001? Prior to 2001, the child credit was \$500 per eligible child. The credit was not refundable for most families. However, for families with 3 or more eligible children, the credit was refundable to the extent the family had payroll tax liability that was not offset by the Earned Income Credit (EIC).

How was the child credit expanded in 2001? The Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 significantly expanded the child credit in two important ways.

(1) The law gradually increased the credit from \$500 to \$1,000. The credit was \$600 for 2003 and was scheduled to reach \$1,000 in 2010.

(2) The law made the child credit partially refundable for all families with children—not just those with 3 or more children. The credit is now refundable by an amount equal to 10 percent of the family's earned income in excess of \$10,000. The \$10,000 threshold is indexed annually for inflation (it is \$10,500 for 2003), and the 10 percent refundability rate will increase to 15 percent in 2005.

NAYS—197

Ackerman	Harman	Neal
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Andrews	Hill	Obey
Baca	Hilliard	Olver
Baird	Hinchey	Ortiz
Baldacci	Hinojosa	Owens
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Pallone
Barcia	Holden	Pascrell
Barrett	Holt	Pastor
Becerra	Honda	Payne
Bentsen	Hooley	Pelosi
Berkley	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Inslee	Phelps
Berry	Israel	Pomeroy
Blagojevich	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)

Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rahall
Bonior	Jefferson	Rangel
Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Boyd	Kaptur	Romer
Brady (PA)	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kind (WI)	Rush
Capuano	Kleccka	Sabo
Cardin	Kucinich	Sanchez
Carson (IN)	LaFalce	Sanders
Carson (OK)	Lampson	Sandlin
Clay	Langevin	Sawyer
Clayton	Lantos	Schiff
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Lee	Sherman
Coyne	Levin	Skelton
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Lowey	Solis
Davis (IL)	Luther	Spratt
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Stark
DeGette	Markey	Stenholm
Delahunt	Mascara	Strickland
DeLauro	Matheson	Stupak
Deutsch	Matsui	Tanner
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McGovern	Thurman
Edwards	McKinney	Tierney
Engel	McNulty	Towns
Eshoo	Meehan	Turner
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Millender-McDonald	Visclosky
Filner	Miller, George	Waters
Ford	Mink	Watt (NC)
Frank	Moakley	Waxman
Frost	Mollohan	Weiner
Gephardt	Moore	Wexler
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Woosley
Green (TX)	Murtha	Wu
Gutierrez	Nadler	Wynn
Hall (OH)	Napolitano	

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Georgia his tax package is about welfare for the rich. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what incredible nonsense we have heard here on the floor of the House this afternoon, this attempt to raise the flag and besmirch Members of this House over their stance on the American flag practically on the eve of Flag Day.

Let me tell the gentleman (Mr. KINGSTON), there are two kinds of people today that have the American flag wrapped around them. Some of them are young men and women who come back in coffins with the flag draped around it, who gave their all in the ultimate sacrifice for this country; and all of us honor them, whatever our views about the President's policy. But the other kind of people we do not honor, and it is those who choose to wrap their own bad policies that they cannot defend by stretching the flag around themselves.

What are the merits of the argument about the child tax credit? Who came up with it in the first place? I think the names are Al Gore and Tom Downey, who both served in this body who long ago presented a child tax credit proposal. How did it become law? It eventually became law with the signature of a Democratic President in 1997 when we passed the Balanced Budget

Act with the support of a large number of Members on both sides of this aisle, balancing the budget, not busting it as this Republican tax bill would do.

The child tax credit has had strong Democratic support within our caucus and within the Committee on Ways and Means on which I serve, and the only reason any Democrat has voted against that child tax credit on this floor was when it was used, much as the flag has been misused this afternoon, as the reason for voting for a bill that gave most all of the help to the people at the top and none of the people at the bottom.

I am glad that my colleague from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has joined us this afternoon. He has announced to the American people that there are more important things to do than to ensure that the child tax credit is available to people that earn a mere \$20,000, \$25,000 a year. Who are those people? They are the people that empty the bed pans at the nursing homes. They are the cafeteria workers in our public schools. They are the people that we check out with at the gas station when we go in to pay for our gas. They are people that are sweeping the floors today at the hospitals around America.

