

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. KELLY. 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 H.R. 3170.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker very much for allowing me to bring this important legislation to the floor for consideration today. I also thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for working with me on this important issue that will help small businesses.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy and Congress must ensure that they have every opportunity to succeed. It is crucial that small businesses have efficient access to capital in order to create jobs and ensure a strong and growing economy.

Today, the legislation before us, the Increased Capital Access For Growing Business Act, will ensure that small businesses have better access to capital by modernizing outdated security laws.

In 1980, Congress created Business Development Companies to encourage investments in small, developing and financially troubled businesses, known as "eligible portfolio companies."

BDCs are publicly traded investment companies that invest in both public and private companies and generate an injection of capital for businesses. BDCs have provided significant benefits to the economy, including the opportunity for the public to invest in small, developing companies while also supplying much needed financing.

The legislation we are considering today makes important changes to the securities laws that ensure the viability of BDCs and expands the businesses these entities are able to assist.

In 1980, BDCs were able to invest in approximately 66 percent of the 12,000 publicly held operating companies. Since that time, however, the Federal Reserve has amended its margin rules on several occasions, resulting in a clear decrease in the number of eligible portfolio companies.

In order to correct these unintended consequences, the legislation amends the definition of an eligible portfolio company to enable the BDCs to have a greater flexibility in selecting appropriate investments.

To accomplish this goal, the legislation permits BDCs to provide capital to a larger number of companies by increasing the size of companies that BDCs can invest in to reflect changes in the market since the creation of the act. The legislation also includes specific authority for the Securities and Exchange Commission to modify dollar thresholds in the future.

This would enable the SEC to review these thresholds on a regular basis and consider changes that are in the interest of the companies trying to access capital and shareholders of BDCs.

Small and developing businesses should be able to devote their energies towards their customers growing their business, not worrying about access to capital.

As BDCs are able to provide financing to additional small and medium sized businesses, the economy will experience greater growth and job creation.

I also would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), for recognizing the importance and urgency of this legislation and agreeing to move it quickly.

This is a no-cost, common sense piece of legislation that will help small businesses and increase capital formation; and that is good, healthy economic structure for all. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation for investors and small businesses.

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

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

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3170, the Increased Capital Access For Growing Businesses Act; and I want to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for moving this matter so expeditiously. I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member, for their support in expediting the consideration of this measure.

With this legislation we have an opportunity to help more small companies access capital so that they can expand and grow their businesses. Business Development Companies are unique investment companies authorized by the 1980 Amendments to the Investment Company Act. They are publicly traded companies that invest primarily in small companies.

Since 1980, BDCs have proven to be a valuable source of funding for growing companies that do not have access to traditional sources of financing like bank lending or access to the public securities markets. At the same time, BDCs provide the investing public with an opportunity to invest in private equity, an opportunity traditionally limited to wealthy investors.

In 1980, when BDCs were first authorized by Congress, about two-thirds of all publicly held companies were eligible for BDC investment. While the securities and financial services industries evolved during the 1990s, Congress

did not act to keep the BDC statute current. As a result, the number of public companies in which BDCs could invest in has been reduced drastically, effectively eliminating the option of BDC investment for many companies.

It is important to understand that just because a firm has gone public does not mean that it can access the financing necessary for growing and expanding. In the late 1990s, for instance, many companies went public that may not have been able to do so under current market conditions. As a result, after the market bubble burst, many of these companies found themselves unable to access traditional financing sources. These smaller, illiquid company stocks could have greatly benefited from financing offered by BDCs. Instead, the current statute severely restricts such investments by BDCs.

The current standard for eligibility, whether or not a company has outstanding marginable securities, has proven unworkable, as it is tied to a standard that is no longer relevant.

H.R. 3170 attempts to provide more certainty and update the law concerning permissible investments by BDCs. It creates a more workable standard to enable BDCs to provide financing to companies as originally intended by the 1980 amendments. This legislation attempts to provide a more objective standard, based on a market capitalization test, to modernize the definition of eligible portfolio companies.

