

The text of the modification is as follows:

Modification to H.R. 4165 offered by Mr. HOKE: On page 3, beginning on line 12, strike out "the same proof of U.S. citizenship as currently required by INS for U.S. citizens making land surface crossing between the United States and Canada for the duration of the trip." and insert "a United States passport for the duration of the trip."

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is modified.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4165, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for certain changes with respect to requirements for a Canadian border boat landing permit pursuant to section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1330

TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AT FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC FACILITY ON COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3163) to provide that Oregon may not tax compensation paid to a resident of Washington for services as a Federal employee at a Federal hydroelectric facility located on the Columbia River.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3163

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF STATE AUTHORITY TO TAX COMPENSATION PAID TO CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of title 4, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) GENERAL RULE.—" before "The United States" the first place it appears, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED AT FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES LOCATED ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER.—Pay or compensation paid by the United States for personal services as an employee of the United States at a hydroelectric facility—

"(1) which is owned by the United States, and
 "(2) which is located on the Columbia River, and

"(3) portions of which are within the States of Oregon and Washington,

shall be subject to taxation by the State of Oregon or any political subdivision thereof only if such employee is a resident of such State or political subdivision."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to pay and compensation paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3163 and urge its adoption.

We have a very unique situation which this bill will address and which, if passed, will cure. This is an anomaly whereby citizens of one State working near another State are being taxed by the other State, and they, the disaffected taxpayers, have been seeking relief from this problematic situation for a long, long time.

The States involved are the States of Washington and Oregon on the Pacific Coast. The Columbia River, which divides the two States, also is the site of several dam sites which employ people under the Federal aegis, thereby designating them as Federal employees. Yet the residents of Washington, bona fide residents of the State of Washington, have for a long time been paying Oregon taxes. Therein lies the problem.

We will shortly yield to the Members of Congress who know in detail and from a personal standpoint the diameter and the extent of this particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, hoping to yield to them for a full explanation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not planning to object to this legislation, but I do think it is important to note that this bill is being brought up under a most unusual process and under procedures that do not allow for the appropriate degree of consideration by Members.

First, this bill is being brought to the House floor on less than 24 hours' notice. There is no reason for taking action in this manner. The bill was in the Judiciary Committee for more than 6 months without any action being taken whatsoever.

Second, we have absolutely no legislative record or background on the legislation before us. We do not know how many taxpayers will be affected, although it appears that it may affect only some 79 taxpayers. We do not know the current practice by the State of Oregon for taxing these individuals and do not know how much money this will cost the State of Oregon.

It is ironic that a Congress that began the session solemnly declaring its opposition to unfunded Federal mandates on the States would end the session by passing an unfunded man-

date on the State of Oregon. Because of this unusual expedited process, we have no CBO scoring letter, so we are completely in the dark about the degree of the mandate.

Congress should be very careful in adopting special laws that limit State taxation prerogatives. At a time when we are sending more and more responsibility to the States, we need to preserve maximum flexibility for them.

We need to be particularly careful when we adopt laws of special applicability that provide a benefit to only a small number of individuals, as this bill does. This may be the right thing to do in these circumstances, but unfortunately we do not have enough information to make that determination in a thoughtful, prudent manner.

Given the late hour, I do not expect that we will seek a record vote on this bill, but I am certainly hopeful that in the future we can utilize a more deliberative and serious process when adopting a bill such as this. We owe this much to our constituents.

This is a very bad process that would not be tolerated were it not for the complications of today's anticipated adjournment and the need to adopt an emergency spending measure to avoid another Government shutdown Monday, and also, I might add, because I fully expect that the Senate will undoubtedly kill this measure.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is really what I would characterize as common-sense legislation because no American citizen should be forced to pay taxes in two separate States at the same time. But that is exactly what is happening to several dozen Army Corps of Engineers workers in the Pacific Northwest.

The State of Oregon has mistakenly determined that it has the authority to impose its Oregon income tax on 79 corps employees who live in Washington State. These workers do not work in Oregon. They do not cross into Oregon during the workday. In fact, many of them work entirely on the Washington side of the Columbia River, and seldom, if ever, step onto the four dams which separate the two States.

