

his deep sense of fairness and equality to organize and establish what is today the United Farmworkers of America. Because of his efforts, many farm workers today enjoy higher pay, family health coverage, pension benefits, and other contract protections. While we still have a long way to go in giving farm workers the fair pay and healthy work conditions they deserve, César Chávez laid the foundation toward accomplishing those important goals.

César Chávez understood what it took to create a movement and he dedicated every part of his life to setting an example and leading the way. As a child and young man, he experienced firsthand the harsh working conditions of farm workers—the long hours, poverty wages, harassment, and abuse—as well as the limited access to education and health care. Understanding and addressing the roots of the problem, Chávez was able to make a lasting and significant impact. He conducted voter registration drives and campaigns against racial and economic discrimination. He led boycotts and pickets and hunger strikes. His nonviolent methods echoed those of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi. He showed us all how critical it is to organize people, to unify them for a cause, and to help them believe in themselves and their ability to make a difference.

César Chávez continues to be an example for us today. He taught us that “Si se puede,” or “Yes we can.” We can—and we must—help those with no voice, help those who are discriminated against, help those who are taken advantage of, and help those who live in poverty and are struggling to survive. If César Chávez were alive today, I am sure he would still be leading the fight for fairness and equality for workers and their families. We must not let his legacy die; we must not let his great strides forward become giant steps backward. We must continue to work for what is right. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 925.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with my colleagues to honor the enduring legacy of Mr. Cesar Estrada Chavez.

Mr. Chavez was born of humble beginnings in 1933 near Yuma, Arizona. Early in life, Mr. Chavez was forced to recognize the harsh realities of racism that all too often plagued communities of color. After his family's home and land were taken from them, Mr. Chavez knew first hand what it meant to be the victim of gross injustice. Yet despite this and similar experiences of discrimination, Mr. Chavez was not deterred. He often said that, “the love for justice that is in us is not only the best part of our being but also the most true to our nature.”

In 1945, Mr. Chavez joined the U.S. Navy and served in the Western Pacific during the end of WWII. After completing his military service, Mr. Chavez returned to his roots, working and laboring in the fields. By day Mr. Chavez picked apricots in an orchard outside of San Jose; by night he was actively involved in galvanizing voter registration drives. In 1952, Mr. Chavez was a full time organizer with the Chicago-based Community Service Organization (CSO). Not only did he coordinate voter registration drives, but he battled racial and economic discrimination against Chicano residents and organized new CSO chapters across California and Arizona as well.

In 1962, Mr. Chavez moved his wife and eight young children to California where he founded the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA). Cesar Chavez founded and led the first successful farm workers' union in U.S. history. In 1968, Mr. Chavez conducted a 25-day fast to reaffirm the United Farm Workers commitment to nonviolence. The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy called Cesar Chavez “one of the heroic figures of our time”, and actually flew to be with Mr. Chavez when he ended his fast.

In 1991, Mr. Chavez received the Aguila Azteca (The Aztec Eagle), Mexico's highest award presented to people of Mexican heritage who have made significant contributions outside of Mexico. Mr. Cesar Chavez passed away on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66. At the time of his death he was the president of the United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO. On August 8, 1994 Cesar became the second Mexican American to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in the United States. The award was presented posthumously by then president, Bill Clinton.

Given the immense and innumerable contributions that Mr. Cesar Chavez has made to our society in advocating for the rights and causes of the working poor, I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting affirmatively that the U.S. Postal Service Facility located at 1859 Southland Avenue in Chicago, Illinois be designated at the “Cesar Chavez Post Office”.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 925.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2143, UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 263 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be

confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. Speaker, H. Res. 263 is a structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. This is a fair, structured rule that merits the House's approval.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

This rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying H. Res. 263. It provides that the amendments printed in the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated by the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

This rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

With respect to the underlying legislation, H.R. 2143, I want to acknowledge the efforts of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, in bringing this important bill to the floor today. This rule we have before us today will give the House the opportunity to consider

H.R. 2143 and three additional amendments made in order under the rule.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 263 is a structured rule that will give the full House an opportunity to work its will on the major issues it raises, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we can move on to consideration of the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me this time.

The Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act has the potential to eradicate illegal Internet gambling by disallowing merchants from accepting credit card, debit card, or other bank-sanctioned transactions as payment for online wagering.

Mr. Speaker, because online gambling has grave societal consequences, I support this legislation that aims to eradicate it. As the "crack cocaine" of gambling, Internet betting often leads to severe personal and family hardships, including debt, bankruptcy, foreclosed mortgages, and divorce.

