

curious as to why the bill that passed the House that is now being promoted, why over 40 of our welfare administrators in our various States have said it will cause a fundamental change in their welfare system, it would cause them to shift their local priorities to federally mandated priorities where our own scorekeepers have indicated that there are additional mandates to the States far beyond the dollars made available, far beyond the \$2 billion, if in fact \$2 billion is made available, our States would be required to conform to new mandates. If we believe that the current law has been so successful, why are we now taking away the ability of States to set their own priorities?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to do two things. First, I ask my colleagues to support the 3-month extension. It is the responsible thing to do. We need to approve this legislation.

Second, I am going to ask, let us all step back for a moment and take a deep breath and take a look at the issues and the families that are affected, listen to our Governors who have the principal responsibility, analyze the GAO report which indicates that most of our States have had to cut back on child care money because of their fiscal problems.

In my own State of Maryland, they are taking no new enrollments in child care unless you are on welfare. Think of this message: If you want safe, affordable child care, go on welfare. That is the wrong message. Let us talk together, let us listen to each other and let us come up with a bipartisan bill that we can be proud of, that can pass both this body and the other body and be signed by the President; and, most importantly, will help our States in their efforts not only to get people out of welfare, but to get American families out of poverty.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me remind the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) that just in the last 2 weeks we passed legislation which was signed by the President which gives to the States an additional \$20 billion in State aid. The States also have some \$6 billion in Temporary Aid to Needy Families or TANF surplus that is available to them. We also transferred some \$3 billion of surplus that they have available. We also have \$6 billion of unemployment that they have in surplus available.

The gentleman asked if the legislation is so successful, why would we want to make changes; child poverty has fallen, more parents are working, dependence fell by unprecedented levels. But the fact is there is still more that needs to be done. There is still 58 percent of recipients who are not working or trained. There are too many families that are breaking up, who never formed, that this legislation will

address, and there are some 2 million families that remain dependent on welfare. And that is why even though this legislation has been so incredibly successful, we still have more to do.

With that, I would urge the body to support this legislation, this extending of 3 months. I urge an "aye" vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2350.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CARDIN. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2115, FLIGHT 100—CENTURY OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

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. 2115) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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 re-

port 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 amendment 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 265 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of 2115, the Flight 100 Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule provides ample opportunity to discuss this important reauthorization before us today.

H.R. 2115 is a bipartisan bill introduced by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) as well as the ranking members, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). This reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration, appropriately titled for the 100th anniversary of powered flight, continues a tradition of funding the promotion of safety in our skies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight some of the important provisions in the underlying legislation.

First, this legislation reauthorizes the FAA at \$3.4 billion next year raising \$200 million in the year after that. The FAA, nearly 45 years after it was created, takes an ever-present role as we take important steps to ensure America's security. The FAA is primarily responsible for the safety of our Nation's skies through activities ranging from the continued monitoring by air traffic controllers to the development of new air space technologies.

Within my district is Miami International Airport, which I have the privilege to represent, and is consistently one of the Nation's busiest for

both international and domestic travel. I am impressed by the level of public-private cooperation between organizations such as the FAA and Miami International Airport.

Mr. Speaker, following the tragedy of September 11, 2001, our Nation's airports and airlines were forced to deal with the ever-growing and obvious problem of security. I believe that this bill contributes to this endeavor while ensuring that those affected by these horrible acts are helped.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2115 provides for an extension of war risk insurance for both international and domestic flights while ensuring that this important insurance is extended to manufacturers and airline vendors through the Department of Transportation.

This Congress was quick to assist airlines following September 11, and rightfully so. The economic benefits from the movements of people and goods that airlines provide, I think, demanded our attention. I think we also have to consider that smaller aircraft that were restricted for months following September 11 would also need attention of the Congress. Congress, I think, should act, and I think it will through this underlying legislation to help general aviation return to some stability by providing compensation for the hardships on their businesses. The bill authorizes \$100 million for these general aviators that were also greatly affected by increased security requirements.

H.R. 2115 is a good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. It is important to the continued needs of the FAA, obviously, and to the flying public. The underlying legislation was reported favorably out of the committee by voice vote.

I take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman, for his great leadership on this issue, as well as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the distinguished ranking member.

Due to the importance of the FAA's role in the security of the United States, as well as in the economic well-being of the United States, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation. I think it is important that we move forward and reauthorize the FAA, and we are doing that today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today we consider the bipartisan FAA reauthorization bill. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr.