This is not the first time this issue has come before Congress. Several years ago, we had a similar concern for the tax treatment of Federal employees working for Amtrak. They frequently would travel into other States, and those States had attempted to impose their State tax, in addition to the State tax of the State of residence. Congress recognized that this double taxation was unfair, and corrected the problem in the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1990.

This situation is even more clear cut. In the case of Amtrak, workers would actually cross into the work in the second State. In the case of these workers, they do not cross into Oregon. They do not use Oregon facilities. They do not drive on Oregon roads. And since they already pay all applicable Washington State taxes, they should not be forced to pay twice.

In addition, this Congress just passed the Source Tax reform bill. We established a precedent by determining that pension taxes should be taken by the State of residence. The very same principle applies in this case. Taxes should be imposed by the State of residence.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of this bill is minimal. As I mentioned, we believe that it applies to approximately 79 workers at four Federal dams. It would have no fiscal impact on the United States. It would have minimal impact on the State of Oregon. But it would have a tremendous impact on 79 working families who are struggling to make ends meet. That is why the union which represents not only these workers, but also the several hundred Oregon workers who work at these dams, strongly supports my legislation.

As a result, I would strongly urge a "yes" vote on this important bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I just wanted to make a couple of additional comments.

We have been contacted by the Federation of State Tax Administrators, who have expressed very serious reservations about this bill and the precedent it might set. We have also heard from the Oregon Department of Revenue expressing reservations, concern, and perhaps even objections to this bill.

The comments made by the previous speaker are some that would have been better explored in committee if we had had a hearing on this bill. In fact, the rule of law generally is that many States tax the income of nonresidents that is generated within those States. Oftentimes, and I would say it is the general rule, the State of residence of the taxpayer then gives a credit to the taxpayer for income that was earned and taxed in another State. The Constitution of the United States gives States the authority to tax residents' income and this does disrupt to some extent the constitutional scheme.

It may be that this is a good exception. Many good rules sometimes require an exception. I think my point, however, is that the exception and the need to create one in this case, if it needs to be made, was not pursued properly. There were no hearings, there were no markups, there was no committee action whatsoever, and I think this is a cause of some concern.

Mr. SPEAKER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are really into the middle of the political silly season

here. Nobody knows how many people exactly are impacted by this bill. No one knows exactly what the revenue impact is to the State of Oregon. The State of Oregon has been afforded no opportunity to comment. No hearings have been held. Not a single hearing, not one day, not one minute, not one second of hearings.

Before yesterday, nobody had the slightest idea that this bill might come forward. Here we are. Reelect the majority. They can deliver bills at the last minute that no one has read, no one understands, and no one is going to have an opportunity to review. I am going to object to this and call for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. Just like in a few hours we are going to vote on a continuing resolution for the entire Government of the United States of America larded down with thousands of special interest provisions that no Member of this body will have read. Not a one. The President of the United States has not even read it. He does not know what is in it. His people just made some deals for him.

Why are we not doing it tomorrow? Why are we not doing it Monday? Why do they not give us 36 hours to read it? Why do we not hold this bill over? If this is important, let us keep Congress in session until next week. We get paid. We do not get paid to campaign. We get paid to work. Let us stay in Washington and work. Let us not just jam bills through that no one understands.

There are a few constitutional implications here. Yes, there are some pretty extraordinary constitutional implications here. The Federal Government is going to tell the State of Oregon that it cannot tax people who it thinks it can rightfully tax given its jurisdiction.

What about New York? Let us do away with their commuter tax. We might get a little more excitement if we were doing away with New York's commuter tax. Or let us look at some of the other jurisdictions that levy commuter taxes.

This is an extraordinary precedent, possibly unconstitutional, but the worst thing is it has not been heard, it has not been understood, it has not been properly noticed, and it is being jammed through here at the last moment.

I am going to at least put everybody on record and then when we revisit these issues in the future, a couple of Republicans from Washington State can go home and say, "Hey, we were able to jam through a bill that would do something for some unspecified number of people from our State. Reelect us."

