

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that now we are on the House floor, and so there is no jurisdictional problem.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, there is no jurisdictional problem on the House floor, and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) made that point very clearly to the Committee on Rules, that if they allowed this amendment in order today, there would be no jurisdictional problem.

I frankly believe if this amendment had been allowed in order and debated, I cannot see how any Member of this House would vote against an independent study addressing the major problem that we have in this country of outsourcing jobs.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, we are getting ready to vote on this rule, and if we vote for this rule, any Member who votes for this rule is voting not to allow us to have the opportunity to have a study on outsourcing?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that any Member who votes for this rule, in my opinion, is voting for the status quo, to take no action whatsoever to try to determine, to try to collect the data and determine what is going on with the offshoring of jobs and how to address the problem.

Mr. GORDON. But, Mr. Speaker, if we vote against this rule, we can turn right around and come back and have a vote not only on trying to find out better the problems of outsourcing, but allow any Member who has a good idea about trying to improve and increase our manufacturing base in this country, to allow them to bring it to the floor and try to improve this situation; is that correct?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct. If we defeat the rule, we can come back and debate the issue of outsourcing. I have to believe there are a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will vote against this rule in order to move forward with the study so we can gather the data and come up with a blueprint to address this problem.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address H.R. 3598, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2004.

I find it very important that we address manufacturing technology competitiveness at a time when over 8.2 million Americans are without employment and over 10 percent of African Americans are currently jobless.

Today the American economy is facing challenges unlike any that it has ever faced before. The sector most drastically affected by this decline is the manufacturing industry. Histori-

cally, the manufacturing sector has been a pillar of the American economy. Without a strong manufacturing base, we will not have a strong economic recovery. Not only is manufacturing a key source of skilled, high-paying jobs, but it also is critical to our economic and national security that we have the ability to manufacture goods we need in this country.

In my home State of Texas, more than 156,000 jobs have been lost since January 2001. The manufacturing unemployment rate continued to rise last month.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was marked up in the committee, the vast majority of the suggestions from this side of the aisle were dismissed. The markup was uncommonly partisan. No matter how good the amendment was, and there were many amendments spoken about as being good, but no support.

So as we debate this bill on the House floor today, I am hopeful we can reach constructive consensus on many of the amendments being offered today, and I do ask that as many Members as possible join me in voting against the rule.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her remarks.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as a student of representative democracy, I continue to be amazed at the imagination demonstrated by our friends on the other side of the aisle. They talk about problems and talk about problems; we bring forth solutions.

Today we bring forth with this rule legislation that will authorize \$160 million for the manufacturing sector of our economy for training of workers in small businesses in the manufacturing field to retain their competitive edge in technology. We bring forth solutions. We have to deal with things. When in the majority, we have to deal with things like whether amendments are germane and other technical matters, which sometimes may seem too technical, but they are important.

So it is nice to engage in theoretical debate, even about very important problems, like we have seen today. I maintain that it is even nicer to bring forth solutions for the problems of the people of this country. We have done that with this rule. We bring forth a very important piece of legislation. The \$160 million for the manufacturing sector for training is critical at this time to retain jobs in this country. It is not theory, it is reality.

So I would ask all of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support not only the very important underlying legislation, but the rule that will make possible the consideration by this House of this very important underlying legislation in order to help the manufacturing sec-

tor of our economy which is so important.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4755, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 707 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 707

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. 4755) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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.

□ 1115

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. 707 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4755, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2005. It is a fair and appropriate rule and should be approved by the House so we can move on to consideration of the underlying legislation.

H. Res. 707 provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It also provides that the bill shall be considered as read.

H. Res. 707 waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule 21, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill.

The rule makes in order only those amendments put in the Committee on Rules report accompanying this resolution. H. Res. 707 provides that the amendments printed in the report 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 a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

Finally, H. Res. 707 provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the chairman of the subcommittee. He has worked very closely with his ranking minority member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN of Virginia), in crafting this bill, and for that he deserves our support. This appropriations bill is one of the more challenging bills to manage, and he does so with respect to the institution in which we all serve.

I do want to specifically note that this is a fiscally responsible bill, and I commend the gentleman from Georgia's (Chairman KINGSTON) management oversight that will certainly ensure that organizational changes are managed better within the agencies of the legislative branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for a fair amendment process for consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that House committee was sending mail into the committee members' districts. During yesterday's Committee on Rules hearing on the appropriations bill for the legislative branch, we learned that the Committee on Resources is sending mail to committee members' districts touting the individual Member's accomplishments on that committee. Mailed under the chairman's frank, these laudatory mail pieces are sent out as Committee on Resources reports.