Why do those young women and men not have an opportunity to get the same type of child tax credit available to those at the top? They are working. Some of them are working two and three jobs to have a chance to advance out of poverty and share in the American Dream. They respect the flag just as much as the gentleman from Georgia does, but they would also like to share in a little of the American Dream.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, my, my, what a heated debate we are having today. I came to the well to talk about what this debate is all about. A lot has been left out by those Members on the other side of the aisle because they are afraid for the truth to surface, so I wanted to bring the real facts about what is going on here.

The child tax credit provision in this new tax law is refundable, and it is refundable to the extent 10 percent of earned income in excess of \$10,500, people that make \$10,500 get a refundable tax rebate. In 2005, the 10 percent rate goes up to 15 percent.

What this fight is over is there was a provision in the Senate that basically said they wanted to accelerate that 2 years, and we may want to do that in the proper way under regular order; but what the Democrats are angry about is that we did not accelerate that spending increase; and thanks to the tax relief passed by Republican Congresses over the last 8 years, 13 million American families have had their entire income tax liability eliminated, eliminated.

The gentleman from Texas brings up who are these people. I would like to show my colleagues one. Here is a married couple earning \$30,000 with three children. Before the 2001 law, that they voted against, this married couple would be paying a marginal rate of 15 percent, which means their income tax liability is over \$1,000 and their payroll tax liability is \$2,160. Before the 2001 law, they would get a \$1,500 credit, and they would get an earned income tax credit of \$782, which means that their income tax liability was zero. They still had a payroll tax liability; but because of EITC, the payment from the government was zero.

So after 2001, this same family would have an income tax liability of \$688, \$2,160 from their payroll tax liability; but they get \$1,800 in a child tax credit, and they get a \$992 earned income tax credit, which means that their income tax liability is still zero, but their payroll tax liability goes down to \$48.

After this law that the President passed that they voted against, that the President signed a week ago, this same family is going to have an income tax liability of \$525, payroll tax liability of \$2,160, but they get a child tax credit of \$2,475, and they get an earned income tax credit of \$992, which actually helps them pay not only for their payroll taxes; it reimburses them for their payroll taxes. They pay no income taxes. They actually get a check for \$782.

□ 1445

A check from the American taxpayers. No tax liability, but they get to put \$782 in their pocket.

Now, let us take a single mother that makes \$20,000 and has two children. They are going through the same thing. What has happened to her is she gets a check of over \$1,000. Over \$1,000. She pays no payroll taxes, she pays no income taxes, and she gets a check for \$1,000. They voted against that. They voted against that.

Now they want to come and tell the American people they are all tax relievers. Now all of a sudden they are tax relievers, and they want to give more tax relief to the taxpaying public and to people that do not have a tax liability.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. They fail to—

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, may I have order?

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to ask the gentleman if he will yield for a quick question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas has the time.

Ms. DELAURO. I understand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not yielding to the gentleman. The gentleman may proceed.

Ms. DELAURO. . . .

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not yielding. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, what has happened here is they also do not want to mention that in the bill signed by the President last week we raised by 10 percent and added more people to the rolls that do not pay income taxes. So this notion that we are not taking care of the poor working families of this country are completely false; and, most importantly, they voted against it. We passed it without their votes, moved forward, gave tax relief to poor working families in this country; and we will continue to do so.

When the Senate does something, we always take it into consideration and we will move forward. I would just remind the Members of this House that we have now almost a trillion dollars left in the budget to do more tax relief for the American people, and we are coming back. We are going to have at least two if not three more tax relief packages for the American people. Because we feel very strongly that we need jobs in this country, we need economic growth in this country, and American families need to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman yield on the tax question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the distinguished majority leader would extend the courtesy to his Members and not leave the floor. It is so important when Members have something to say to correct their position that they stay on the floor, not for Democrats but for Republicans as well.

This is a very edifying thing that he said in the well of the House. He is trying to rebut the allegations that we have made that in the last tax bill that the working people in the lower incomes were deliberately left out of the bill. Now, my colleague can go back to last year, the year before last, 10 years from now, but the accusation was made and still stands. The accusation is that the Republican leadership cared more about accelerating tax relief for the wealthiest people than they did for working people.

So let us not come here and mislead and make these statements and walk off the floor. There is a tendency for all of us to be out of order when we see the arrogance, the indifference, and the lack of respect that certain Members, especially those in the leadership, have for those that have to work here each and every day.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 5½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 13 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I pointed out earlier, this is a rule on two suspensions that were unfortunately defeated earlier this week that deal with serious matters in the southwestern part of the United States, at least one of them does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) to speak on one of these matters.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleagues that what we are here to debate is the rule as it affects the Zuni tribe of New Mexico and Arizona as it affects the sacred lands and those lands right now that have no water.