I know you have got some tight re-elections. Good luck. If you are back, I only hope that you are in the minority so we can discuss this in a different vein next year.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs.

SMITH] for a further description of the simple justice that is included in this bill.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill with a very extensive background in Oregon tax law, as well as preparing nonresident and resident taxes for nearly 15 years along the border. We come to a lot of decisions when you straddle a border, and quite often the State that can get the most tax out of the citizens will.

We have found that in the past we have had to come to the Federal Government because we do have a sales tax on one side and an income tax on the other. Out of one of those trips came the Amtrak law, we call it, but it just simply said, "When a train goes back and forth across the river, then that train engineer doesn't have to pay tax on both sides of the river."

That made sense. We passed it here in Congress. But we left some people behind. On the river are a group of people that work on dams. They work right on the river, which is kind of no man's land in our State. Halfway through the river sort of, it is supposed to be Oregon and halfway it is Washington. All these people get up each morning, they pick up their lunch pail, they go out and they work, and they get on the river.

What Oregon decided to do was make them keep track of the time they walked back and forth across the river, depending on what they were doing, so they could pay part of it to Oregon income tax, although when they got in their car, went home to their families, bought their groceries, it was all in Washington State where they pay tax, drive on the roads and never do anything in Oregon.

This is more unjust than it was for the poor railroad engineer, my husband. My husband used to have to go through this, breaking down his hours, breaking down his time, declining how much Oregon tax we paid. But he never, ever went to work in Oregon. It was when he drove his train into Oregon and back out again.

Sometimes we do not need studies anymore. We have had major studies. We already looked at this issue extensively when we looked at this provision for truckers and railroaders and those that went back and forth across borders.

□ 1345

If that was just, this is more just, and it makes a whale of a lot of sense. Commonsense provisions for working families, that is what this Congress has been all about. You try to defend taxing a man and woman that goes to work, never gets any benefits out of a State, but they get their payroll check and they find 10 percent went to a State that they do not live in.

It does not make sense, it is not fair, it is taxation without representation, and that is the wherein we had a tea party. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for this. This makes sense.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the other tax measures referred to by the prior speaker were indeed passed, but they were passed before I was here. Both the prior speaker and I are freshmen Members of the House of Representatives. Accordingly, I was not here in Congress to observe the hearings and to study those measures, nor were any of the freshmen Members.

This may in fact be a good thing to do, or it may not be. The point I am making is that this measure received no scrutiny by the Committee on the Judiciary. It was introduced on March 26 of this year. The Committee on the Judiciary held no hearings, and held no markup. So I do not think it is the right process, frankly.

I am one who always likes to achieve sensible, easy, streamlining. The problem here is that we do the not know if that is what this is in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I guess my question would be if this is so simple and such a no-brainer, and there may well be some equity issues here, why was it not brought up under the famous Corrections Day procedure when some scrutiny could have been applied? Why is it being brought up with less than 24 hours notice the day of the adjournment of the House of Representatives to run home for reelections without reading or understanding what we are passing in the last 24 to 48 hours?

It is simple. This body is a full-blown majority party, and let us have a process that makes sense for the people of the United States. This bill might have good arguments, but the arguments have not been made. The State of Oregon and the State of Washington have not been heard before the committee.

The persons to be impacted have not been heard before the committee. We have not understood the constitutional implications. I always heard States rights from that side of the aisle. States rights, States rights. We are preempting a State here today. What precedent are we setting by presenting one State with this? What other States have transborder issues?

Washington State does not have an income tax. That is one of the issues before us, these people do not pay income taxes in the State of Washington, because they do not have an income tax. There are many thousands of people that live across the border in Washington State who commute over the bridge to go daily to work, all the way over into Portland and other places across the river.