Although I am pleased that three amendments were made in order, I find it especially disappointing and frustrating that the Pombo amendment will not be debated today.

The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) presented an amendment that would have treated Indian tribes on a par with State governments. The interests of the Native American people, a community that has been disenfranchised for all of their history, should always be heard and, in this case, should have been debated.

The price of Internet gambling can be measured best in terms of the human costs. As we debate the pros and cons of this act, the most important question we should be asking is, What does Internet gambling cost our children, and is this a price we are willing to pay?

Mr. Speaker, we are debating a bill that has the potential to stop the gambling with our future, because Internet gambling hurts children. I have learned of one young man that racked up debts of \$70,000 and was kicked out of his house because he was stealing from his family, and of another teen who blew his tuition and 3 days after his father repaid it, he withdrew from his courses, demanded a refund, and spent the refund on gambling. Stories like these are innumerable.

The American Psychiatric Association is so concerned about the increase in youth gambling, primarily on the Internet, that it recently issued the following statement: "In virtually all studies of the rates of gambling problems at various ages, high school and college-aged individuals show the highest problem areas."

The APA says the increase in problems among young people can be at-

tributed, in part, to the ease with which they can gamble on the Internet, where there are no enforceable restrictions on age.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to help reduce the extent of existing illegal Internet gambling in the United States; and I support it as it is presently constituted, with hopes of continuing revision.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking minority member on the committee of jurisdiction, and I am pleased that we forestalled a suspension proposal here and that we do have a chance to debate some of the amendments. I will talk about that bill in due time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I did want to note today, though, and I guess I may need the Parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker. I know under our rules it is forbidden to speak ill of the Senate and from time to time people get exasperated and they speak ill of the Senate and they are duly chilled.

But the question I have, Mr. Speaker, is, is it permissible to speak well of the Senate? Is it within the rules to lavish on the Senate the praise they deserve for passing the child tax credit bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not in order to characterize the Senate in any way.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In any way. Well, I regret my inability to give credit where credit is due. I was hoping that an example recently given would be followed in this side of the Capitol; but I will abide by the rules, though as foolish as I think this particular rule is, and not comment on the Senate.

□ 1515

I will, though, have to say that the refusal of the Republican leadership in the House to allow the House to vote on a proposal that would extend to hard-working, low-income people financial relief after all of the financial relief we have given to people in the upper brackets is truly distressing.

I know there has been an effort on the House floor to portray our interest in providing a tax credit to people, and let us be clear, we are talking about here people who work. They work very hard. They work at jobs that are not very pleasant, and that, by definition, are not well paid. Many of them have families.

It is true that because they work hard at jobs that this society has devalued in many cases they do not pay much or any income tax. They do, however, pay a significant percentage of their income in taxes. They pay the Social Security tax and the tax on Medicare. They pay the withholding tax.

For many of them because there are no exemptions from that, there are no deductions, they pay the full thing no matter how many children they have, no matter how many other expenses they have. For some of those people this is a larger percentage of their income paid in tax than is paid by many wealthier people. That reduction will be further.

What this House says is, no, they get no relief out of this bill comparable to what others get. It is unworthy of this House to say that to these hardworking people struggling to provide for their children when the Republicans have said, in the tax bill, this looks like \$350 billion, but we are going to convert it into hundreds of billions more.

A bill is going to be introduced that would cost a total of \$10 billion, or would expend \$10 billion; but it would be neutral revenue-wise to help these low-income people. We are told we cannot do that.

When there was a parliamentary situation that the President confronted, and he was told he could only get \$350 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years, he said that he did not think people should be for such a little bitty piece of tax relief. So \$350 billion is a little bitty. We are asking for a very small percentage of that little bitty for the poorest, hardest-working people in this country.

The Republican leadership, I can understand in the core Republican philosophy that they would say no to these people, but to refuse to allow the House of Representatives to vote on it seems to me unpardonable. We are just asking, okay, let it come to the floor. Let us have a debate. Are they so afraid that their resistance to helping these low-income people is so out of sync with the American people that they will not let it come forward?

I hope we will see that bill on the floor fairly soon.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to actually speak on the underlying bill and the rule in support of both of those, and, as well, if I could take the opportunity to speak against one of the amendments.

I am from New York's 20th Congressional District, the home of Saratoga, New York. We like to say it is the home of horse racing. It certainly is the home of the oldest flat track in the Nation, the proud home of Funny Cide, the winner of the Kentucky Derby and the Preakness.