H.R. 3170 modernizes U.S. securities laws to reflect changes in the marketplace. Small and growing companies are often widely regarded as engines of economic growth and job creation. Allowing BDCs to invest in more companies in need of capital will provide more opportunities, more jobs, and contribute to the economic expansion.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation critical for small businesses and the U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3170.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4181, PERMANENTLY EXTENDING INCREASED STANDARD DEDUCTION, AND THE 15-PERCENT INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE BRACKET EXPANSION, FOR MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING JOINT RETURNS

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 607 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 607

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4181) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the increased standard deduction, and the 15-percent individual income tax rate bracket expansion, for married taxpayers filing joint returns. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1130

Mrs. MYRICK. 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.

On Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a modified closed rule for the Marriage Penalty Relief Act.

H.R. 4181 amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the increased standard deduction and the 15 percent individual income tax rate bracket expansion for married taxpayers filing joint returns. It will also make permanent the increase in the phase-out of the earned income credit for joint filers.

Before 2001, the Tax Code penalized many married couples by forcing them to pay higher taxes just because they were married. The 2001 tax relief bill, enacted by President Bush, brought fairness to the Tax Code by phasing out these penalties. This law increased the standard deduction in the 15 percent tax bracket for married couples to twice as much for individuals. The relief was accelerated in the tax relief that was signed into law last year.

Thirty-five million couples currently benefit from the elimination of the marriage penalty. However, this relief will be reduced next year and will expire in 2010, and we cannot let that happen. Unless the relief is extended, 27 million married couples will face an average tax increase of \$300 in 2005, and over 35 million will see a tax increase of more than \$700 starting in 2011.

H.R. 4181 ensures that the marriage penalty relief is not reduced next year and that it stays in the law permanently.

We all know our economy is starting to rebound. Businesses are beginning to hire workers again, and Americans are starting to spend their money with more confidence. If we do not eliminate the marriage tax penalty and prevent other tax increases, our economy might slow down and prevent job creation.

Married working couples will be able to use this tax relief to benefit their families, which always helps the economy. They will be able to spend this money to improve their home or buy something they want, like a new washing machine or a new TV; and the more money they spend, the more jobs they will help create for their neighbors and friends.

This is what the bill is all about. The most important thing we can do today is revitalize our economy here at home, and we do this by eliminating the marriage penalty tax.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, marriage penalty tax relief is a good thing, not paying for it is a bad thing. All of us in this Chamber support tax fairness for married couples. But the question is, who supports tax fairness for future generations?

The deficit in this country continues to skyrocket, and what is disturbing to me is that there do not seem to be very many people on the other side of the aisle that care very much about that fact. We have to give President Clinton and his administration credit because, during the Clinton administration, this country experienced the first budget surpluses since the 1960s. Democrats and Republicans, working in a bipartisan way, delivered balanced budgets and extended the solvency of Social Security and Medicare well into the 21st century, but then the Bush administration moved into the White House, and fiscal responsibility went out of fashion.

Over the course of three major tax cuts, essentially handouts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations in this country, the \$5.6 trillion surplus became a \$2.9 trillion deficit, a stunning \$8.5 trillion reversal.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership claimed they were providing middle-class tax relief, but the truth is that the vast majority of these tax cuts went to the wealthiest individuals and corporations in this country. They claimed that these tax cuts would stimulate the economy and create jobs, but the truth is that this country has

lost more than 2 million jobs since the President took office. They claim that this country could afford these tax cuts; but the truth is, they have squandered the Clinton surplus and actually hidden the long-term costs of these tax cuts by pretending that they will expire in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, I believe, can separate the rhetoric from reality. Over the next 4 weeks, starting today, this House will consider legislation to extend various provisions of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. Mind you, we will consider these bills without a budget resolution, the framework for all Federal spending for the upcoming fiscal year; and we will consider them years before many of them actually expire.