We were able to provide them with enough land in 1984 to establish Zuni Heaven in Arizona, a reservation, and yet without Senator KYL's intervention we would not have been able to achieve the kind of water that we see the communities in rural Arizona supplying now.

This summer, while we debate separate issues, the Zuni people are hoping to engage in their 4-year migration and trek to their holy lands, to their holy site. So the delay that we imposed 2 days ago, the delay we impose today affects their ability to plan and celebrate this agreement. And there is all kinds of agreement, I think even from both sides, if my colleagues will allow us to get to it. We need to be able to restore the tribe's ability to perform not only the religious duties but the farming and subsistence that they need in order to care for their children.

So when we talk about children today, the Zuni people themselves are waiting to plant their crops and feed their children. They are waiting to take their children to their sacred lands, their wetlands, to teach their children their sacred rights. There will be no more delay if we can get this to a vote. Each day, each hour, each minute we allow to pass, the Zuni people feel there are inequities and that the agreement cannot be reached.

For the record, I want the Zuni people to know that what they see here today does not reflect upon them as a people. There are hours and times, Special Orders available in this House for this issue to be debated. Instead, my colleagues have taken their issue and turned this into a side show.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. And since I could not get the gentleman from Texas to answer a simple question for me, maybe I can pose a question to his colleagues and see if we can get an answer.

It appears in fact that the Senate has come to some agreement; that the Senate has said on a bipartisan basis that we need to address the fact that 12 million children were left out of the equation; that they were supposed to be

able to have the benefit of a \$400 tax credit, these 6.5 million families. The Senate has come to an agreement with about a \$10 billion package.

I want to get an answer from the Republican side of the aisle as to whether or not they will bring up the Senate package for us to be able to deliberate and help those 12 million children and those 6.5 million households. The Senate has done it; we ought to be able to do it here and to address that issue.

If we can, we would like to get an answer to that question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to see if anyone on the other side wants to respond. We are waiting.

Mr. Speaker, I guess we are not going to get an answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know I mean no disrespect to you personally or to the institution, but the notion that somehow welfare has any role in this debate is asinine. My colleagues know and we know, as do those watching know, certainly our colleagues in the Senate know, that everyone we are discussing today with regard to this child tax credit are working people.

The welfare reform package that passed this Congress passed before I got here, so it is easy for me to say I would have voted for it, since I was not here. But I can assure my colleagues that my votes since that time are consistent with that.

Now, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) coming down here, but what he did, I think, was to lay out pretty clearly for those on our side and the other side just the difference in priorities. Our priorities differ in great ways from the Republicans. Many of us like tax cuts; my Republican colleagues like tax cuts. We think tax cuts should benefit more people, the Republicans think they should benefit a lesser group of people. No disrespect to you. Do not mean to ridicule my colleagues personally, but there are complete differences in priorities and realities.

The reality is what we are discussing today. People earning \$25,000 a year or less make up a good portion of America. Frankly, those of us on this floor, that is a fraction of what we earn year in and year out. And how dare we, as we pass a tax cut bill, how dare we say that we have done enough for people that make \$11,000, \$12,000, \$13,000, \$14,000 and \$15,000 a year. How dare we say that to their children, when the facts betray everything that you believe and I believe.

Frankly, if these children whom we are denying this tax credit to could vote, they would vote all of us out of office. As many times as we have lied to them about building new schools and putting more teachers in the classrooms, they would fire the President, might have even fired the former President.

So let us be honest. We deny 12 million children a tax credit. No funny math, no Enron accounting, no Arthur Andersen accounting can refute that. We should do better and we can.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. A question was posed and unanswered. We can wait for an answer, if my colleagues have one.

Is there no answer to the question?

Apparently, there is no answer, I tell the gentlewoman from Connecticut, to the question she posed. Let me tell her and my colleagues why.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington, no Democrat and no liberal, and very wealthy, said this in the Los Angeles Times, and I quote: "A magnetic compass always points north; a moral compass should always point out that heaping billions on the rich while ensuring that one out of six American children do not get a penny is dead wrong."

Dead wrong. Arianna Huffington. Not the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), not the Democrats, not those fuzzy-headed liberals my Republican colleagues like to talk about, but Arianna Huffington. She continued: "But that's exactly what congressional Republicans did in pushing through tax cut legislation last month, and that's what President Bush signed off on." Arianna Huffington.