While we are a little less jubilant today than we were, maybe, a couple of days ago, we are still very bullish on the whole idea and the whole horse racing industry.

I am also the cochairman of the Congressional Horse Caucus. I want to talk a little bit about how important this rule is and this underlying bill is to horse racing and the horse racing industry. U.S. horse racing is regulated

by Federal and State laws. It is in fact the most highly regulated form of entertainment sports initiative in this Nation.

The specific concerns expressed by many in this Congress about offshore international wagering, the integrity of operators, the identity of the participants, consumer fraud, and money laundering are not an issue as it relates to horse racing. Horse racing is a \$34 billion domestic industry, along with the agribusinesses that it supports. It is critically important not just to the economy of my district but through vast regions throughout the Nation.

The underlying bill respects existing Federal and State gambling law. It does not make any unlawful gambling lawful; it does not make any lawful gambling unlawful. It does not override any State prohibitions or requirements. It does not expand or contract wagering. It simply maintains the status quo with respect to the underlying substantive law on gaming.

There will be an amendment later today brought forward sponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONYERS) that would prohibit State license activities and represents a broad overuse and abuse of Federal power.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for bringing this rule forward. I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), for recognizing the importance of this underlying legislation and how important, critically important, it is to vast areas throughout the Nation.

I want to ask my colleagues to support both this rule and to support the underlying legislation and oppose the so-called Sensenbrenner-Cannon-Conyers amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this rule. This bill requires U.S. credit card companies and other financial entities to develop reasonable policies and procedures to identify and block financial transactions made in connection with unlawful Internet gambling.

Online gambling can have a severe impact on family life. It can be done anonymously easily from someone's home and requires little more than a computer and a credit card. We know the dangers of online gambling: lost savings, excessive debt, bankruptcies, foreclosed mortgages.

This is an important issue that we discuss today. Equally important as an issue is the restoration by the House of the child tax credit to 6.5 million families that have been in fact left behind, families of 12 million children which

are taxpaying families, Mr. Speaker, who deserve tax relief. They have bills to pay, mouths to feed, children to take care of. With the economy continuing its slide downward, they do not know where their jobs will be the week after next.

Let me be clear: as has been indicated, these families do pay taxes. They pay payroll taxes, sales taxes. They may not know week to week whether their next paycheck is forthcoming; but they know that if it does, that 8 percent will come off the top on the first dollar earned.

So we should not be kind of lulled or fooled into thinking that these families do not pay any taxes, because they pay a greater share of their income in taxes than a corporation like Enron did in 4 of the last 5 years. Just because these families do not have a powerful lobby, we must be their lobby in this institution. We must lobby for their hard-earned money and not take it from them.

Before we consider bills like the Internet gambling bill, this House should take up the other body's child tax credit legislation. The White House has said that the House should take up this bill, and if we do, that the President will sign our bill.

This is not a partisan issue; this is an issue of values, of character. Each individual, those of us who serve in this marvelous institution, come here to do the right thing. This reflects doing the right thing, and also it reflects what our national character is all about.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, though I support this underlying bill, I also support the motion for the House to take from the Speaker's table, agree to, and pass the Senate amendment on the child tax credit. It is time the House votes to extend the full \$1,000 tax credit to the families of 12 million children, just like 25 million other families in America. Quite simply, it is the right thing to do. We should meet that July 1 deadline when others will be getting their tax cut.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

Mr. Speaker, illegal Internet gambling, that is something that many Americans do not know much about. They have not heard much about it until they look at their credit card and there is \$4,000 or \$5,000 worth of charges on their credit card because their son off at a university, or even their 14-year-old son, has gotten their card, gone in his bedroom, got on the Internet, and began to gamble.

Harvard University Medical School, the University of Connecticut, newspapers all over this country have looked at this problem. They estimate that as many as 5 million of our youth, as well as compulsive, what they call "pathological gamblers," are gambling on the Internet today.

This is basically a new phenomenon. In 1997 it was first brought to our attention when groups came before the Congress and asked that we do something about it. At that time, there were about 24 sites offshore, and it is estimated at that time that anywhere from \$50 million to \$300 million being bet.

In 2001, an Internet gambling bill was killed by this Congress, despite the urging of groups as diverse as Major League baseball, the NCAA, the NFL, various faith-based groups, and the AARP, because AARP represents a lot of grandparents whose grandchildren are becoming addicted to gambling in these sites, and they urged us to act.