DEFAZIO) in the best tradition of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure worked long and hard to produce a sensible bipartisan bill, and they should be commended.

I also want to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for including an important provision that will benefit smaller airports like the one I represent in Worcester, Massachusetts.

This provision will allow airports like Worcester, known as primary airports, to continue to receive Air Improvement Program Entitlement Funding, or AIP, for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 based on prior year emplanement levels. It specifically grants the Secretary of Transportation the authority to maintain current AIP funding levels for primary airports based on a discrete set of criteria related to the dramatic reduction in commercial air service since September 11.

AIP entitlement is a critical source and oftentimes the only source of funding for capital improvements at these airports. These airports rely on AIP funding to make a number of upgrades which now also include necessary, but costly, safety enhancements. In Worcester's case, this bill could mean the difference between receiving more than \$1 million a year annually or \$150,000.

This is an important provision, and I thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for its inclusion.

If only the Committee on Rules and the leadership of this House could act in a bipartisan way, because although I support the FAA bill, for the life of me I cannot figure out why the Republicans will not let us consider the child tax credit.

For a second straight week, the leadership is playing a nasty game with millions of hardworking American families. Two weeks ago, the President, Vice President, and the Republican leaders deliberately left 12 million families, including hundreds of thousands of military families, out in the cold by deleting the child tax credit extension from the recently passed tax cut.

We just fought a war in Iraq; we still have soldiers fighting in Afghanistan. And instead of a warm thank you, the Republican leadership gives our troops the cold shoulder. The average base pay of a serviceman in Iraq is about \$16,000; but according to the Republicans, that soldier's family does not need any tax relief because they are not subject to Federal income tax.

This is wrong. These families work hard and they pay taxes. They pay sales taxes and payroll taxes and State taxes and local taxes and property taxes, most of which are going up because of the policies of this administration; but according to the Republican leadership, giving them a small tax credit would be welfare. How insulting.

My colleagues want to talk about welfare, well, let us do that. Enron paid no income taxes at all in 4 of the past

5 years, despite \$1.8 billion in profits. Enron's taxes over 5 years were a negative \$381 million, and its corporate tax welfare totaled \$1 billion.

WorldCom paid no taxes at all in 2 of the last 3 years, despite \$15.2 billion in profits before going bankrupt. WorldCom's total tax rate over the 3 years was only 1.6 percent. Corporate tax welfare slashed WorldCom's tax bill by \$5.3 billion over the past 5 years.

All the while these corporations are not paying taxes, other companies are relocating to the Caribbean to avoid paying them altogether.

These corporate robber barons have saved billions and billions of dollars through loopholes supported by the Republican majority, and yet those same Republicans say that providing a hardworking American family a few hundred extra dollars is bad policy.

The Republican policies are crystal clear, Mr. Speaker; and they are wrong.

Last week, in this Chamber, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip, challenged the Republicans to defend their actions. Their response? Dead silence. Yesterday, President Bush and his staff, at long last bowing to public demand, implored House Republicans to take up and pass the child tax credit passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote in the other body. That bill is targeted, it is sensible, and very importantly, it is paid for by other offsets.

But the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, still refuses to bring this bill to the floor. Last week, the majority leader said there are more important priorities than tax relief for low- and middle-income families, and yesterday he brushed aside the White House request.

Instead, they are playing a game, pushing a much larger tax cut that will cost over \$80 billion. They are betting that the other body will engage in a long, protracted debate over the House proposal because they know that the other body will not pass an \$80 billion tax cut that is not paid for, and they are hoping that the whole issue will just go away.

Mr. Speaker, it will not go away because, as we have said over and over, we will not let it go away up till the Republican leadership in this House does the right thing and fixes the mistake that they made when they removed the child tax credit for millions of low-income and middle-income families.

So I say to the Republican leadership, are you really that cynical, are you really so consumed by the thrill of your own power that you refuse to do the right thing? Why can you not simply admit that it was wrong to drop these hardworking, tax-paying families from the tax bill and fix your mistake?

The answer may lie in an article in today's Washington Post. According to the article, the administration had no intention ever of implementing the child tax credit as approved by the other body. Treasury officials assumed

in May, weeks before the House and Senate met to work out the differences in the two tax bills, that the child tax credit would not become law; and now the White House claims to support it.

I insert this article in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 2003]
HOUSE GOP RESPONDS TO SENATE CHILD
CREDIT BILL

\$82 BILLION PLAN OFFERS BREAKS FOR MILITARY
FAMILIES

(By Juliet Eiperin)

For the second time in two weeks, House leaders are pushing a sizable tax cut bill, seizing the debate over expanded credits for parents of minor children to propose several new, unrelated tax cuts.