But listen to what they say: "Members of Arizona's congressional delegation are making a difference for Arizonians every day through their work on the House Committee on Resources. Arizona is fortunate to have Congressmen RICK RENZI, J.D. HAYWORTH, JEFF FLAKE and RAÚL GRIJALVA on these important issues."

It goes on to read, "Committee members RENZI, HAYWORTH and FLAKE supported the Healthy Forest Restoration Act, which provides resource managers with the tools they need to combat the dangers of overstocked forests."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have four of these committee mailings submitted for the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee mailings are as follows:

RESOURCES COMMITTEE FIELD HEARING

What is the impact of the Endangered Species Act on southeast New Mexico? It's your chance to learn more.

What: Examining the Impacts of the Endangered Species Act on Southern New Mexico.

When: Monday, June 7th, 2004 at 9 a.m.

Where: Pecos River Village, Carousel Building, 701 Muscatel Avenue, Carlsbad, New Mexico.

Learn About the Impact of the Endangered Species Act on Southeast New Mexico.

Congressman Steve Pearce Represents the 2nd District of New Mexico. After a very successful hearing on the impact of the endangered silvery minnow last year in Belen, NM, Congressman Steve Pearce has asked the Resources Committee to learn about the impact of endangered species legislation on jobs and lifestyle in southeast New Mexico.

Congressman Pombo is Chairman of the House Resources Committee. Join Congressman Pearce and Congressman Pombo in Carlsbad on June 7th where they will hear first-hand from family farmers, ranchers, irrigation providers, oil and gas producers and local governments about how the Endangered Species Act has brought pain and suffering to their communities and families. The Resources Committee welcomes the opportunity to travel to New Mexico to personally visit with people who are directly affected by this outdated, onerous and unreasonable policy.

RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT ON HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT

America's National Forests have become unnaturally dense, diseased, and insect infested, leaving them incredibly susceptible to catastrophic wildfire. To date, wildfires have burned over three million acres in the United States in 2003. These fires not only destroy forests, they kill wildlife and pollute air and water alike.

California has had more than its fair share of wildfire disasters. The House Resources Committee and its members are committed to protecting our environment from the devastating effects of catastrophic forest fires.

This report is meant to update you on what the Resources Committee and your California Representatives are working on to help keep our forests healthy and keep fires from destroying forests, property, and jobs.

RICHARD POMBO,

House Resources Committee Chairman.

"The Resources Committee and its members are charged with the responsibility of coordinating federal efforts to encourage, enhance and improve programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources within our Public Forest areas. I am honored to have such dedicated and knowledgeable committee members to work with as we work to balance resource preservation and usage. I am particularly honored to work with California Congressmen in efforts to prevent further forest fires from devastating California's incredible resources and beauty. Together we will continue to work on the issues affecting California and the West."—Richard Pombo

RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORK VALUABLE TO CALIFORNIA

Members of California's Congressional Delegation are making a difference for Californians every day through their work on the House Resources Committee. The Resources Committee deals with issues such as wildfire prevention, water rights, environmental protection, and land use. California is fortunate to have so many able men and women on this committee to work on these important issues.

CALIFORNIA CONGRESSMEN HELP PASS "HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT"

Committee Members Baca, Miller, Cardoza, Radanovich, Dooley, Nunes, Gallegly and Calvert supported this bill, which provides resource managers with the tools they need to combat the dangers of overstocked forests.

The "Healthy Forests Restoration Act" establishes streamlined procedures to increase use of scientifically-proven management techniques of thinning and prescribed burning to avoid catastrophes to our forests, homes and water supply.

Additionally, the Act calls for additional open public meetings on all projects that fall under the Healthy Forests legislation, providing an opportunity for public input over-and-beyond current public hearing requirements.

And this landmark legislation makes for better forest management and helps protect communities from the dangers of uncontrolled wildfires.

It protects the rights of private landowners.

RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT ON ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT REFORM

As you may know, the application of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) has caused economic hardship and to farmers, ranchers, small businesses, and individuals—and it has done little to actually protect endangered species of animals.

The law has become more powerful than Congress ever intended it to be. It has been

applied across millions of acres and hundreds of miles of waterways, at a cost of billions of dollars. We can improve this law—limiting unwarranted impacts—if we define the scientific standard federal agencies must meet when making ESA decisions.

This report is meant to update you on what the Resources Committee and your Arizona Representatives are working on to ensure that improper application of the Endangered Species Act will never threaten the economic security of Arizona and its people.

RICHARD POMBO,

House Resources Committee Chairman.