In 2001, and again in 2002, this Congress began to argue not about illegal Internet gambling, but they began to attach amendments to this bill that would make lawful gambling unlawful or unlawful gambling lawful. Everybody wanted to improve their position. Some Members wanted to eliminate certain types of lawful gambling. Others wanted to create lawful exceptions to what was illegal gambling in this country. These bills continued to go down.

Today, we are not faced with a situation where we have a half a dozen sites and maybe \$10 million of gambling on these sites; we are faced with a situation where we have \$6 billion a year bet on these sites, \$6 billion. That we know. We also know that there are somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 sites offshore.

What else do we know about these sites? We know that they are untaxed. Not one dime of tax is collected. We know they are unsupervised. In fact, we do not know the identity of these people, except in two cases when the FBI prosecuted them and found out. The reason they prosecuted them is because they were laundering money. We found out they were money-launderers.

We do know, because the FBI has reported it, that organized crime is heavily invested in these sites, and they believe that organized crime controls these sites. We know that.

We know some other things about these people. We know they are not good people. We know they link these sites with pornographic sites, and we know some of these sites specifically target preteens. When they go on those sites, they also get a pop-up that exposes them to pornographic sites. We know that because various organizations have come before us and over the last 3 years testified that our youth, our preteens, are being led into addictive gambling.

The University of Connecticut, Harvard University, The New York Times, all of them have exposed this problem; but this Congress continues to take the occasion when these bills come up to try to have a turf fight on gambling.

In fact, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) will offer an amendment which is another turf fight. Senators have said that if the Cannon amendment is attached that this bill will be

killed in the Senate. So we again have a choice to make: Do we want to continue to let this industry grow, a mob-run industry? Do we want to continue to not know who these people are? Do we want to continue, in the words of a professor at Harvard University, to allow what he calls the "crack cocaine of gambling" to take hold in America?

□ 1530

Do we want to continue to do that or do we want to vote down the Cannon amendment and vote up this legislation?

One final thing that I would like to remind this body. There is a trial that went on last week in Florida. Adrian McPherson, Adrian McPherson was Mr. Football in the State of Florida. He was also Mr. Basketball in the State of Florida. Imagine such a talent, both the best high school football player, the best high school basketball player, and he went to Florida State University. And what do we know from the testimony last week? We know that he, and this is according to testimony, he has not been convicted, but we know this: We know he has been suspended from the team; not suspended, but he has actually been thrown off the Florida State team. We know he has been accused of going in a business and stealing checks from that business. We know that he is accused of going to a grocery store and bouncing a number of checks. We know that he is facing time in jail. We know that if he is convicted in the trial that he will be going through in the next month or two, that he will be banned from organized college athletics for life.

And all because what? The accusations, the testimony is he became addicted to Internet gambling, and he had massive debts and that is why he went out and stole these checks. But that young man and his family have been devastated. Florida State University has spent over a million dollars investigating this case.

What if 3 years ago this Congress had quit fooling with these turf battle Cannon-type amendments and adopted this legislation? I wonder if this young man would be taking the field for Florida State? I wonder if we had listened to the NCAA when they testified before our committee 3 years ago when they said, please take action, do something; when the NCAA warned us 2 years ago in testimony that we are going to have a scandal one day because illegal Internet gambling is making it very difficult for us to protect the integrity, the integrity of this sport.

There was one Gallup poll which said that 25 percent of college athletes today are betting on the Internet on sports, and most of those are betting on their own teams, and almost all of them were betting on college sports. What are we going to do? Are we going to continue to stand by while families are broken apart?

This morning I was on C-SPAN and when I got off, a man from Georgia

called and said, I support this legislation. He was asked why. He said, I am a compulsive gambler. And he said, If I have to go 50 miles or 100 miles to gamble, I feel like I can keep that under control. But, he said, If it is in my home, if it is in my bedroom, if it is on my computer, I have a difficult time handling that. That man was saying to us: Take action.

In a few minutes we will get an opportunity to do two things. We will get an opportunity to do what the National Governors Association, in a letter dated yesterday, has urged us to do. We will do what the attorney generals, when they urged us, the Attorney Generals Association usually says, hands off, let the States handle it. But the Attorney Generals Association has said do something about this, we cannot.

When the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Southern Baptists, we received a letter, Focus on the Family have written us, different faith-based groups; when even major league baseball says there is a growing problem, it is time to take action. If we do not, there will be other Adrian McPhersons. There will be other lives ruined. There will be families broken up. There will be children addicted to gambling. Because if there is one thing these illegal Internet gamblers know is, they know that our children are fascinated with and very literate on the computers. They use the computers.