House Republicans yesterday unveiled their \$82 billion plan, which features tax breaks for military families (and for the estates of astronauts who die on space shuttle missions). The proposal sets up a likely fight with the Senate, which approved a more modest tax cut package last week.

For several days, Republicans have been trying to quell protests over the fact that the tax cut enacted last month excluded 6.5 million poor families from receiving a credit of as much as \$1,000 per child. The Senate reacted swiftly, passing a \$10 billion bill last week that would give the expanded child credit (now \$600) to families making from \$10,500 to \$26,625 a year.

House Republicans rejected that approach yesterday, saying they wanted a broader bill that would extend the child credit and other tax breaks through 2010.

"We've not in the business of politics, but rather in policy," said Ways and Means Chairman Bill Thomas (R-Calif.), noting that the expanded child tax credit phases out in 2005 under the existing law. "If these people need help between now and the election [of 2004], they need it for the rest of the decade."

House Majority Leader Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) told reporters yesterday that passing a bill dealing only with the child credit "ain't going to happen," because GOP leaders prefer a broader package that "provides tax relief, creates jobs and [helps] the economy grow."

The House proposal would provide a \$1,000 per-child credit for families from Jan. 1, 2003, through 2010. The credit now begins to phase out when married couples make \$110,000 or more. House GOP leaders would raise start of the phaseout to \$150,000.

Their plan also would help military families, giving them a tax break on home sales, death benefits and dependent-care assistance. It would suspend the tax-exempt status of designated terrorist organizations and provide income and estate tax relief for astronauts who die on space shuttle missions, including those in the Columbia disaster.

The House is poised to pass the plan Thursday. Its prospects in a conference with the Senate are unclear. The Senate bill's costs are offset by higher Customs Service fees, adding nothing to the deficit. The House plan includes no such offsets, which could cause problems with Senate Democrats and some moderate Republicans.

"I philosophically support the House Ways and Means Committee proposal," Senate Finance Committee Chairman Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa) said yesterday, but "I don't know if there are enough Senate votes to pass it."

Treasury officials informed Senate aides yesterday that the government will not be able to mail child credit checks to low-income families for 8 to 10 weeks. Administration officials assumed in May that the Sen-

ate child credit proposals would not become law, according to a Senate Democratic aide who met with Treasury officials.

The American people are smart. They can see through all the politics. They want Congress to fix the child tax credit, and they deserve action.

Mr. Speaker, the other body has already acted. We can solve this problem by taking up the bill right now. With quick action, we can send this bill to the President; and he can keep his word and sign it by the end of this week.

That is why, at the end of this debate on the rule, I will ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and should the previous question be defeated, I will bring up the Senate-passed child tax credit so we can send it to the President immediately.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this bill may be fine, but we need to defeat this question on the rule to get to the business at hand, because the business at hand is we want to free the goodly number of Republicans who want to vote for a child care tax credit, but who are under the tyranny of a Republican leadership who will not let them do it. We need to free those 228 Republicans to exercise some of their conscience because I believe there is a goodly number of them who realize why we are right; and we are right because it is indefensible to have decided to give these tax breaks to the wealthy and deny it to families as a child tax credit.

It is indefensible, and if my colleagues want to know why there has been such silence from this side of the aisle defending this, it is because they do not want to defend the indefensible. It is not because of massive laryngitis on this side of the aisle. If my colleagues want to know why there have been so few coming to this Chamber to try to excuse this, it is because they do not want to try to excuse the inexcusable.

I believe we should defeat this rule and go to the business at hand, and we should have a goodly number of Republicans join us to do it; and here is why I think this is possible. It is possible because there are a fair number of Republicans who share two basic values with the Democrats on this side of the aisle. Those values are work, number one, and two, responsibility.

We believe that work should be honored; and when we have heard the few Republicans that have come to defend this indefensible position, they have not honored work because what they have tried to say is that these people

that are owed this child care tax credit, they have said, well, they are not working or they are not working for enough money. Hogwash. All work ought to be respected in this country whether one gets paid a million bucks a year or \$12,500 a year, and there are a goodly number of Republicans who share that view.

I am here to call on my friends on the Republican side of the aisle who share that view to come defeat this rule and bring up the Senate bill so that we can pass a responsible bill that does not bust the budget and create another \$80 billion of debt for the very kids subject to this child care tax credit.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules for yielding the time to me; to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for bringing forward a very forward-thinking legislative initiative, Flight 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act; to the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, the excellent work that they have done; and the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. They have truly brought forward a bill that raises and promotes the question of security.