Mr. Speaker, America now knows that the GOP's moral compass lies shattered on the conference room floor where the final deals on the Republican tax bill were cut 2 weeks ago.

Why did the majority leader leave the floor? The majority leader left the floor because he used an example just above the \$28,000, where he would have been wrong. My colleagues, the moral compass is absent.

There was a report that showed that the policies in 2001 and 2003 are leading to a \$44.4 trillion deficit. Who did that? Two people in the Bush administration asked to do that report and OMB. And guess what? They stonewalled the report. Why? Because they did not want the magnitude of the debt tax that we are imposing on every American family known while at the same time, when they had no lobbyist in that hall, those 12 million children, who did not have somebody highly paid to sit in that hallway and say do not cut us, found themselves cut out of the bill that in the still and dark of the night, with no Democrats present, was brought out to this floor, pages and pages of bill, with minutes to review it.

Arianna Huffington is correct. Shame, shame, shame.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 30 seconds. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can help millions of children and working families. We have heard the other side defend the indefensible.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, if they do not want to help millions of working families, they should at least have the guts to go on record as voting no instead of hiding behind procedures. So let this House work its will. Let us have a little democracy in this Chamber. Vote on the previous question so we can bring up the Rangel bill and literally help millions of children in this country.

WORKING FAMILIES TAX CREDIT ACT OF 2003—SUMMARY OF H.R. 2286, JUNE 4, 2003

Republicans have left moderate-income families behind in their zeal to cut taxes on millionaires, contrary to their "leave no child behind" rhetoric.

H.R. 2286 helps moderate-income working families and is revenue neutral.

PROVISIONS

Provides Child Credit to More Working Families: Lowers to \$7,500 (from \$10,500) the amount of the wages a family must have before refundability of the child credit begins. This is identical to a provision that was included in the house Democratic alternative on the economic stimulus legislation. The credit would be allowed for approximately 19 million additional children by reason of this change.

Increases Benefit for Working Families: Increases partial refundability from 10 percent of wages to 15 percent of wages. Again, this is identical to a provision that was included in the Democratic alternative. This would result in an average credit increase of over \$300 per child.

Helps Families of Soldiers in Combat: Allows refundability for families of soldiers in combat zones even though combat wages are not taxed.

Speeds up Marriage Penalty Relief for Lower Income Working Couples: Makes effective immediately the marriage penalty relief in the Earned Income Tax Credit that was provided in the 2001 tax cut. This is the only marriage penalty relief not accelerated in the recently enacted tax bill.

Does Not Increase the Deficit: Closes corporate loopholes: prohibits tax shelters, and taxes corporations that move headquarters offshore (expatriates).

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and description of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this is a rule on two suspension bills that were, unfortunately, not passed earlier this week. They are very important bills to those areas that are affected.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the chart that the distinguished majority leader discussed earlier today.

EXAMPLES: REFUNDABILITY OF CHILD CREDIT FOR 2003

	Pre-2001 law	2001 law	2003 law
Example 1: Married couple earning \$30,000 with 3 children			
Tax liability before credits:			
Earnings .....	30,000	30,000	30,000

EXAMPLES: REFUNDABILITY OF CHILD CREDIT FOR 2003—Continued

	Pre-2001 law	2001 law	2003 law
Standard deduction .....	(7,950)	(7,950)	(9,500)
Personal exemptions .....	(15,250)	(15,250)	(15,250)
Taxable income .....	6,800	6,800	5,250
Marginal tax rate .....	15%	10%	10%
Income tax liability .....	1,020	680	525
Payroll tax liability .....	2,160	2,160	2,160
Child credit .....	1,500	1,800	2,475
Earned income credit .....	782	992	992
Tax liability after EIC and child credit:			
Income tax liability .....	0	0	0
Payroll tax liability .....	898	48	0
Payroll from government .....	0	0	782
Example 2: Single mother earning \$20,000 with 2 children			
Tax liability before credits:			
Earnings .....	20,000	20,000	20,000
Standard deduction .....	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)
Personal exemptions .....	(9,150)	(9,150)	(9,150)
Taxable income .....	3,850	3,850	3,850
Marginal tax rate .....	15%	10%	10%
Income tax liability .....	578	385	385
Payroll tax liability .....	1,440	1,440	1,440
Child credit .....	578	1,200	1,335
Earned income credit .....	2,888	2,888	2,888
Tax liability after EIC and child credit:			
Income tax liability .....	0	0	0
Payroll tax liability .....	0	0	0
Payment from government .....	1,748	2,263	2,398