We have seen the statistics. The average teenager is on the computer 20, 30 hours a week. We hear incredible numbers, and what do they enjoy doing as much as anything? Sports. You combine the computer with sports and you get what the Harvard Medical School said is an explosive, the crack cocaine, as I said earlier, of gambling. Let us take action before any more lives are ruined. We have had suicides. We have had at least five suicides.

Let us take action. Let us vote down these killer amendments and let us vote up this legislation, and let us finally take action.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), a new Member, new in the sense that this is his first term; however, he has distinguished himself in many ways among freshmen and all of us.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and I have a motion to the House to take from the Speaker's table and pass the Senate amendment to the Child Tax Credit.

This body continues to refuse to address the problem that we have created. Extending the child tax credit to low-income working families is the right thing to do, and we should do it today. The Senate has already passed and the President is calling for it now.

Now, I have heard people say that those who did not vote for the tax cut should not be complaining about the way it turned out. Well, I supported

the tax cut. I was 1 of only 4 Democrats to vote for it from day one, and I stand by that vote today. But by neglecting to provide the child tax credit to the low-income families, we have made a drastic mistake. We need to correct that now. These are hardworking people who pay taxes, too, and they deserve relief like everyone else.

Because of our actions, in Louisiana 1 out of every 4 families is being told that their children are not as valuable as other kids. That is wrong. We have the power to easily correct that mistake. Instead, we are playing games.

Now, last night I joined with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) to introduce an exact replica of the Senate bill that has already passed. If they wanted, the House leadership could bring up our bill today and we could send it to the President.

The time for playing games is over. We made a mistake and we need to correct that today so that all working families can receive the needed relief when the checks go out next month.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker inform us of how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my very good friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak against the rule, and it is not because I am against the underlying bill. It is because, Mr. Speaker, hardworking families need a break more than anyone else in this country and hardworking families are the ones that are bearing the brunt of this weak economy. But for some reason the Republicans leadership feels that the privileged few are more important than the 12 million children who are left out of the Republican tax cut and that Internet gambling is more important to discuss today than our children. And that is just plain wrong.

Voices across the country are speaking out in great numbers. It is overwhelming what we are hearing in our offices. And it must be overwhelming what the administration is hearing about supporting increasing the child tax credit and making it permanent, especially for those 12 million children who were left out of the recent tax package, because President Bush is finally urging the House to follow suit with the other body, saying that he wants to sign legislation that will restore tax credits for lower-income families and put the majority party's bad decision behind him.

Why is the Republican leadership in the House dragging its feet when we can help American families now?

Let us hold off on debating issues, even though we agree with them, like the underlying bill we are talking about, Internet gambling. Let us hold off on those issues until all working families are provided the benefits of the child tax credit. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, while it is imperative that we swiftly extend the child tax credit to lower-income families, it absolutely should not be part of a broad package that extends even more benefits to the wealthy.

We must pass a clean bill that solves the injustice that has been done to these hardworking families. Our priority must be the 12 million forgotten children, not more tax breaks for the rich, not debate about Internet gambling, not anything except giving the tax breaks to those hardworking families.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my good friend.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, not only because I believe the House should finally address the child tax credit, but also because the Committee on Rules refused to include an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) to allow American Indian tribes to operate Internet gambling sites on their reservations, the very action the overall bill gives to the States. Without the inclusion of this amendment, Indian tribes are unfairly singled out and cannot reap the same benefits States will receive if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, I join my Democratic colleagues in calling on the Republican leadership to follow the Senate's lead and immediately approve legislation that will provide a child tax credit to 12 million children, children Republicans left out of their bill last month. Included among these 12 million children are the children of U.S. military families.

A report out last week showed nearly 1 in 5 children of active duty U.S. military families will not benefit from the increased tax credit because their parents earn too little to qualify.

Mr. Speaker, it appears the only Republicans who do not fully comprehend the huge mistake they made in their tax bill are my Republican colleagues here in the House. Last week the Senate passed a bill. Yesterday the President's press secretary said his advice to the House Republicans is to pass it, to send it to him so he can sign it. And yet House Republicans continue to fight against common fairness.

Just today in an AP story that I will quote, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, it "ain't going to happen."

"DeLay said the House will not pass the Senate's bill. Instead, it will use the child tax credit as a bargaining chip to encourage the Senate to pass bigger tax cuts favored by the House."

And I have a quote of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), "What we are interested in is real solid tax relief for those who are paying taxes," he said.

So the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), on behalf of the House leadership, continues to stop the child tax credit from becoming law for these 12 million working families.

