

Slaughter	Taylor (MS)	Visclosky
Smith (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Snyder	Thompson (MS)	Watson
Solis	Tierney	Watt
Spratt	Towns	Weiner
Stark	Turner (TX)	Wexler
Stenholm	Udall (CO)	Woolsey
Strickland	Udall (NM)	Wu
Stupak	Upton	Wynn
Tanner	Van Hollen	
Tauscher	Velazquez	

NAYS—201

Aderholt	Gingrey	Otter
Akin	Goode	Oxley
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pearce
Baker	Goss	Pence
Ballenger	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Green (WI)	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Greenwood	Platts
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pombo
Biggett	Harris	Porter
Bilirakis	Hart	Portman
Bishop (UT)	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Blunt	Hayes	Quinn
Boehner	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hefley	Ramstad
Bonner	Hensarling	Regula
Bono	Herger	Rehberg
Boozman	Hobson	Renzi
Bradley (NH)	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Houghton	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Burns	Isakson	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Issa	Ryun (KS)
Calvert	Istook	Saxton
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Schrock
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Kaptur	Shadegg
Chabot	Keller	Shaw
Chocola	Kelly	Shays
Coble	Kennedy (MN)	Sherwood
Cole	King (IA)	Shimkus
Collins	King (NY)	Shuster
Cox	Kingston	Simmons
Crane	Kirk	Simpson
Crenshaw	Kline	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Kolbe	Souder
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Latham	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Sweeney
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
DeMint	Lewis (KY)	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas (OK)	Thornberry
Doolittle	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Dreier	McCotter	Tiberi
Duncan	McCreery	Toomey
Dunn	McKeon	Turner (OH)
Ehlers	Mica	Vitter
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
English	Miller (MI)	Walsh
Everett	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Feeney	Murphy	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	Musgrave	Weldon (PA)
Flake	Myrick	Weller
Fletcher	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Foley	Neugebauer	Wicker
Forbes	Ney	Wilson (NM)
Franks (AZ)	Northup	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Nussle	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Osborne	
Gilchrest	Ose	

NOT VOTING—29

Abercrombie	Fossella	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Galleghy	Paul
Berman	Gephardt	Pickering
Blumenauer	Janklow	Royce
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Sessions
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Linder	Tancredo
Davis (FL)	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Eshoo	McInnis	Waxman
Ford	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1840

Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. HERGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 275, I was unavoidably detained in traffic due to the thunderstorm in Northern Virginia. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 275, the motion to instruct, I would like the RECORD to show that I intended to vote “yea” and inadvertently voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, DELAY, and RANGEL.

There was no objection.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution commending Medgar Wiley Evers and his widow, Myrlie Evers-Williams for their lives and accomplishments, designating a Medgar Evers National Week of Remembrance, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Inter-parliamentary Group during the First Session of the One Hundred Eighth Congress—

the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. AL-EXANDER); and

the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

ORBIT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2003

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2312) to amend the Communications Satellite of 1962 to provide for the orderly dilution of the

ownership interest in Inmarsat by former signatories to the Inmarsat Operating Agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2312

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “ORBIT Technical Corrections Act of 2003”.

SEC. 2. INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING DEADLINES.

Clause (ii) of section 621(5)(A) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 763(5)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “December 31, 2002” and inserting “June 30, 2004”; and

(2) by striking “June 30, 2003” and inserting “December 31, 2004”.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2312, a bill to extend the deadline for Inmarsat to conduct the initial public offering required of it by the ORBIT Act.

The ORBIT Act was adopted in March of 2000 to promote a competitive market for satellite communications through privatization of inter-governmental organizations, one of which is Inmarsat. To further the twin goals of the privatization and independence of satellite carriers, the ORBIT Act called on Inmarsat to conduct an initial public offering (IPO) by December 31, 2001. As that December 2001 deadline approached, however, it became clear, given market conditions at the time, that it would be punitive to effectively force Inmarsat to conduct its IPO by the specified date. As a result, Congress passed legislation to provide an additional year to conduct the IPO, and also provided the FCC the ability to grant a six-month extension if warranted by market conditions.

Unfortunately, the market conditions have not improved to a point where it would be reasonable to require the IPO, and the current deadline—June 30, 2003—is now less than a month away. H.R. 2312, the ORBIT Technical Corrections Act, would not require Inmarsat to conduct its IPO until June 30, 2004, and it permits the FCC to grant an additional six months delay should market conditions continue to warrant such regulatory action. This legislation is clearly necessary at this time, lest the government would unfairly require one company and its investors to risk capital by offering shares to the public at a time when such shares are likely to be undervalued—perhaps grossly undervalued.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce continues to take an interest in the state of competition in the industry and the financial health of those who invest capital to build networks and offer satellite communications services. But as we proceed to grant one carrier additional time with which to conduct its IPO, I would observe that another provider—New Skies Satellites—long ago fulfilled the ORBIT Act’s IPO and substantial dilution requirements. Since that time, it has diluted its original shareholder base yet again with a 10 percent share buyback. And New Skies is competing for satellite business independently, with strong independent management, precisely as congress envisioned in ORBIT. As

the Committee considers holding hearings to examine the state of competition in the satellite industry, I believe that Congress, having introduced a new market competitor to the satellite industry, ought to examine whether the many restrictions the ORBIT Act placed on "separated entities"—in effect New Skies—are still necessary to preserve that company's independence and promote competition.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee on these issues. Today, I am satisfied simply to enact H.R. 2312. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2312.