Today's offering is a bill to extend marriage penalty tax relief beyond 2010. I fully support extending tax relief for married couples, but this bill that the Republican leadership has drafted has the same problem as their previous bills. It is not paid for. Well, I should say actually it will be paid for some day, but not by this Congress. Just like in 2001 and 2003, the Republicans pass the cost of their tax cuts to our children and to our grandchildren. In essence, they are raising taxes on future generations. Mr. Speaker, that is not fair and that is not right.

Democrats, I think, have a better plan to extend marriage penalty relief. The Democratic substitute improves this legislation with three simple, commonsense provisions.

First, the Democrats extend the earned income tax credit for low- and middle-income married couples; and the Democratic bill speeds up the EITC marriage penalty relief included in the 2001 tax cut bill, ensuring that low- and middle-income married couples are not penalized by this unfair tax.

Second, Democrats exempt any marriage penalty relief from the alternative minimum tax. Unfortunately, over half of the marriage penalty relief is taken away from married couples by the Federal Government because of the alternative minimum tax. The Republican bill fails to fix this unfair taxation, and many married couples will find that the government is taxing the very relief promised them by the Republican leadership. We will not see that in the Republican press releases today.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats provide an offset. Unlike the Republican bill, Democrats actually pay for this tax relief. Democrats do not believe we should be passing the burden of paying for these tax cuts onto future generations.

Mr. Speaker, every day American families must make tough choices with their hard-earned money. They budget for groceries and housing, transportation, education and child care. They spend sensibly within their means.

Congress could learn a lot from the average American family. Congress should live within its means as well.

It is very simple. If you are going to spend, you should pay for it. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the other side of the aisle is ignoring that important lesson.

We have an opportunity here today to work together and provide meaningful marriage penalty relief to married couples, regardless of income; and we can do this in a way that we pay for it.

So I would urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to join us today. Support the Rangel-Matsui Democratic substitute. Show the American people that this Congress can actually act in a fiscally responsible manner, that it does indeed care about the deficit and the fiscal health of this Nation.

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

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

I would just say to the gentleman that we do have a bit of a philosophical difference here because, throughout history, every time we have done tax relief, the economy improves, and we put more money into the system, and it pays for itself over and over and over and over and over again. So this is just a philosophical difference we have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, the examples of inequities and simply unfair and lacking-in-commonsense provisions of our existing Tax Code are just too numerous to mention. I wish I could wave a magic wand and eliminate them all overnight.

This President and this Congress are doing their best to bring about much-needed and long-overdue tax reform to the American people, but I am a realist. I know that a journey of 1,000 miles requires many steps forward. Today, we have an opportunity to take a joint step forward.

I stand before my colleagues as a proud cosponsor and strong advocate for eliminating permanently the marriage tax penalty. And what is the marriage tax penalty? I wish it were easy to explain to the American people, but think of it in these terms. When the only thing that changes in the lives of a man and a woman, not their job, not their income, nothing else, when the only thing that changes is that they fall in love and get married, only to discover that their tax obligation is dramatically increased, not double what they were paying as two single people but double plus, that just does not make sense.

The 2001 tax relief act, enacted by President Bush and proudly passed by this Congress, brought fairness to the Tax Code by phasing out this penalty; however, this relief will be reduced next year and will expire entirely by 2010 unless we take the action called for in this good legislation.

We want to provide tax relief for the American people. We want them to

keep more of their own money so that they can make the wise decisions on how to spend that money. We want to provide relief for the American business community to incentivize them to buy new equipment, to build new buildings, to expand and create more jobs. The President and this Congress are seeking to do just that.

It is mind-boggling to me to think that anyone would oppose it, but we get people who stand up on this floor and say I am for it, but I am for it but. There is always but, but, but. Let us do it, provide tax relief to the American families, tax relief that will get our economy moving again; and this is one very important step forward in that very important and long journey.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who I have great respect for.