Now, let me point out that these workers do pay Federal taxes; 7.65 percent of their earnings go to pay for Social Security and Medicare. These hardworking parents also pay State and local taxes as well. An analysis released earlier this year by the New York Times found that families pay 14 percent of their income.

These people pay taxes and they deserve the child tax credit, too. Pass the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), my good friend.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I support the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

Online gambling has a huge impact on individuals and families. But I am not supporting the rule because we have not been able to bring up the child tax credit. I went to the Rose Garden today for the celebration of Leave No Child Behind. And they were celebrating all of the States having plans and about what they were going to do about education and how they were going to move forward. And I supported that plan.

But today we are leaving children behind, 12 million children. These are children whose parents earn \$6, \$7, \$8, \$9, \$10, \$11, \$12 an hour. These are people that get up every morning, every noon, every afternoon, whatever their shift is. They go out and work hard, and yet they were denied the child tax credit.

□ 1545

It is time that we change that. The time is now. When I saw the quote from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) that said there are a lot of other things that are more important than that, referring to the child tax credit, I wanted to say to the gentleman, say it isn't so, say it isn't so. We need to pass this and get on with our business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this unlawful Internet funding prohibition act and in support of the Sensenbrenner-Conyers amendment.

I oppose this bill as a strong defender of tribal government, a strong advocate for tribal sovereignty, a strong believer in fairness and equity. I state, a strong believer in fairness and equity.

This bill does not treat solvent tribe governments with the same level of respect it does States. Section four of this bill provides for a carve-out for States that allows States to license Internet gaming operations for lottery, horse track, and corporate gambling operations.

Although the bill grants States with this exception, it does not provide tribal governments with the same exception. Have we not learned that it is wrong to treat our Native American brothers and sisters as second class citizens? One would think that we would know better.

Let me be clear, I will not be standing here today in opposition to this bill if tribal governments were treated equal, if tribal governments were treated equal.

I do not disagree with the principle behind this legislation, but I disagree with the effects on Native Americans and their economy. H.R. 2143 gives an unfair advantage to private gaming enterprises, and it treats tribal governments and their industry as inferior.

Just when we think that the centuries of mistreatment and discrimination are ending, something like this comes up or shows up. Once again, Congress is trying to put tribal government at a disadvantage. Once again, Congress is trying to put tribal government at a disadvantage; and once again, I will stand up and defend the sovereignty of our tribal governments. I will stand up and make sure that our government lives up to its responsibility, lives up to their responsibility.

Gaming provides the financial resources the tribes need to survive and bring economic development to their people. It provides resources. The tribal governments need to provide health, education and hope for their people. It is the livelihood of our Native American brothers and sisters.

I will not stand by and watch Congress put tribes behind the eight ball once again.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2143 and "yes" on the Sensenbrenner amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), my classmate and good friend, former Secretary of State of the State of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can take the Senate tax bill off the Speaker's table for immediate consideration.

On May 22, this House passed a bill that gives a tax break of \$93,500 to the average millionaire in our country. As Republicans rushed towards the Memorial Day recess, Vice President CHENEY cut a deal that left working, tax paying families out of the child tax credit expansion. That is right, \$93,500 for millionaires, not one cent to working lower-income families.

As the tax bill advanced in the House, I joined my colleagues and sent out three Dear Colleagues alerting Members of all parties to the fact that it left low-income, working, tax-paying families out in the cold by denying them marriage penalty relief under the earned income tax credit.

Republicans knew they were making low-income Americans wait years for the same benefit that they would offer more affluent families right now. Republicans of the House knew that their leadership and knew that the Bush White House had stuck it to low-income families again by denying them relief under the child tax credit, \$93,500 to millionaires and not one cent to lower-income working families. Republicans knew that the bill they supported offered that \$93,000 to millionaires and was a slap in the face to millions of tax-paying, working American families.

Democrats believe simple fairness demands that we act immediately to remedy the injustice; but the majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), says we will not do it, not while he is the Republican leader. He says there are a lot of other things that are more important than that. The majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), says we do not need to rush through this. Remember, \$93,500 for millionaires, not a cent for lower-income working families.

We had to rush to give millionaires this \$90,000 tax break; but when it comes to tax breaks for working tax-paying families, Republicans need time to think it over. While Republicans have left working families out in the cold by refusing to advance tax fairness legislation, they have moved on other bills.