“Congress’ efforts to improve the ESA stems from an April 2001 decision by the Federal government to shut off irrigation water to nearly 1,200 farmers and ranchers in the Klamath Basin in California in order to protect several species of endangered fish. This decision was later examined by a panel of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), which found that the order to shut off the water had ‘no sound scientific basis.’ As a result of this decision—with ‘no sound scientific basis’—the livelihoods of hundreds of farmers and ranchers in the area were destroyed, and the local economy and community was severely harmed. Your Arizona Representatives are working in Congress to reform the ESA to prevent this type of devastation from ever occurring in Arizona.”—Richard Pombo

RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORK VALUABLE TO ARIZONA

Members of Arizona’s Congressional Delegation are making a difference for Arizonans every day through their work on the House Resources Committee. The Resources Committee deals with issues such as wildfire prevention, water rights, environmental protection, and land use. Arizona is fortunate to have Congressmen Rick Renzi, J.D. Hayworth, Jeff Flake, and Raul Grijalva working on these important issues.

RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORKING TO ENACT ESA REFORMS

Congressmen Renzi, Hayworth and Flake are co-sponsors of H.R. 1662, “The Sound Science for Endangered Species Act Planning Act,” to improve the way the law uses science and to further involve the public.

- Requires peer-reviewed science as basis for ESA decisions.
- Creates an independent process to amend the ESA to make certain that all aspects of science in the implementation of that act are sound and peer-reviewed.
- Establishes a mandatory independent scientific review requirement for all ESA listing and de-listing proposals to ensure the use of sound science and provide a mechanism for resolving scientific disputes during the rulemaking process.
- Requires the Secretary of the Interior to solicit and obtain additional data from landowners and others that would assist in the development of recovery plans, including the recovery goals.
- Requires that an action, including an action for injunctive relief, to enforce the prohibition against the incidental taking of a species must be based on pertinent evidence using scientifically valid principles.

RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT ON HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT

America’s National Forests have become unnaturally dense, diseased, and insect infested, leaving them incredibly susceptible to catastrophic wildfire. To date, wildfires have burned over three million acres in the United States in 2003. These fires not only destroy forests, they kill wildlife and pollute air and water alike.

Arizona has had its fair share of wildfire disasters. The House Resources Committee

and its members are committed to protecting our environment from the devastating effects of catastrophic forest fires.

This report is meant to update you on what the Resources Committee and your Arizona Representatives are working on to help keep our forests healthy and keep fires from destroying forests, property, and jobs.

RICHARD POMBO,

House Resources Committee Chairman.

“The Resources Committee and its members are charged with the responsibility of coordinating federal efforts to encourage, enhance and improve programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources within our Public Forest areas. I am honored to have such dedicated and knowledgeable committee members to work with as we work to balance resource preservation and usage. I am particularly honored to work with Arizona Congressmen in efforts to prevent further forest fires from devastating Arizona’s incredible resources and beauty. Together we will continue to work on the issues affecting Arizona and the Southwest.”—Richard Pombo

RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORK VALUABLE TO ARIZONA

Members of Arizona’s Congressional Delegation are making a difference for Arizonans every day through their work on the House Resources Committee. The Resources Committee deals with issues such as wildfire prevention, water rights, environmental protection, and land use. Arizona is fortunate to have Congressman Rick Renzi, J.D. Hayworth, Jeff Flake, and Raul Grijalva working on these important issues.

ARIZONA CONGRESSMEN HELP PASS “HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT”

Committee Members Renzi, Hayworth and Flake supported this bill, which provides resource managers with the tools they need to combat the dangers of overstocked forests.

The “Healthy Forests Restoration Act” would establish streamlined procedures to increase use of scientifically-proven management techniques of thinning and prescribed burning to avoid catastrophes to our forests, homes and water supply.

Additionally, the Act calls for additional open public meetings on all projects that fall under the Healthy Forests legislation, providing an opportunity for public input over-and-beyond current public hearing requirements.

And this landmark legislation makes for better forests management and helps protect communities from the dangers of uncontrolled wildfires.

It protects the rights of private landowners.

RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORK FOCUSES ON SOUTHWEST’S FORESTS

Congressman Renzi introduced the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2003 to promote the use of adaptive ecosystem management to reduce the risk of wildfires and restore the health of fire-adapted forest and woodland ecosystems. Resources Committee member J.D. Hayworth is a co-sponsor of this bill, along with Arizona Representative Jim Kolbe. The Resources Committee passed the act this summer helping solidify the future of Northern Arizona University’s Ecological Restoration Institute.

This is an important first step toward the future application of practical science-based forest restoration treatments that will reduce the risk of severe wildlife and improve the health of dry forest and woodland ecosystems across the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage that I think the Members of the House sim-

ply do not know anything about. That committee received a large increase in funding last year in order to send out this propaganda into Members’ districts. I have heard of income protection, but this goes way too far. There is no excuse in the world for it, and I think we ought to take measures to stop it.