We serve together on the Committee on Rules, and I did not think we had much of a philosophical difference because I have admired a lot of the comments that she has made over the last several months about the importance of this Congress being fiscally responsible. The gentlewoman actually heads the Republican's Study Group which represents a lot of the more conservative Members of this Chamber, but I read a quote that she had made that appeared in Congress Daily on January 22 that I actually agree with. She says, "I support making tax cuts permanent, but we have to pay for them."

I think the only kind of difference that we seem to have on this debate, which I did not think we did based on this quote, was that we want tax relief and we want it paid for.

My colleague from New York says that we always want to say but, but, but. Well, it is not that we want to say "but." I think most Americans want us to be fiscally responsible, and the fact of the matter is we are faced with the largest deficits in the history of our country. That used to be a concern on the other side of the aisle. It does not seem to be a concern anymore, and we are also faced with record job losses. I mean, 2.6 million jobs have been lost under this administration.

I am concerned by the fact that we cannot seem to get a highway bill to the President's desk. The gentleman from New York is on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. He knows full well that if we passed a transportation bill, we would create a lot of jobs by investing in our infrastructure and investing in our highways.

So if we want to get serious about controlling this deficit, I think we need to show a little fiscal responsibility here on the House floor.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, to my distinguished colleague from Massa-

chusetts, I say this: if my colleagues provide tax relief to the American families, they are not going to hide the money under the mattress. They are going to use it to buy goods and services, manufactured right here in the United States, by his neighbors and mine.

My favorite four letter word, and we can use it in polite company, is "jobs."

□ 1145

And if you provide tax relief for the families, they will use their money wisely to create new jobs. If you incentivize business to buy new equipment, build new buildings, create new jobs, that is the best way to get more money flowing into the Treasury to reduce that deficit.

I, like you, want to do that; but we are moving in the right direction. We have got the right ticket to drive this economy forward if we provide much-needed tax relief for the families and for the businesses of America so that our economy, which is moving in the right direction, will do so at an accelerated pace.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and say to the gentleman from New York that my favorite four letter word as well is "jobs," and I am, quite frankly, very worried about the fact that under this administration and under their economic policies we have lost 2.6 million jobs.

I want to make sure that our economy moves in a different direction. I guess I also believe that one of the ways to help continue to move us in a different direction is to get our fiscal house in order and to reverse this trend that we are now pursuing, which is one of record deficits.

Going deeper into debt, in the long run, is going to undercut our economy and undercut our ability to grow jobs. What we are simply saying here is that, yes, we believe in marriage penalty tax relief; but we think it should be paid for. I do not think that should be controversial. That seems consistent with a lot of statements made by the other side of the aisle over the many years I have heard speeches being given on this floor.

What we are doing today is not paid for. What we are doing today, in the end, is going to bring us further into debt; and I think that we can do this better. We should be able to come together in a bipartisan way and get this right. I think that is what the American people would expect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and to quote someone a lot more famous than me, "There you go again." It is, we believe in this, but, but, but. Let us do it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and again thank the gentleman for his

remarks; but this is not an excuse. This is very serious.

We are now faced with the biggest deficit in the history of this country; and every single Member, Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative, should be worried about it because we are passing this on to our kids and our grandkids. That is no joking matter. That is serious.

I believe if we do not reverse this trend, we will undercut our ability to grow jobs. So I want tax relief, but I also want us to be fiscally responsible and pay for it. That is consistent with the statement of my colleague from North Carolina, who I have great admiration for. I just wish when we say these things, we would actually fight to make them a reality on this House floor.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and would just say that I am glad the gentleman agrees that we need tax relief and we need fiscal constraint, because the budget we are looking at bringing forward, of course, has a freeze on spending, which is a very important part of this to reduce the deficit.