For example, since that May 22 date, since Republicans were rushing out of town for the Memorial Day recess, Congress has renamed Federal buildings and post offices, congratulated baseball star Sammy Sosa, commemorated the 20th anniversary of National Tourism Week, and made it easier to clear bank checks. There is nothing wrong for any of those bills. I voted for all of them. But was any of them more important than helping 12 million children who were intentionally left behind by the Bush-Cheney-DeLay-GOP tax bill? Was any one of them more important, any of those pieces of legislation more important than helping 3.7 million working, low-income, tax-paying families whose marriages this House said were not worth as much as the marriage of their bosses? Not by a long shot, not in the wake of a tax bill that gives \$93,000 to millionaires, not one cent to tax-paying working families.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can take the Senate tax bill off the Speaker's table.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule; and my amendment will provide that as soon as the House passes this rule, it will take from the Speaker's table and immediately consider the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1308, which restores the refundable child tax credit that was removed from the recently passed Republican tax bill.

Let me make very clear to my colleagues in the House that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. A "no" vote will allow the House to vote on H.R. 2143 and on the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1308 as well. However, a "yes" vote on the previous question will prevent the House from voting on this badly needed tax package to provide real relief to America's working families.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can send this bill to the President today.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

I would just like to point out in the light of the conversations we have heard today that by definition a tax credit is a credit against income taxes paid. People who are left out supposedly were people who do not pay income taxes and do not get a credit because there is no place against which to lay that credit. I am sorry that we are turning the income tax system into a welfare program, but it appears that we are about to do that.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. Defeating the previous question allows us to discuss H.R. 2286 introduced by Congressman RANGEL to grant the Child Tax Credit to the thousands of needy families wrongfully ignored by the Republican majority.

When the conference report on the Republican tax cut was finished, the dividend tax cut got bigger and tax credits for working families got smaller. It is unconscionable that we are willing to sacrifice Child Tax Credits for the poorest in our society, so that we can give more money to the wealthiest.

Six and a half million families in this Nation earn \$10,500 to \$26,625 per year. If we do not pass a child tax credit for these families, 19 million children will be ignored. In my home State of California, nearly 1.3 million families alone, will not receive a child tax credit under the Republican's plan. These families need tax relief.

By not passing a child tax credit, 250,000 kids of active duty military families, many of whom are right now fighting overseas, will be ignored. Military families need tax relief.

Our economy is in desperate need of stimulation. Unemployment across the Nation has risen to 6.1 percent. The Hispanic unemployment rate alone is currently at 8.2 percent. America's families are suffering. They need immediate relief from the burden of a weak economy.

During this time of economic downturn we must not leave out those who are working harder for less pay or those who have recently joined the ranks of the unemployed. It is time to put working families back into the equation. America's families need our help. They need a child tax credit.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 263—RULE ON H.R. 2143: THE UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION ACT

At the end of the resolution add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1308) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end certain abusive tax practices, to provide tax relief and simplification, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and a single motion that the House concur in each of the Senate amendments shall be considered as pending without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bereuter
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Biggart
Bachus	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Baker	Bass	Bishop (UT)
Ballenger	Beauprez	Blackburn

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

NAYS—196

Abercrombie Carson (IN)
Ackerman Carson (OK)
Alexander Case
Allen Clay
Andrews Clyburn
Baca Conyers
Baird Cooper
Baldwin Costello
Ballance Cramer
Becerra Crowley
Bell Cummings
Berkley Davis (AL)
Berman Davis (CA)
Berry Davis (FL)
Bishop (GA) Davis (IL)
Bishop (NY) Davis (TN)
Blumenauer DeFazio
Boswell Delahunt
Boucher DeLauro
Boyd Deutsch
Brady (PA) Dicks
Brown (OH) Dingell
Brown, Corrine Doggett
Capps Dooley (CA)
Capuano Doyle
Cardin Edwards
Cardoza Emanuel

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
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inlee
Israel

Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan

Cole
DeGette
Eshoo
Fletcher
Gephardt
Gordon

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

□ 1615

Messrs. MARSHALL, WEINER, SCOTT of Georgia and RODRIQUEZ 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. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 259, noes 158, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—259

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berry
Biggart

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd

Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
 T.