During the 107th and 108th Congress, most communities requested franking allocations somewhere between \$10,000 and \$30,000, and most spent far less than those allocations.

For example, the Committee on Government Reform franking allocation was \$35,000. They spent less than 10,000. Not counting the Committee on Resources, the largest request in Congress was the Committee on the Judiciary, which asked for \$80,000 for franking. However, the Committee on Resources requested a franking allocation of \$500,000, half a million. It is more than a 10,000 percent increase over the amount of the money that the Committee on Resources actually spent on franking in the 107th Congress. What is even more shocking is that the House rules do not prohibit a committee from sending out this propaganda with taxpayer dollars.

The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) offered an amendment to close this loophole to stop this practice. The amendment would limit mailing expenses for any committee to \$25,000, which is more than generous. On a party-line vote, the Committee on Rules refused to make the sensible solution in order, and it is troubling that this problem has slipped under the radar for a year and a half and that the Committee on Rules refused to allow the full House to discuss the issue and vote up or down on this straightforward amendment. Debate on this serious problem has been quashed with a soft promise of future action.

Again and again, the Republicans silence the Democrats and the voices of millions of Americans. There is little time left on the legislative calendar. This problem deserves immediate attention. It is shocking in that this body will not even have the opportunity to debate the problem and to consider the solution of the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

This cries out for attention from this Congress, and I demand it, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to note that we did have this discussion in the Committee on Rules about the printing yesterday. It just came up yesterday for the Republicans being criticized forever for rushing things to the floor. This seems a bit quick for the Democrats to do so. None of us on the Committee on Rules, Republican side, have seen that yet, but the committee of jurisdiction is actually the Committee on House Administration, and I think

it would be appropriate to let the authorizing committee have a shot at this to take a look at the problem before we move to address it on the House floor in an appropriations bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we need to defeat this rule so that I can offer an amendment to simply say that no committee in any year can spend more than \$25,000 on just postage. That would be \$50,000 a Congress. Why would such a limit be needed? Why is the \$25,000 limit needed? After all, in the year 2002, the average committee spent only \$2,104 on postage. The largest amount spent by any committee during the 107th Congress on an annualized basis was \$6,807.

I know the gentlewoman from New York cited the amounts requested by committees. They requested a bit more than these figures. But when we look at what they actually spent, no committee needed to spend in the average year more than \$6,807 in the 107th Congress.

But a new phenomenon has arisen. The Committee on Resources has decided it needs more resources. In the 107th Congress it spent \$2,483 per year on postage. For the 108th Congress they requested a quarter million dollars per year for postage; \$500,000, half a million dollars, for the whole 108th Congress.

Think of this from a fiscal responsibility standpoint. That is a 4,445 percent increase over what they requested before. Maybe that is not too bad. After all, 4,445 percent increase in the cost of a government agency, no fiscally responsible person would object to that. But do not compare it to what they requested last Congress. Compare it to what they actually spent. Then it is a 9,968 percent increase. Maybe somebody with some fiscal conservatism would be concerned about that, a committee which in the last Congress spent \$2,483 on postage now wants to spend \$250,000 on postage.

We do not know what they are spending all this money for. It is hard to get the information. But we do know that last quarter, just in 3 months, the committee spent \$49,587 on postage, and when they spend money on postage, they inevitably have to spend money on printing, and, yes, they spent \$40,732 on printing.

What did they use the money for? Not to carry on committee business in the sense of telling the press what the committee is doing, writing to experts to see if they can gather information. This is not individually sent-out letters, no. These were mass mailings into individual Members' districts, \$250,000 per year. What kind of mailings went out? Here is an example that was referred to by the gentlewoman from

New York. We will see that this mailing went out to Arizona. Our information is that it went it to the gentleman from Arizona's (Mr. RENZI) district, who happens to be one of the most targeted Members in the entire Congress by one political party. It praises three Members of the Arizona delegation for cosponsoring a bill, and if we read it very carefully, it attacks or implicitly criticizes a fourth Member of the Arizona delegation for not cosponsoring this bill. I might add it is a terrible bill, but the mailing praises those who cosponsor it. Our information is that it went just to the gentleman from Arizona's (Mr. RENZI) district; so the fact that it implicitly criticizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) is not of great significance unless he has statewide ambitions I am unaware of.

In any case, what does this mailing do? It lauds a Member. Some of these mailings are going out in violation or possible violation of the blackout period. So we are used to not sending out mailings 90 days before an election. Apparently the committee chairmen can. This mailing seems rather benign in that it lauds a Member, and it does so only on one issue.