As a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, this legislation includes grant programs for local airports. It also increases the number of flights that we can utilize out of Reagan National, indicating that we are secure and we are not afraid, and prohibits a very important aspect of a very important traffic controller from being privatized.

I have met with my traffic controllers, particularly in Houston. The kind of expertise that they have and the importance of their independence and their relationship to the government in our effort of security is crucial. It is imperative that we not privatize those individuals.

As well, it is important that we have other security measures that are being provided by this legislation.

Let me make one quick point. I am disappointed that the Gibbons amendment was not allowed in, the amendment that I supported, that raised the age of pilots to 65.

□ 1145

I think we are making a mistake by not having a vigorous debate on this question, particularly in light of the fact that it is well known that we are as a Federal Government opposed to age discrimination. This is supported by a number of members of the pilots union, meaning small groups or local chapters, and it certainly is questioned by the Black Pilots Association as to the issue of discrimination. I think we are making a mistake. I think it was a very effective amendment and I hope

we will have a time to address that question.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that we are bringing this bill up, but yet we have a difficulty in helping the children of America, particularly with bringing to the floor a freestanding bill that has now been passed by the Senate since last week that provides for minimally \$154 for 12 million children, or families representing 12 million children in America. We understand that America believes in its children, but we are not believing it by putting our money where our mouth is. We only spend at this point between 1 and 2 percent of the GDP on our children. Yet today this House, the Republican leadership, is fighting against passing a freestanding tax credit for children, a refund to allow for 12 million children to be provided for and protected.

Under the tax cut plan passed in 2001, while most families with children receive the child tax credit, nearly 10 million low-income children receive nothing and another roughly 10 million children did not receive a full child tax credit. It seems ridiculous that this House can find its way to pass a number of suspension bills between this week and the end of the week. We did find it to move forward on this FAA legislation which is a positive step. But when the Senate moved quickly last week to pass the child tax credit refund, it does not seem to make any sense that we cannot support the Rangel-DeLauro bill or, in this instance, the freestanding Senate bill that simply provides the children of America of those making \$10,000 to \$26,000, working families, a tax credit refund. But we can provide, it seems, a number of our families, 190,000 families in America, we can give them a \$93,000 check.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we would bog down the tax bill and give all but the kitchen sink so that we know it will go to conference and takes ages and eons and months and weeks, but we cannot pass a freestanding bill. I hope that we will come to our senses and pass a freestanding bill and work on behalf of America's working families and children of America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this rule. This bill reauthorizes \$58.9 billion over 4 years for the activities of the Federal Aviation Administration, including the grant program to local airports. It also increases the number of flights at Washington's Reagan National Airport, prohibits air traffic controllers from being privatized and allows airports to use some of their Federal grant resources to install explosive detection systems for checked luggage.

Funding our aviation infrastructure is an important component of ensuring the safety of the American public. But I would like to talk about another issue of great importance, and that is extending the child tax credit to the 6.5

million American families who were left out of the Republican tax bill, 200,000 of those military families while their spouse is at war. After the furor that erupted during the last 2 weeks over the Republicans' secret elimination of the child tax credit for the families of 12 million children, after the other body passed legislation to undo that wrong, late yesterday comes word from this House that this House has finally decided to act. But instead of accepting a simple extending of this tax cut to the taxpaying families who need it most, those who were left out of the package, the Republicans use the opportunity to try to pass another round of irresponsible tax cuts.

With the Thomas bill, what the Republicans are doing is very simple. They are holding 12 million children hostage. As I said yesterday, for them, extending the child tax credit to low-wage families who earn between \$10,500 and \$26,625 is simply part of a deal. They would use these 12 million children as a bargaining chip in their never-ending quest to cut taxes for only the wealthiest Americans.

But that is not what providing tax relief to these 6.5 million families should be about. Helping these families is a matter of fairness, equity and economic justice. They work hard. They pay nearly 8 percent of their incomes in payroll taxes and in sales taxes. Yes, they pay taxes, unlike Enron which the last 4 out of 5 years paid no taxes to this government, or those companies who go offshore for the direct purpose of paying no taxes and yet they are in line for very, very big tax cuts.