Henger
Houghton
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Rush
Smith (WA)

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)
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon

Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Collins
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Henger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)

Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
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)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)

NOES—158

Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Emanuel
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr

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
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchee
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inlee
Jackson (IL)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)

Kanjorski	Millender-	Sanders
Kaptur	McDonald	Schakowsky
Kennedy (RI)	Miller (NC)	Schiff
Kildee	Miller, George	Scott (GA)
Kilpatrick	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kind	Moore	Serrano
Klecza	Murtha	Sherman
Kucinich	Nadler	Slaughter
Lampson	Napolitano	Snyder
Langevin	Neal (MA)	Solis
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Spratt
Lee	Obey	Stark
Levin	Olver	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Stupak
Lipinski	Pallone	Tauscher
Lofgren	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Lowey	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Majette	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Maloney	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Markey	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)
Matsui	Rahall	Van Hollen
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Velazquez
McCollum	Reyes	Visclosky
McDermott	Rodriguez	Watson
McGovern	Rothman	Watt
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	T.
Menendez	T.	Woolsey
	Sanchez, Loretta	Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Carson (OK)	Gordon	Smith (WA)
Cole	Houghton	Tierney
DeLay	Jenkins	Toomey
Eshoo	Jantos	Waters
Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1623

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida changed her vote from "aye" to "no." So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 2003 for rollcall votes 252 and 253, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present, on rollcall vote No. 252, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall vote No. 253, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2143.

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

There was no objection.

UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 263 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2143.

□ 1625

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill today. There are going to be several amendments offered. One amendment will be offered as if it is an antigambling amendment. In essence, the amendment will actually bring this bill down. Fifteen years ago, there was gambling in two States, Nevada and New Jersey. Once we in this country moved to what we call convenience gambling, we have seen an increase in crime, corruption, domestic violence, physical abuse, and many other bad things that we Republicans and Democrats do not want to see. The ultimate in what is called "convenience gambling," meaning that you do not have to go very far to gamble, is Internet gambling where you can sit in your own family room in your bathrobe on a rainy weekend and literally go broke in about 24 hours.

There will be an amendment offered that will be sort of viewed as maybe some of the pro-family groups are for it. Let me say I have a letter to the gentleman from Alabama signed by the Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, the Family Research Council, the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, and the National Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches headed by former Democratic Congressman Bob Edgar who served here for many years.

I would ask you, do not support the amendments that will weaken this bill. Internet gambling is beginning to be very corrosive in our society. We have a chance to deal with Internet gambling in the Bachus bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and other Members of the House have put forth. I rise in strong support of the bill. I think this is an opportunity to get control of Internet gambling and to do it in a way that is constructive and positive.

I ask my colleagues, one, support the bill on final passage; but, lastly, do not support any amendments that may ap-

pear on the surface to be good but what will in essence bring down this bill and thereby mean that Internet gambling will never be controlled. Five to 7 percent of the young people in our country are addicted to gambling.

□ 1630

As Internet gambling becomes easier and easier, that addiction rate goes up.

So I hope Members will oppose the amendments that will really bring the bill down, and on final passage do something to help this country, to help the young people, to get control of it, to get control and regulate Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, legislation needed to prevent the use of credit cards, checks, or electronic funds transfers for unlawful Internet gambling. It will be of vital assistance in curbing illegal Internet gambling.

This legislation states in the findings section that: "the National Gambling Impact Study Commission in 1999 recommended the passage of legislation to prohibit wire transfers to Internet gambling sites or the banks which represent them."

As the author of the legislation which established the commission, I am pleased to see that one of its most important recommendations may indeed become law. The spread of Internet gambling means that people can now gamble at the workplace and their homes, around the clock. The unchecked progress of Internet gambling must be curbed.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission report went on to state that gambling can breed bankruptcy, divorce, domestic violence, and physical and emotional problems. Even suicide has been linked to gambling. Often times, even school-aged children—who have never gambled before—are lured into on-line gambling.

H.R. 2143 will establish an enforcement structure that will let federal regulators set up regulations which will limit the acceptance of bank instruments such as credit cards for use in illegal Internet gambling, reducing the chance for gambling to gain a further foothold in our society.

Before I close, let me share with you a story. Donna Kelly, a mother of a 12-year-old daughter and a 7-year-old son developed a gambling problem. At one time there were 13 warrants for her arrest for writing bad checks. Gambling had so wrecked her life that she saw only one option: suicide. Two days before Thanksgiving, she tried to kill herself. She failed, and was placed in a mental hospital. Mrs. Kelly spent Thanksgiving in a mental hospital because of her gambling problem.

Her daughter asked her afterwards, "Momma, why did you try to kill yourself? Do you not love me anymore?" This is the human dimension to gambling. This story illustrates why it is so important to vote for this bill. When you cast your vote today, remember the many lives ruined by gambling, and remember the family members left devastated by their loved ones gambling activities.

Internet gambling is a vast and growing enterprise which can serve as an avenue for money launders and terrorist funding. Gambling also involves great social costs. This bill will reduce access to the medium of the Internet as another forum for inducing people to