Mark my words: If we do not draw the line now, the next piece will be a hit piece, and it will not be limited to one issue. It will not even be limited to a committee's jurisdiction. It will be an attack piece sent out a day or a week before an election.

How is this all different from the Member communications that we are aware of? Because many of us send mail to our constituents. First, a Member gets a limited Members' representational allowance. We are responsible to our districts, to the recipients of that mail. If the mail is informative, then I can tell my constituents we sent them informative mail that came out of our budget, which we could otherwise have used to hire personnel. But a committee chairman is not responsible to the people who receive the mailing, so they could look at it and say this is wildly uninformative. It is a terrible waste of money. It says it was paid for at taxpayer expense. I do not like it, but it does not matter because my Member did not send it. It comes out of the budget of some Washington committee.

Second, the MRA funds are at least distributed relatively equally by party. Each Member gets their own account. This \$500,000 went solely to one political party. And it is not just \$500,000. If we do not draw the line now, it will be 5 million, it will be 25 million. It will not be one committee; it will be every committee.

Members also know what information their constituents need to receive. Committee chairmen, with all due respect to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), I do not think he is an expert at what information people in the gentleman from Arizona's (Mr. RENZI) district need to hear. Then we are going to be told that these are to an-

nounce field hearings. I might add this piece of mail has nothing to do with any field hearing. But we could have a rule that we have these slush funds, but only if we are announcing a field hearing.

□ 1130

A field hearing should be a field hearing, not an excuse for propaganda, not a district-wide town hall on behalf of an endangered Member or a targeted Member.

Finally, I know here in Washington that our targeted watchdog groups publish lists. They criticize those who spend money on postage and printing. They wonder whether that is a good use of government resources.

Well, wait a minute. None of these groups caught this. They will attack a Member for spending \$100,000 on postage. How about \$250,000 on postage?

We need to do something about it, and we need to do something about it today. If you vote for this rule, you are voting for giant political slush funds, not just of half a million dollars, but for as large as they are done by whichever party controls this House. You cannot say you are going to deal with it tomorrow if you vote against dealing with it today. Vote against the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the gentleman came very close to impugning the motives of the chairman and the actions of the committee. I would just suggest that he tread a bit more lightly on that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, all I can say in response to the last comment is if the committees adhere more closely to the spirit of the rules of the House, maybe we will not tread so closely in questioning their motives.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote for this bill, and I am not going to vote for it for two reasons.

Number one, we have the continued saga of that ridiculous hole out in front of the Capitol, the Capitol Visitors Center. You remember back in the good old days when we had a budget surplus, and then we were told by the Republican majority that we could pass \$6 trillion in tax cuts and still have money left over? Now we have dug ourselves into a huge deficit hole again, the biggest deficit in the history of the country. That hole in front of the Capitol, created for the construction of the so-called visitors center, really, in my view, is a symbol of what we have done to the Nation as a whole. We have dug a huge hole for the Nation.

In this case, in the case of the visitors center, you have an addition to the Capitol which started out to cost

about a quarter of a billion dollars; it is now up to half a billion dollars. And the completion date, I would bet you, before it is over, will slip to sometime in 2007. I just continue to think it is a ridiculous, overblown use of taxpayers money.

But there is something else in this bill that really bugs me. I happen to believe that the number one national disgrace in this country is the fact that some 44 million people are struggling every day without health care coverage. There is a provision in this bill which enables a study to go forward to see whether or not we will add supplemental health and dental benefits for Members of Congress under our health care plan.

Now, I happen to believe that congressional employees should have dental coverage, and I think that Members of Congress should have dental coverage. But I also think that every citizen of this country ought to have access to health care and ought to have decent dental coverage.

We just marked up the Labor-Health-Education appropriations bill; and in contrast to the consideration that we are going to give Members of Congress about adding new health care benefits, what did the committee do this morning with respect to health care benefits for the rest of Americans?

I will tell you: the chairman's mark on the Labor-Health-Education bill today entirely terminates the Community Access Program, which is the glue that makes health delivery to the poor work in 70 communities in this country.

The chairman's mark cut several other programs. It cuts Rural Health Outreach grants, which support primary health care, dental care and mental health and telemedicine projects. It cuts those projects by 24 percent.

The Maternal and Child Health Care block grant is only 2.9 percent above the fiscal 2001 level, which means that we have a 10 percent loss of purchasing power for that program for average Americans.

Then, if you go on, you see that childhood immunization, the cost to immunize a child has gone up by 24 percent since 2001. Appropriations have increased by only 15 percent. So we are having a growing gap in terms of our ability to immunize children in this country.

So it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a substantial gap between what we are willing to consider doing for the average American when it comes to health care and what we are willing to consider doing for Members of Congress.