As the White House said without equivocation the other day, the House of Representatives needs to right this wrong. It needs to do so without complication, and it needs to do so immediately without holding hostage 12 million children. That is the right thing to do. This is why we were elected to this job. This issue is such a violation of all that we hold dear and believe. This issue is not about partisan politics. This is about what we hold dear, what the values of each and every one of us who serves in this body is about. It is about our individual character. It is also about our national character.

The people of the United States of America believe that there has been a violation here of folks who are hardworking people, who pay their taxes, who were told and were supposed to have been signed into law that they were going to get a tax credit for their children, pulled out in the dead of night, money stolen from them. It is an immoral act and we have the moral obligation in this body to move quickly to what the Senate did, not with any bargaining chip to hold these 12 million children hostage, or their families, but to do what the President has asked, without equivocation, do what the Senate did, do it without complication, do it immediately. Let us right this wrong. Let us give these families what they rightfully have earned. Twelve million children are waiting.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight the difference in philosophies here, and I think that my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, in Congress Daily said it best. Speaking for the Republicans, she said: "We have a philosophical difference. I look at it and other Republican Study Committee members feel if we give people a tax break that don't pay taxes, it's welfare."

I profoundly disagree with her characterization of these hardworking citizens who do pay taxes, they do pay payroll taxes and sales taxes and other taxes, as somehow not contributing to our tax base. As a prominent member of my party in the other body said, and let me quote her, We are talking about 200,000 military families, hundreds of firefighters and teachers and other hardworking Americans. I don't think of them or view them as welfare recipients. I don't think that they think of themselves that way. These are taxpayers. These are essential people in our communities, those who are protecting us from fire and from criminal activity, those who are teaching our children, those who are stationed abroad and protecting our very freedoms. They are hardworking families who pay sales tax, both State and local. They have payroll taxes that come out of their checks.

Mr. Speaker, this is what this debate is about, whether or not these people deserve to benefit from this tax cut that was passed only a few weeks ago in this House or whether or not they should be excluded. Those on our side of the aisle and a lot of moderate Republicans in the other body believe that these people should not have been deleted from the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

It is amazing to me. The Democrats have been talking about the need to provide this child tax credit to the 12 million children who are in working families now for at least a week and we were very gratified to see that the other body, the Senate, on a bipartisan basis passed a very carefully tailored bill that would cost, I guess, \$3.5 billion and that would essentially put the families of these children, the working families, back into eligibility for this increased tax credit. What happens when this bill comes over here to the House? Our House Republican leadership, which as we know has repeatedly said that they are not in favor of this, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) was quoted many times last week as saying it was not important and that he was not going to do it unless it was part of a larger tax break giveaway. That is what we are hearing now. The House Republicans are saying and the

gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the Committee on Ways and Means have said that they are only willing to provide this tax credit to these 12 million children if we increase the amount of money greatly, go further into debt and add on a number of other things for wealthier families. It simply is not right because what effectively the Republicans in the House are doing is killing this proposal.

If the bill that passed the Senate came over here and we simply took it up and passed it, it would become law and the 12 million children would get the tax break. They would get the money going out sometime after July 1. And now because of the House Republican action here to expand this and try to help wealthier families and individuals, it is very likely that this whole bill is killed and that the Senate action will not accomplish what it should accomplish.

I blame directly the House Republican leadership. They were not in favor of this from the beginning. They did not include it in their tax bill in the beginning, they said they were opposed to it, and now they are putting up more hurdles and roadblocks to it. They are also saying they are not going to pay for it.

In the Senate, Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN had put in specific pay-fors, increases in customs duties to make sure that this would not do anything to increase the debt which we understand is like \$400 billion now. And what do the House Republicans do in the leadership here? They eliminate the pay-fors and they increase the funding to pay for higher-income individuals, holding these children and their families essentially hostage to a tax break for wealthier individuals, and they refuse to pay for it. They basically come up with a bill that is about 80 or \$82 billion that is all debt and not paid for at all. I cynically say the reason they are doing it is because they want to kill the bill. They do not want these 12 million children to get the tax break, these working families to get the tax break. They just want to kill the bill. They were always against the bill. Through this action they will kill the bill if it passes in that way, and they are totally responsible for that.

You have to understand the way this place works, and this is the sad part about it. It is very easy for the House Republican leadership to simply take something good that the other body did on a bipartisan basis and kill it by adding all these additional tax breaks for wealthier families and at the same time eliminating the pay-fors, so it is now being paid for out of debt which will cause so much problem for the other body that they will never take up the bill, it will never get the 50 or the 60 votes that are necessary in the Senate to pass the bill.