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES.—RULE ON S. 222 & S. 273

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2286) the Working Families tax Credit Act of 2003. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on adoption of the resolution, which will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question of passage of H.R. 1474 which was postponed earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 194, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—220

Aderholt  
Akin  
Bachus  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Bereuter  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Bradley (NH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Cox  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cunningham  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach

Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Rehberg  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Janklow  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle

Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Roxby  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souders  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberti  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—194

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Becerra  
Bell  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd

Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (IN)  
Case  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)

Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank (MA)

Frost  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Harman  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Kleczka  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lowe  
Lucas (KY)  
Lynch  
Majette

Maloney  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Michaud  
Millender-  
Snyder  
McDonald  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard

Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watson  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

NOT VOTING—20

Ballenger  
Brady (TX)  
Burton (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Delahunt  
Dicks  
Eshoo

Gephardt  
Hastings (FL)  
Larson (CT)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lofgren  
McInnis  
Ortiz

Reyes  
Ryan (WI)  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (WA)  
Toomey  
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1521

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. MEEKS of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 175, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—229

Aderholt  
Akin  
Bachus  
Baker

Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass

Beauprez  
Bereuter  
Biggart  
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Bradley (NH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Cox  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cunningham  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach

Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Honda  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Janklow  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Ose

Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Ryun (KS)  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souders  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberti  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOES—175

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Becerra  
Bell  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano

Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Case  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Emanuel  
Etheridge

Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frost  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Hall  
Harman  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holt  
Hooley (OR)  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)

Jefferson	Millender	Schiff	Boehner	Gibbons	Manzullo	Sanders	Stark	Van Hollen
John	McDonald	Scott (GA)	Bonilla	Gilchrest	Markey	Sandlin	Stearns	Velazquez
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)	Bonner	Gillmor	Marshall	Saxton	Stenholm	Visclosky
Jones (OH)	Miller, George	Serrano	Bono	Gingrey	Matheson	Schakowsky	Strickland	Vitter
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Sherman	Boozman	Gonzalez	Matsui	Schiff	Stupak	Walden (OR)
Kaptur	Moore	Skelton	Boswell	Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Schrock	Sullivan	Walsh
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Slaughter	Boucher	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)	Sweeney	Wamp
Kildee	Napolitano	Snyder	Boyd	Gordon	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Tancredo	Waters
Kilpatrick	Neal (MA)	Solis	Bradley (NH)	Goss	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Watson
Kind	Oberstar	Spratt	Brady (PA)	Granger	McCrery	Serrano	Tauscher	Waxman
Klecza	Obey	Stark	Brown (SC)	Graves	McGovern	Sessions	Tauzin	Weiner
Kucinich	Olver	Stenholm	Brown, Corrine	Green (TX)	McHugh	Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	Taylor (FL)
Lampson	Owens	Strickland	Brown-Waite,	Green (WI)	McIntyre	Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Langevin	Pallone	Stupak	Ginny	Greenwood	McKeon	Shays	Terry	Weller
Lantos	Pascarell	Tanner	Burgess	Grijalva	McNulty	Sherman	Thomas	Wexler
Larsen (WA)	Pastor	Tauscher	Burns	Gutierrez	Meehan	Sherwood	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Lee	Payne	Thompson (CA)	Burns	Gutknecht	Meek (FL)	Shimkus	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Levin	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)	Buyer	Hall	Meeks (NY)	Shuster	Thornberry	Wilson (NM)
Lowe	Pomeroy	Tierney	Calvert	Harman	Menendez	Simmons	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Lucas (KY)	Price (NC)	Towns	Cannon	Harris	Mica	Simpson	Tierney	Wolf
Lynch	Rahall	Turner (TX)	Cantor	Hart	Michaud	Skelton	Towns	Woolsey
Majette	Rangel	Udall (CO)	Capito	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Turner (OH)	Wu
Maloney	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)	Capps	Hayes	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Turner (TX)	Wynn
Markey	Ross	Van Hollen	Capuano	Hayworth	Miller (MI)	Snyder	Udall (CO)	Young (AK)
Marshall	Rothman	Velazquez	Cardin	Hefley	Miller (NC)	Solis	Udall (NM)	Young (FL)
Matheson	Roybal-Allard	Wepersberger	Cardin	Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Souder	Upton	
Matsui	Rush	Waters	Carson (IN)	Herger	Hill	Mollohan		
McCarthy (MO)	Ryan (OH)	Watson	Carter	Hinchee	Hinojosa	Moore		
McCarthy (NY)	Sabo	Waxman	Case	Hobson	Moran (KS)	Moran (KS)		
McCollum	Sanchez, Linda	Weiner	Castle	Hobson	Moran (VA)	Moran (VA)		
McGovern	T.	Wexler	Castle	Hoeffel	Murphy	Murphy		
McNulty	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey	Chabot	Hoekstra	Murtha	Murtha		
Meehan	Sanders	Wu	Chocola	Holden	Musgrave	Musgrave		
Meek (FL)	Sandlin	Wynn	Clay	Holt	Myrick	Myrick		
Menendez	Schakowsky		Clyburn	Holt	Nadler	Nadler		
Michaud			Cole	Honda	Napolitano	Napolitano		