So there is a host of issues here. Certain jurisdictions, cities, counties, and others, have commuter taxes. I do not know if any other States have them. I do not know if other States are in a similar situation. I do not believe anybody on that side of the aisle can an-

swer that question if I ask it. No one knows, because no hearings were held, not a single one. If this is such a slam-dunk, you could have had one hearing, 2 hours, brought the bill up under Corrections, last week, the week before, back in July. Why not? This is wrong.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon has been very eloquent in his railing against the system that would try to ram a piece of legislation through without hearings, and yet I am sure, the veteran that he is, he recalls countless instances of unanimous consent, both when the Democrats were in charge of the House and when now that the Republicans are, where the gentleman may not have known, maybe he did, maybe not, the consent of the hundreds, hundreds of unanimous-consent agreements that have been reached between the parties that allow the House to act on something of simple justice, to move a piece of legislation along.

We were under the impression when we came here that the gentleman from Oregon himself was not going to object. Second, that the Corrections Calendar gambit that we felt, as the gentleman has felt, might have been a proper procedure, was met with some distrust on his part or maybe he agreed not to allow it to be presented to the Corrections Calendar, something like that. But we were under the impression that the parties involved here, sensing the equity and justice inherent in this bill, agreed, much like a unanimous consent, in which the gentleman from Oregon perhaps has entered into in his veteran status on this floor, many, many times, maybe not, and maybe he has read all those documents that were inherent in those unanimous consents, maybe not. But now he has the courage to come and say to us they did not read the bill, there were no hearings on it, as if this was something we were foisting on the public for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, when he knows that by unanimous consent, we, not he, we are not sure about him, we, other Members of the House, Democrat and Republicans, have agreed to let a simple agreement reach final stages.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate really boils down to one simple question: Are we willing to allow blatant discrimination against Federal workers? I think the answer clearly to that question is simply no, we should not tolerate any State or organization which seeks to unfairly single out Federal workers for discriminatory tax treatment.

That is what is happening here, Mr. Speaker. In addition, Congress has already spoken clearly on this issue. This past year we took much of the same approach in determining that seniors' pensions should be taxed by the State of residence.

In 1990, this Congress resolved a remarkably similar situation affecting Amtrak workers who crossed State lines. At that time we determined that double taxation was not appropriate for Federal workers.

This is no different. Washington citizens with their residence in Washington who happen to work in Oregon are being taxed by Oregon. Oregon would not tolerate it, and Washington should not either, and the Congress should not as well. It is a simple issue of fairness for these Federal workers, and something that we should have no problem supporting in this body.

I want to thank not only the manager of this bill, but my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS], and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] as well, who have really championed this cause of fairness for workers, fairness for all Federal workers, as they are imposed upon by unfair taxing obligations of a sister State.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me say, I was listening in my office and I heard the opening statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], and I was singularly impressed with the one statement that this is a commonsense idea.

I do not have to have a lot of hearings and a brick does not have to fall on my head to know a good idea when I see it. This is a good idea. Let me explain from a very personal perspective.

I have had a staff person working for me for 15 years, a staff director. In that time, 15 years, she has paid income tax in California and income tax in Virginia, because there is no reciprocal.

There are a lot of Federal employees right here in our House, and on the Senate side too, I imagine, that are in exactly the same posture.

Let me tell you something. It is unfair that people should pay double taxation. I thought one of the ideas of our Constitution was to make sure people weren't double taxed.

Now, I have never met a tax collector anywhere who would not argue that they needed the tax. Yes, they need the tax, but that is not the question. The question is equity. Why should a person pay taxes on income they did not earn in that State? That staff director earns that money here in Washington, DC, but she pays taxes in Virginia, and she pays taxes in California. Tell me how that is fair? That is not fair. And where this issue might open a Pandora's box to all kinds of people asking for the same exemption, I think all Federal employees should have this exemption. I see nothing wrong with that. I only see fairness and equity in it.

I wish my colleagues on this side would see the fairness of it. This is not an issue that has to be partisan. This is an issue that has to deal with people who work for both our side and for their side and every side.