We have to do whatever we can over the next 24 hours, because this is likely to come up tomorrow, to try to force the original Senate bill to pass just at

the cost of the \$3.5 billion, just for those 12 million children that were left out, and with the pay-fors that were in it so that it is acceptable to everyone. That is the way this should be done. Simply take up the other body's bill and pass it and not load it down with all these other problems. We have about 24 hours to try to convince and get the votes for that. It is not going to be easy, but we are going to make sure as Democrats that we do that so that we have a good bill that will pass.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just to make clear the point that this is not a partisan issue throughout the country. Unfortunately it has become a partisan issue here in the House of Representatives, but I want to refer to two quotes from some distinguished Members of the other body. One, a senior Republican from the other body representing the State of Iowa, when asked about this subject said, What's going to make them, meaning the House Republicans, accept it is whether or not they want this group of people, particularly people in the military who are sacrificing their freedom for our freedom, to get the same benefit everybody else is going to get who has children in their family.

What is really unfortunate is that by the inaction of the leadership in this House, it appears that the Republicans in the House do not want to help these military families and their children.

□ 1200

Another prominent Republican in the other body from the State of Maine said the base pay of a first year soldier is \$16,000. Paramedics make an average of \$22,000, and home health aides make an average of \$18,500 per year. These people are a critical part of our infrastructure, and they deserve tax relief too.

I could not agree more. People on this side of the aisle could not agree more. We have been fighting during these last several weeks to try to put back in the bill what the Republican leadership in the House removed from the bill in the dead of night, specifically this child tax credit for low-income workers, precisely because we understand the plight of these workers, and when we go back to our districts we hear from them when they say, you know, if you are going to give tax relief to people, we need it more than Donald Trump does, so why are you not helping us?

Again, there are prominent Members of the other body representing the Republican Party who get it, who are fighting to try to fix this problem right now; and yet here in this Chamber, in this House of Representatives, the leadership continues to try to find ways to deny these hard-working, tax-paying individuals, these families the benefit that they rightly deserve.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in case some colleagues are perhaps listening to the debate on television in their offices, we have brought forth the rule to consider the aviation reauthorization bill, the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Federal Aviation Administration is of extreme importance to the safety of not only the flying public in the United States, but really to the economy of the United States. One of the pillars of the economy of the United States is precisely the superb system of aviation that we have.

But that does not happen by chance. We have an obligation to fund and reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and this legislation that we are attempting to get to today with this rule not only does that, but deals with a number of very important collateral issues in the area of aviation.

So, again, to be clear with regard to what we are attempting to do today, what the Committee on Rules has done, we have passed a rule to bring to the floor legislation to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration in the context of very important legislation entitled Flight 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act. That is what we are discussing today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that the underlying bill that we are considering here today is important. Aviation and the safety of our skies and the strength of our airports, all that is very, very important.

We are also trying to do here, so if anybody is listening they will understand, we are also trying to be able to, in addition to helping the aviation industry and helping our airports and helping protect our airports, we are also trying to help protect a lot of American families, 12 million families, to be exact, some of them military families where servicemen and servicewomen are serving our country in Iraq. We want to make sure that they can benefit from the child tax credit.

We cannot seem to get the leadership of this House to allow us to be able to vote on this issue, up or down. We are trying to advocate for millions of families in this country who not only need help, who deserve help.

So part of what we are doing on this bill and what we have been doing on previous bills is to try to highlight this issue, helping to persuade, and, if not persuade, maybe shame you into doing the right thing.

I guess I will ask the question that the distinguished minority whip asked last week during this debate. Why is it that we cannot get a vote up or down to reinsert the child tax credit that your leadership removed in the middle of the night?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has laid out the case very effectively. The underlying bill here is critically important. The underlying bill also deals with airport workers whose interests are tied up with the child tax credit issue, as well, and the importance of doing what we said we were going to do.

It is not a question of bargaining for putting back what was rightfully the child tax credit to these 6.5 million families, to these 12 million children. That is the only issue that we were trying to address, very simply. It seems to me that what the Senate did is perfectly acceptable and it can be done. And I asked the question last week of the majority leader as well, will you accept the Senate language if it comes over here? The Senate language is here.

We can do this, we can move quickly, and we can do it without holding hostage 12 million children. It is just not quid pro quo. It is not, as I said earlier, for political advantage. It is about doing what is the right thing. That is all we are asking.