This bill is very straightforward. H.R. 2312 amends the ORBIT Act and gives the satellite company, Inmarsat, a little more time to complete their Initial Public Offering (IPO). Specifically, this legislation gives Inmarsat a 12-month extension from their pending June 30, 2003, deadline. It also gives the FCC the discretion to grant Inmarsat an additional 6-month extension on top of that if the company can demonstrate a legitimate need.

This legislation is necessary because the ORBIT Act—which was enacted in March 2000—did not anticipate the collapse of the IPO markets, especially in the telecommunications sector. In today's economic climate, Inmarsat cannot complete an IPO.

Without swift action by Congress on this bill, American farmers will face disrupted service of their precision farming technologies that rely on Inmarsat-distributed signals at the end of this month. Currently, many farmers, including many in my home state of Illinois, are utilizing GPS-based guidance systems to improve their productivity and efficiency. These systems enable farmers to more accurately apply seed, fertilizer and other inputs, reduce fuel use, and increase yields while reducing costs.

I want to emphasize that H.R. 2312 does not reopen the battles over the ORBIT law or challenge its underlying public policy. Rather, it simply makes this law workable as we suffer through this continuing down market.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important and time-sensitive legislation.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2312, which will extend the deadline for Inmarsat to conduct the initial public offering required of it by the ORBIT satellite privatization law. H.R. 2312, introduced by Representatives SHIMKUS and MARKEY, is unopposed.

The ORBIT Act was enacted in March of 2000 to promote a competitive market for satellite communications through privatization of inter-governmental organizations, one of which is Inmarsat. The Federal Communications Commission has since found that Inmarsat has indeed satisfied the privatization criteria of the ORBIT Act.

In addition, ORBIT called on Inmarsat to conduct an initial public offering (IPO) by a date certain—December 31, 2001. However, as that December 2001 deadline approached, it became quite apparent that the volatility in the financial markets in general, and the telecommunications sector specifically, necessitated a grant of additional time within which Inmarsat could conduct its statutorily mandated IPO. As a result, Congress took the prudent step of including language in the Commerce-Justice-State FY 2002 Appropriations bill to provide an additional year to conduct the IPO, and also provide the FCC the ability

to grant a six-month extension if warranted by market conditions. This action was non-controversial.

Unfortunately, the market conditions have not improved to a point where it would be reasonable to require the IPO and the current deadline (June 30, 2003) is now less than a month away. H.R. 2312, the ORBIT Technical Corrections Act, allows Inmarsat until June 30, 2004, to conduct its IPO.

The purpose of this IPO requirement was to substantially dilute the ownership of the privatized Inmarsat by its former owners, many of which are foreign governmental entities, so as to further ensure its independence. I fully supported this goal when we enacted ORBIT, and still do today. Indeed, the action we take today, in my view, is consistent with this policy objective.

If forced to move ahead with an IPO at this time, Inmarsat will probably receive a reduced price for its shares offered. Foreign entities that still own significant portions of Inmarsat would likely be discouraged from offering their ownership interests for sale. Instead of resulting in substantial dilution of prior owners as envisioned by the ORBIT Act, a current year IPO might not achieve much dilution whatsoever. In that instance, Inmarsat would have complied with the procedural requirement of ORBIT without the substantive result that we in Congress sought: dilution of previous government owners. Given the state of the markets, the only way to ensure the dilution sought by ORBIT is to allow Inmarsat to further delay its IPO. That result is good public policy that is also good for the long-term health of the satellite communications industry.

The health of the satellite communications industry and ORBIT's implementation are important to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. We are currently exploring the possibility of holding hearings on the state of the industry in the future. At the appropriate time, we need to examine ORBIT's implementation, and the efficiency of the existing regulatory regime. For instance, New Skies Satellites has fulfilled the requirements of ORBIT and now is a fully independent competitor in the international satellite marketplace. Some have questioned whether it makes sense to hold New Skies to a continuing list of regulatory restrictions and requirements. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee to ensure that current law reflects the current realities of the satellite industry. However, today we need to enact H.R. 2312. I thank my colleagues for their support and I urge the prompt passage of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2312, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LEADERSHIP NEEDS TO MAKE SURE THE ELEVATORS ARE WORKING SO MEMBERS CAN VOTE

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I and other Members are as anxious as everyone else in here and leadership on both sides to vote in an expeditious manner; but if that is going to take place, then the leadership has to see to it that we are able to get into these elevators and get downstairs and get over here.

If it says "Members Only" during the time that the bells are ringing, then you have got to either put some signage up or get some people into the elevators that see to it that happens. I cannot see trying to kick people off the elevators who are citizens, trying to come see us, who operate in good faith, and we cannot get here to vote.

Now if you are so anxious to get this thing done in 15 minutes or 17 or whatever it is, that is fine. I will do my best, as I am sure everybody else will; but, Mr. Speaker, you have got to see to it then that we are able to get to do this in the manner in which we are supposedly designated to do it.

If you have elevators that are supposed to be for us during this time, then you are going to have to do things to see we can use them. I am not the only one who was disabled from voting because I simply could not get down here. I could not get here fast enough because these elevators are stuck, and there are all kinds of people on them asking directions and you cannot get down here. If they are on the seventh floor in Longworth or end of the Cannon building, it is just not easy to do that in the 15 minutes, particularly when you are trying to kick people out of your office or get finished with what you have to get done in order to get over here to vote.

I am just asking on behalf of not just myself but any Member that finds himself or herself in these circumstances. Had I been over here, I am sure I would have voted aye, depending on what the wisdom of my colleagues would have directed me to do in the interest of the national purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is respectfully noted.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority whip the schedule for tomorrow, and I will be pleased to yield to my friend, the distinguished majority whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.