I actually think the gentleman came forth with a good piece of legislation, and this may be an expedited way of getting it through, but hallelujah to him and hallelujah to people who will not wait on a prolonged system to bring about equity for people and justice for people who have suffered as long as my staff director has, for 15 years, paying taxes in two places, earning that money in a different place altogether.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. He said it best thus far, and he has personal experience, does the gentleman from California, with a staffer, on the simple injustice which we are attempting to cure here today, albeit we did not conform to the procedures that the gentleman from Oregon would force upon us on a question that many times would have been cured by unanimous consent in any event.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that when I began my statement this afternoon, I indicated that I was not going to object only because of the need here at the end of the session to move along, noting that the process is dreadful. I am a member of the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], and I know that we could have sorted through issues such as those raised by my colleague from California that are broad and potentially national in scope. I certainly would be willing to do that. But as I am hearing more and more, I am seeing that what in fact may be a sensible, small exception, has raised questions about a nationwide scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle, there were a number of times when I objected to the procedures under my own majority party, and there were times I voted against continuing resolutions, because I said we had not been given the opportunity to read them and understand them even if they were written by Democrats in the majority.

To say that because the Democrats, which I am fully willing to admit, at times abused their power or abused the rush to adjournment, then we should do it too, would it not be nice to change things around here? I thought we were going to have a revolution and do things in regular order.

This is not something that began last week, last month, this year, last year. This bill was originally introduced by Jay Inslee from Washington when the Democrats were in the majority. It received no action then. For some reason, whatever reason, it received no action, no hearings, no markup.

The esteemed gentleman from Pennsylvania chairs the subcommittee. I am certain in his busy schedule he could have found 2 hours, sometime in the last 6 months, to hold a hearing on this issue, and invite in the opposing parties and understand fully what we are entering into and doing here.

But that was not done. That was not done. It was not done under the Democrats, it has not been done under the Republicans. The only difference is in this case a few Members from Washington, despite the fact the former Speaker was from Washington, apparently had more clout with the leadership and they can jam something through that has not had hearings, it has not been heard, and no one fully understands the implications of.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] opened an extraordinary Pandora's box here with what he is proposing, although I think there is a mistake. I think his staffer needs a new accountant. When I was a staffer and lived in Maryland, I paid taxes in Oregon. They once asked me to pay taxes in Maryland and I sent them my Oregon return. They said, are you crazy? Your taxes are much higher. You should be paying taxes here, but since you paid taxes in Oregon, you do not have to pay them here. So I am a bit puzzled by what is happening to his poor staffer.

But there are a whole host of issues here and a whole host of commuter taxes out there that are being paid across the country, and what precedent are we setting, if this is legal and constitutional?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, a member of the committee.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise really on a point of inquiry that I will probably have a colloquy with myself on. The concern I have, and as a member of local government we had the same experience—

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman would be kind enough to let me finish.

Mr. GEKAS. If the gentlewoman would yield, I simply want to tell her I am available for any inquiry that she might want to pose, and I would be glad to engage in a colloquy.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having this experience with local government, we are familiar with the concept of one entity and its citizens benefiting by salary from another entity and the question of taxation. The question that I would raise that I think is important, even as we may be trying to remedy this for certain isolated areas, process is important.

This does not fall into the category of correction or one that can be aptly categorized as appropriate for suspension, for as far as I may know this may be an appropriate procedure for the entire Nation.

Have we determined that there is in fact a problem between Oregon and Washington? Have we determined in fact that that problem does not find itself relevant to California, to Texas, to Virginia, to Ohio, to New York? If we are doing this isolated legislation, why should it not then create an opportunity for precedent to solve problems across the Nation?

I do not want double taxation, but what I am concerned about is that I am not being helped in the State of Texas. Those in Ohio are not being helped. Those in New York are not being helped. Those in the Washington-Virginia area are not being helped.

So we have a piece of legislation that has no basis in credibility for us on the Federal level to be dealing with, without hearings, to suggest that there is need to correct the entire problem.

I would hope that we would have an opportunity to address this not from the question of whether it is right or wrong, because I do not think anyone would rise to the floor of the House and support double taxation. They do raise the question, however, what is the precedent, the data, the basis for making this decision, whether there is a fair applicability of State laws in Oregon and Washington, and whether or not there is a penalty that is being assessed against those citizens by this legislation without precedence, hearing and process.

Ms. LOFGREN. 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 gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3163.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

RESIDENT REVIEWS FOR NURSING FACILITIES UNDER MEDICAID

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3632) to