I do not want to vote to deny health care coverage of any kind to anybody, but I want to say this to the majority in this House: if you vote for this legislative appropriations bill today, by God, do not dare to bring out an expansion of health care benefits for Members of Congress until you have also brought out legislation to this floor

that covers health care for every American. And make sure that those Americans have the same kind of coverage, including dental care, that you would like to see for the average Member of Congress. Unless you do that, you will be giving hypocrisy a bad name.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that the gentleman was not referring specifically to me, because I do not have Federal health insurance.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that I plan to vote for this bill, but there is no way I can support this rule.

There were a total of eight amendments submitted. There were seven by Democrats, one by a Republican. The one by the Republican was allowed. Only one out of the seven submitted by Democrats was allowed.

A lot of them had no political overtones whatsoever. What is wrong, for example, with studying ways to improve and expand day care services on the Hill for our employees? That is hardly political. The only thing I can imagine is wrong is that a Member of the majority did not think of it; and I am sure if they had, it would have been made in order. But that should have been allowed, to study it.

Now, I acknowledge that at least four of the amendments have some political overtones, and I can appreciate the embarrassment that Members of the majority must experience when their legislative actions stretch the bounds of proper rules and procedures of the House.

How long, I think we know how long, what, 3 hours we kept that vote open on Medicare prescription drugs. We have subsequently read about all of the promises and the threats that were thrown back and forth to change the result, successfully, I might add.

Then, on a separate issue, how often have we seen conference agreements completed before the conference was even convened? The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) had every right to bring our attention to that abuse of power.

I doubt the majority would have approved any of those amendments, but they should have been debated.

Then there are the two amendments by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). First, should C-SPAN tapes be rebroadcast for political purposes? I am not sure, but I think it is something that ought to be discussed on the floor of the House, and I regret the fact that we did not get an opportunity to discuss it.

He had a second amendment to curb another potential abuse of power. I think it could be a pretty serious one.

It is inappropriate to use the franking privilege out of committee resources to mail mass propaganda pieces on behalf of any Member, on the majority or the minority side.

Now, if you look at the numbers that we have, the Committee on Resources apparently has asked for about half a million dollars to be mailing pieces into other Members' districts. We saw the explanation by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). No matter how much we want to cooperate with the other side, this is a major potential abuse of power, if somebody does not stand up and say wait a minute, there is something wrong with this.

This has to be discussed. The public needs to be aware of it before we embark on this. Of course, if nothing is said, other committees are likely to do the same thing, and no ranking member has that ability.

So this was an amendment that really needed to be discussed, and perhaps in that discussion we could get an explanation that would show us that this is not as abusive as it appears at first glance. Perhaps there is a logical explanation, but we sure ought to get that kind of explanation. The fact that we were denied the opportunity to discuss this is reason enough to vote against the rule.

What we are looking for is fairness. We are looking for the resources in this bill to continue this great institution at a reasonable level, a fiscally responsible level, one that is acceptable to both sides. But when the process is clearly not acceptable to both sides, I think we have an obligation to stand up and say no.

I would like to see some support from the other side of the aisle for raising objection to the way in which this rule was put together.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am in no way trying to defend or impugn any question of what the Committee on Resources did, but I think the appropriate place to have a look at that is through the Committee on House Administration or through the bipartisan Committee on Franking. I expect that will be done. Not on the floor of the House.

I know they do not want to miss an opportunity to make political hay over this, but the fact of the matter is, this is an inappropriate place to have that discussion.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me take this time just to express my disappointment with this rule and my opposition to it. I listen frequently where Members of Congress like to say that we do not want to treat ourselves differently than we treat the general public. Yet

on this appropriations bill that affects our budget, we use different standards than we do on other appropriations bills. That is wrong.

The ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), pointed out there are only eight amendments that were offered to the Committee on Rules. It would have been very easy to allow those amendments to be considered and then use the democratic process to either vote up or down those amendments. But, no, the majority refuses to allow us to have a debate on this floor on issues that affect the manner in which we operate the legislative branch.

I am particularly disappointed that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) was not made in order. We have an obligation to make sure that the resources of this body are used appropriately. That is the Committee on Appropriations' responsibility; that is the responsibility of our debate on the legislative branch bill. Yet we are not going to have an opportunity to see whether we could use a better standard on the franking privileges of our committees.

It is my understanding that the majority controlled that. The minority has no opportunity. The majority has used that at least in one committee in a partisan manner. That is wrong. We should have a chance to be able to debate that issue.

We work together to try to make sure that the resources of the legislative are used appropriately. In this case, it looks like it was not. Our opportunity to speak is when the legislative appropriation bill is on the floor. We are going to be denied that opportunity, because the majority refused to make in order an amendment so we could have that debate. That is wrong.

Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to reject this amendment, reject this rule, so that we have an opportunity to be able to have a full discussion on the legislative branch appropriation, as we would on any other appropriations bill that comes before this body.

□ 1145

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

Let me just close by saying, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), was perfectly germane. The only reason in the world it was turned down was for political reasons. It was a major embarrassment that they had been found out, and I have to assure the people who are listening today that on my part, and I am sure on the part of others, that we will not rest until we rectify this mistake, although it is not a mistake. It is a blatant attempt, frankly, to misuse taxpayers' money as incumbent protection.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This vote will be followed by two 5-minute votes on House Resolution 706 and H.R. 3980.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 194, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie	Foley	McKeon
Aderholt	Forbes	Mica
Akin	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary
Ballenger	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy
Bartlett (MD)	Gerlach	Musgrave
Barton (TX)	Gibbons	Myrick
Bass	Gilchrest	Nethercutt
Beauprez	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Bereuter	Gingrey	Ney
Biggert	Goode	Northup
Billrakis	Goodlatte	Norwood
Bishop (UT)	Goss	Nunes
Blackburn	Granger	Nussle
Blunt	Graves	Osborne
Boehlert	Green (WI)	Ose
Boehner	Greenwood	Otter
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Paul
Bonner	Hall	Pearce
Bono	Harris	Pence
Boozman	Hart	Peterson (PA)
Bradley (NH)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Brady (TX)	Hayes	Pickering
Brown (SC)	Hayworth	Pitts
Brown-Waite,	Hefley	Pombo
Ginny	Hensarling	Porter
Burgess	Herger	Portman
Burns	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Burr	Hoekstra	Putnam
Burton (IN)	Holt	Radanovich
Buyer	Hostettler	Ramstad
Calvert	Houghton	Regula
Camp	Hulshof	Rehberg
Cannon	Hunter	Renzi
Cantor	Hyde	Reynolds
Capito	Isakson	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Castle	Istook	Rogers (MI)
Chabot	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Chocola	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Cox	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Crane	Keller	Saxton
Crenshaw	Kelly	Schrock
Cubin	Kennedy (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	King (IA)	Sessions
Cunningham	King (NY)	Shadegg
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Shaw
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Shays
Deal (GA)	Kline	Sherwood
DeLay	Knollenberg	Shimkus
DeMint	Kolbe	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, L.	Latham	Simmons
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaTourette	Simpson
Doolittle	Leach	Smith (MI)
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Dunn	Linder	Souder
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Stearns
Emerson	Lucas (OK)	Sullivan
English	Manzullo	Sweeney
Everett	McCotter	Tancred
Feeney	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Ferguson	McHugh	Terry
Flake	McInnis	Thomas

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter

Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—194

Ackerman	Herseth	Olver
Alexander	Hill	Ortiz
Allen	Hinojosa	Owens
Andrews	Hoeffel	Pallone
Baca	Holden	Pascarell
Baird	Hoolley (OR)	Pastor
Baldwin	Hoyer	Payne
Becerra	Inslee	Pelosi
Bell	Israel	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	(TX)	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Jefferson	Rangel
Boswell	John	Reyes
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Boyd	Jones (OH)	Ross
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (RI)	Ruppersberger
Capps	Kildee	Rush
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Cardin	Kind	Sabo
Cardoza	Klecza	Sanchez, Linda
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	T.
Case	Lampson	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Langevin	Sanders
Clay	Lantos	Sandlin
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cooper	Lee	Scott (GA)
Costello	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Sherman
Cummings	Lofgren	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lucas (KY)	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lynch	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Majette	Solis
Davis (TN)	Maloney	Spratt
DeFazio	Markey	Stark
DeGette	Marshall	Stenholm
Delahunt	Matheson	Strickland
DeLauro	Matsui	Stupak
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Doggett	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Dooley (CA)	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McIntyre	Tierney
Emanuel	McNulty	Towns
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Turner (TX)
Eshoo	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	Michaud	Udall (NM)
Evans	Millender-	Van Hollen
Farr	McDonald	Velázquez
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Filner	Miller, George	Waters
Ford	Mollohan	Watson
Frank (MA)	Moore	Watt
Frost	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Gonzalez	Murtha	Weiner
Gordon	Nadler	Wexler
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Woolsey
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Wu
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wynn
Harman	Obey	

NOT VOTING—16

Berry	Hastings (FL)	Oxley
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Platts
Carson (IN)	Honda	Quinn
Collins	LaHood	Tauzin
Deutsch	Meehan	
Gephardt	Meek (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1211