The President has said, do it. Take the Senate language; make it happen. When people of well-meaning in every part of the government, whether it is the House, the other body, the executive branch, want to come together to try to address these 12 million children, these 6.5 million families, who pay taxes, it would just seem to me that we could do it quickly in this body without any hesitation.

What we want to do is be able to provide the opportunity for these people to get the same benefit 25 million other people are going to get on July 1. Why should they not be the beneficiaries of a tax cut to allow them to put food on their table? It is easy. Let us get it done, and let us just try to take aside all of the extraneous matter.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Members should refrain from making improper references to the Senate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will provide that as soon as the House passes this rule it will take from the Speaker's table and immediately consider the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1308, which restores the refundable child tax credit that was removed from the recently passed Republican tax bill. This way we can send that bill immediately to the President's desk for his signature and start helping America's low- and modest-income families right away, right this second.

The President's press secretary, Ari Fleischer, said this week that "the President thinks at its core what the Senate has done is the right thing to do, a good thing to do, and he wants to sign it." I think we should give the President an opportunity to do just that.

H.R. 1308, as amended by the Senate, will provide immediate tax relief to America's hard-working families, in contrast to the Republican/Bush tax bill. That bill does next to nothing to help those low- and moderate-income Americans who need relief the most. In fact, in a late night negotiating session behind closed doors, the Republican leadership deleted the one provision that would have helped these Americans, the refundable child tax credit. When it came to a choice of helping their rich contributors or Americans struggling to make a living, they chose the rich. They stripped out this tax break that would have helped the families of 8 million children whose parents serve in the military or are veterans.

H.R. 1308, the bill amended and passed last week in the other body and sent back here, will give immediate help to working families by providing the child tax credit to 6.5 million low-income working families and nearly 12 million additional children. These families would receive an average annual increase of \$150 per child.

It will also help families of soldiers in combat in Iraq by extending the child tax credit to many of them. It was suggested by some on the other side of the aisle that this break for our brave men and women in the military was nothing more than welfare. Well, I strongly disagree.

I ask for a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 265—RULES ON H.R. 2115 FLIGHT 100—CENTURY OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

At the end of the resolution add the following:

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, in case somebody would like to determine what we have brought to the floor today, because obviously any students of political

science who may have been watching this debate will have confirmed today that there is certainly no rule requiring germaneness in debate in the House of Representatives, the issue that we have brought to the floor today, that the Committee on Rules passed a rule in order to be able to do so, we did so yesterday, is the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

In order to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, the relevant committees worked long and hard on a very important piece of aviation legislation which we bring to the floor today. It is H.R. 2115, the Flight 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act. So that is what we are doing.

Now, since there is obviously no germaneness requirement with regard to debate, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about other issues, and they are certainly welcome to do so. The semantic of the day had to do with the word "tax."

We are very proud of our record since we were honored by the American people with the majority in this Chamber with regard to the issue of taxes. I remember in my first term here, Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member, we were still in the minority and our friends on the other side of the aisle controlled the agenda, they were the majority, being faced with one of the largest tax increases in the history of this country. We on this side of the aisle opposed that tax increase, and our friends on the other side of the aisle pushed very hard, and at that time they had a Member of their party in the White House, to impose that record tax increase on the American people.

Every time we have been able to since we were given the majority by the American people, we have tried to do the opposite. We have tried to lessen the tax burden on the American people, and we are very proud of that.

So with regard to when it is germane to the debate on taxes, we are extremely proud of our record. That debate will continue, and I think it is a fundamental difference between the parties. We believe in and have every time we have been able to reduce the tax burden on the American people.

But today the debate that we bring forward, the legislation that we bring forward, is the important reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that because of the importance of the Federal Aviation Administration, not only to the flying public and to the aviation industry in this country, but to the economy of the United States, as well as to our national security, that we should move forward and reauthorize that very important Federal agency, as well as effectuate the other important programs and initiatives that are included in this very significant piece of legislation.

□ 1215

With that in mind, I remind our colleagues what we are doing, the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule, which does not allow consideration of several Democratic amendments. I submitted two amendments regarding Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), which is in my district, and neither was made in order.

The operator of LAX is proposing a major expansion project that would include the construction of a remote passenger check-in facility that would force all passengers to check-in and leave their baggage in the same location. This project could cost an estimated \$9 to \$10 billion. Supporters of this controversial project claim that it is necessary to protect public safety. Yet a RAND Corporation study concluded that this project will not improve public safety and could increase the likelihood of a terrorist attack by concentrating large number of people at the check-in facility.