## NOT VOTING—30

Ballenger	Frank (MA)	McInnis
Brady (TX)	Gephardt	Meeks (NY)
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Burton (IN)	Herger	Reyes
Carson (OK)	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Cubin	Larson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MI)
Delahunt	Lewis (KY)	Smith (WA)
Dicks	Lofgren	Toomey
Eshoo	McDermott	Watt

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1527

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.

## CHECK CLEARING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 1474, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill 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 405, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Berman
Ackerman	Ballance	Berry
Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Biggart
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Bilirakis
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Allen	Bass	Bishop (NY)
Andrews	Beauprez	Bishop (UT)
Baca	Becerra	Blackburn
Bachus	Bell	Blumenauer
Baird	Bereuter	Blunt
Baker	Berkley	Boehlert
		Foley
		Forbes
		Ford
		Fossella
		Frank (MA)
		Franks (AZ)
		Frelinghuysen
		Frost
		Gallegly
		Garrett (NJ)
		Gerlach
		Lewis (CA)
		Lewis (GA)
		Linder
		Lipinski
		LoBiondo
		Lowe
		Lucas (KY)
		Lucas (OK)
		Lynch
		Majette
		Maloney
		McGovern
		McIntyre
		McKeon
		McNulty
		Meehan
		Meek (FL)
		Meeks (NY)
		Menendez
		Mica
		Michaud
		Miller (FL)
		Miller (MI)
		Miller (NC)
		Miller, Gary
		Mollohan
		Moore
		Moran (KS)
		Moran (VA)
		Murphy
		Murtha
		Musgrave
		Myrick
		Nadler
		Napolitano
		Neal (MA)
		Nethercutt
		Neugebauer
		Ney
		Northup
		Norwood
		Nunes
		Nussle
		Oberstar
		Obey
		Olver
		Osborne
		Ose
		Otter
		Owens
		Oxley
		Pallone
		Pascarell
		Pastor
		Paul
		Payne
		Pearce
		Pelosi
		Pence
		Peterson (MN)
		Petri
		Pitts
		Platts
		Pombo
		Pomeroy
		Porter
		Portman
		Price (NC)
		Pryce (OH)
		Putnam
		Quinn
		Radanovich
		Rahall
		Ramstad
		Rangel
		Regula
		Rehberg
		Renzi
		Reynolds
		Rodriguez
		Rogers (AL)
		Rogers (KY)
		Rogers (MI)
		Rohrabacher
		Ros-Lehtinen
		Ross
		Rothman
		Roybal-Allard
		Royce
		Ruppersberger
		Rush
		Ryan (OH)
		Ryun (KS)
		Sabo
		Sanchez, Linda
		T.
		Sanchez, Loretta

## NOT VOTING—29

Ballenger	Gephardt	Peterson (PA)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Brown (OH)	Jenkins	Reyes
Burton (IN)	Larson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Carson (OK)	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)
Coble	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	McDermott	Spratt
Delahunt	McInnis	Toomey
Dicks	Miller, George	Watt
Eshoo	Ortiz	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Members are advised two minutes remain to vote.

□ 1533

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 246, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CHANGE OF MEETING PLACE FOR MEMBERS-ONLY BRIEFING ON IRAQ

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the briefing by Secretary Rumsfeld that was to take place on the floor at 4 p.m. will take place at 4 p.m. in Rayburn 2118.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 222 and S. 273.

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

There was no objection.