And again I would just say that we have a difference in how we look at this and how we pay for the tax cuts, because we believe that there will be increased monies coming in to the Treasury through the economic generation that is done with the tax relief. It has happened throughout history. And because of that, we will see the tax cuts paid for and the deficit reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), another distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and I thank my friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a traditional rule for legislation that amends the Internal Revenue Code, and I am pleased the House will have the opportunity to consider the merits of the underlying legislation and also an amendment from the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Tax Code remains hopelessly complex. Just a few years ago, it was so convoluted from years of tax changes that it punished married taxpayers merely because they were married. Unfortunately, only under this current monstrosity of a Tax Code could the marriage penalty that this House eliminated reappear in the very near future. This rule before the House, H. Res. 607, will give Members of the House an opportunity to consider legislation that not only makes the Tax Code fairer but also ensures that we can halt a targeted tax increase on married Americans.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) for introducing this important legislation, H.R. 4181, which extends indefinitely the tax relief that the Congress and President Bush enacted in 2001 and 2003 to help married couples.

Previously, our income tax code penalized couples who got married, frequently forcing them to pay higher taxes than if they had remained single. If we fail to enact H.R. 4181, tax rates will revert to their pre-2001 levels, and the marriage tax penalty will be reinstated at the end of this year.

As a Nation built on strong families, we should promote marriage, not penalize it. Our tax system should not discourage getting married and raising a family. Therefore, it is imperative we pass H.R. 4181 today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so we may proceed to debating the underlying legislation.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Democratic substitute that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) will offer. I think it is a responsible way to approach this issue because it supports marriage penalty tax relief, but it pays for it.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina mentioned that their budget resolution urges that we pay for additional spending programs. I am all for pay-as-you-go rules, but I think they should also apply to tax cuts. I think it is the responsible thing to do.

I think all of us here would like to go home to our districts and talk about all the tax relief that we can provide our American families; but I think without specifying how we are going to pay for it, it is really irresponsible. It is a nice press release. It is a nice kind of public relations item. But if we do not pay for it, what we are really doing is we are passing the burdens on to future generations, to our children, our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren.

My grandfather used to say to me that you cannot have dessert without first having your spinach, and I think that that is a good lesson for us to apply to how we do business on the House floor. It is nice to get up here and talk about tax cuts and tax cuts and tax cuts, but it would be better to do so in the context that we pay for them. I think that is what the American people expect. That is what American families have to do. They pay as they go. They have to live within their means, and I think that same lesson should apply here.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the rule, but I would urge my colleagues very strongly to do the responsible thing and to support the Rangel-Matsui Democratic substitute.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I say to my friend from Massachusetts that tax cuts do not cost money, they make money.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4219, by the yeas and nays; and S. 1904, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2004, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4219.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4219, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Bono	Coble
Ackerman	Boozman	Cole
Aderholt	Boswell	Collins
Akin	Boucher	Conyers
Alexander	Boyd	Cooper
Allen	Bradley (NH)	Costello
Andrews	Brady (PA)	Cox
Baca	Brady (TX)	Cramer
Bachus	Brown (OH)	Crane
Baird	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Baker	Brown, Corrine	Crowley
Baldwin	Brown-Waite,	Cubin
Ballance	Ginny	Culberson
Ballenger	Burgess	Cummings
Barrett (SC)	Burns	Cunningham
Bartlett (MD)	Burr	Davis (AL)
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Davis (CA)
Bass	Buyer	Davis (FL)
Beauprez	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Camp	Davis, Jo Ann
Bell	Cannon	Davis, Tom
Bereuter	Cantor	Deal (GA)
Berkley	Capito	DeFazio
Berman	Capps	DeGette
Berry	Capuano	Delahunt
Biggart	Cardoza	DeLauro
Bilirakis	Carson (IN)	DeLay
Bishop (GA)	Carson (OK)	Deutsch
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Case	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Castle	Dicks
Blumenauer	Chabot	Dingell
Blunt	Chandler	Doggett
Boehlert	Chocola	Dooley (CA)
Boehner	Clay	Doolittle
Bonilla	Clyburn	Doyle