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BACA and Mrs. DAVIS of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. NORTHUP changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3598, MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 706, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 196, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Forbes	Miller (MI)
Akin	Fossella	Miller, Gary
Baker	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Ballenger	Frelinghuysen	Murphy
Barrett (SC)	Gallely	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	Nethercutt
Bass	Gibbons	Neugebauer
Beauprez	Gilchrest	Ney
Bereuter	Gillmor	Northup
Biggart	Gingrey	Norwood
Bilirakis	Goode	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Nussle
Blackburn	Goss	Osborne
Blunt	Granger	Ose
Boehlert	Graves	Otter
Boehner	Green (WI)	Paul
Bonilla	Greenwood	Pearce
Bonner	Gutknecht	Pence
Bono	Hall	Peterson (PA)
Boozman	Harris	Petri
Bradley (NH)	Hart	Pickering
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Pombo
Brown-Waite,	Hayworth	Porter
Ginny	Hefley	Portman
Burgess	Hensarling	Pryce (OH)
Burns	Herger	Putnam
Burr	Hobson	Radanovich
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Buyer	Hostettler	Regula
Calvert	Houghton	Rehberg
Camp	Hulshof	Renzi
Cannon	Hunter	Reynolds
Cantor	Hyde	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Isakson	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Castle	Istook	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Chocola	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)
Cox	Jones (NC)	Saxton
Crane	Keller	Schrock
Crenshaw	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Cubin	Kennedy (MN)	Sessions
Culberson	King (IA)	Shadegg
Cunningham	King (NY)	Shaw
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Shays
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Sherwood
Deal (GA)	Kline	Shimkus
DeLay	Kolbe	Shuster
DeMint	Latham	Simmons
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, M.	Leach	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Linder	Souder
Dunn	LoBiondo	Stearns
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Sullivan
Emerson	Manzullo	Sweeney
English	McCotter	Tancredo
Everett	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Feeney	McHugh	Terry
Ferguson	McInnis	Thomas
Flake	McKeon	Thornberry
Foley	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt

Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)

Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker

Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
DeLucco
Dingell
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Finer
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman

Herseth
Hill
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langvin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
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
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3980, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3980, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 26, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hall
Ackerman	Crane	Harman
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Harris
Akin	Crowley	Hart
Alexander	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Allen	Cummings	Hayes
Andrews	Cunningham	Hayworth
Baca	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Herger
Baird	Davis (FL)	Herseth
Baker	Davis (IL)	Hill
Baldwin	Davis (TN)	Hinojosa
Ballenger	Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Tom	Hoeffel
Bartlett (MD)	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Barton (TX)	DeFazio	Holden
Bass	DeGette	Holt
Beauprez	Delahunt	Hooley (OR)
Becerra	DeLauro	Houghton
Bell	DeLay	Hoyer
Bereuter	DeMint	Hulshof
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Berman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hyde
Biggart	Dicks	Inslee
Bilirakis	Dingell	Isakson
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Dooley (CA)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Doolittle	Istook
Blunt	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Boehlert	Dreier	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Boehner	Dunn	Jefferson
Bonilla	Edwards	Jenkins
Bonner	Ehlers	John
Bono	Emanuel	Johnson (CT)
Boozman	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Boucher	English	Jones (OH)
Boyd	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Bradley (NH)	Etheridge	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Evans	Keller
Brady (TX)	Everett	Kelly
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kennedy (MN)
Brown (SC)	Feeney	Kennedy (RI)
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Kildee
Brown-Waite,	Filner	Kilpatrick
Ginny	Foley	Kind
Burgess	Forbes	King (IA)
Burns	Ford	King (NY)
Burr	Fossella	Kirk
Buyer	Frank (MA)	Kleczka
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Cantor	Frost	Kolbe
Capito	Gallely	Kucinich
Capps	Garrett (NJ)	Lampson
Capuano	Gerlach	Langevin
Cardin	Gibbons	Lantos
Cardoza	Gilchrest	Larsen (WA)
Carson (OK)	Gillmor	Larson (CT)
Carter	Gingrey	Latham
Case	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Castle	Goodlatte	Leach
Chabot	Gordon	Lee
Chandler	Goss	Levin
Chocola	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Graves	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Lewis (KY)
Cole	Green (WI)	Linder
Conyers	Greenwood	Lipinski
Cooper	Grijalva	LoBiondo
Costello	Gutierrez	Lofgren
Cox	Gutknecht	

NOT VOTING—20

Bachus	Hastings (FL)	Oxley
Berry	Hinchey	Platts
Blumenauer	Honda	Quinn
Carson (IN)	Knollenberg	Sherman
Collins	LaHood	Tauzin
Deutsch	Meek (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Gephardt	Mica	

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

□ 1219

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.