I submitted an amendment to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed remote passenger check-in facility and determine whether it would, in fact, protect public safety. My amendment would have prohibited the construction of this project unless the Secretary of Homeland Security concluded that it would protect the safety of air passengers and the general public. I also submitted an amendment to ensure that taxpayer funds are not wasted on dubious LAX expansion projects like this one.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and allow me to offer my amendments to protect the American people from both threats to public safety and unnecessary and expansion airport construction projects.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 265, if ordered; and on the three motions to suspend the rules previously postponed, in the following order: H. Con. Res. 110; H.R. 1320; and H.R. 2350.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 195, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Bereuter	Boozman
Akin	Bilirakis	Bradley (NH)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Baker	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Ballenger	Blunt	Brown-Waite.
Barrett (SC)	Boehlert	Ginny
Bartlett (MD)	Boehner	Burgess
Barton (TX)	Bonilla	Burns
Bass	Bonner	Burr
Beauprez	Bono	Burton (IN)

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

NAYS—195

Abercrombie	Cooper	Harman
Ackerman	Costello	Hastings (FL)
Alexander	Cramer	Hill
Allen	Crowley	Hinchey
Andrews	Cummings	Hinojosa
Baca	Davis (AL)	Hoefel
Baird	Davis (CA)	Holden
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Holt
Ballance	Davis (TN)	Honda
Becerra	DeFazio	Hooley (OR)
Bell	DeGette	Hoyer
Berkley	Delahunt	Inslee
Berman	DeLauro	Israel
Berry	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	(TX)
Blumenauer	Dooley (CA)	Jefferson
Boswell	Doyle	John
Boucher	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Boyd	Engel	Jones (OH)
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Evans	Kaptur
Brown, Corrine	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Capps	Fattah	Kildee
Capuano	Filner	Kilpatrick
Cardin	Ford	Kind
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Kleczka
Carson (IN)	Frost	Kucinich
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Lampson
Case	Gordon	Langevin
Clay	Green (TX)	Lantos
Clyburn	Grijalva	Larsen (WA)
Conyers	Hall	Lee

Levin	Napolitano	Scott (VA)
Lewis (GA)	Neal (MA)	Serrano
Lipinski	Oberstar	Sherman
Lofgren	Obey	Skelton
Lowey	Olver	Slaughter
Lucas (KY)	Ortiz	Snyder
Lynch	Owens	Solis
Majette	Pallone	Stark
Maloney	Pascrell	Stenholm
Markey	Pastor	Strickland
Marshall	Payne	Stupak
Matheson	Pelosi	Tanner
Matsui	Peterson (MN)	Tauscher
McCarthy (MO)	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Rangel	Tierney
McGovern	Reyes	Towns
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Turner (TX)
McNulty	Ross	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Menendez	Ruppersberger	Velazquez
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Vislosky
Millender-	Sabo	Waters
McDonald	Sanchez, Linda	Watson
Miller (NC)	T.	Watt
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Mollohan	Sanders	Weiner
Moore	Sandlin	Wexler
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Murtha	Schiff	Wu
Nadler	Scott (GA)	Wynn

NOT VOTING—20

Biggert	Fossella	Rush
Crane	Gallely	Sessions
Cubin	Gephardt	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Gutiérrez	Smith (WA)
Deutsch	Kirk	Spratt
Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Weldon (PA)
Eshoo	Meehan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). There are 10 Members stuck in an elevator in Rayburn. We are waiting for them.

□ 1305

Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, the remainder of this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 370, noes 43, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—370

Abercrombie	Baca	Ballenger
Ackerman	Bachus	Barrett (SC)
Aderholt	Baird	Bartlett (MD)
Akin	Baker	Barton (TX)
Alexander	Baldwin	Bass
Allen	Ballance	Beauprez

Bereuter	Foley	Markey	Shaw	Sullivan	Velazquez	Baird	Dunn	Knollenberg
Berkley	Forbes	Marshall	Shays	Sweeney	Visclosky	Baker	Edwards	Kolbe
Berman	Frank (MA)	Matheson	Sherman	Tancredo	Vitter	Baldwin	Ehlers	Kucinich
Berry	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (MO)	Sherwood	Tanner	Walden (OR)	Ballance	Emerson	LaHood
Bilirakis	Frost	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus	Tauscher	Walsh	Engel	Lampson	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Shuster	Tauzin	Wamp	Barrett (SC)	English	Lantos
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	McCrery	Simmons	Taylor (MS)	Weiner	Bartlett (MD)	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Gibbons	McHugh	Simpson	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)	Barton (TX)	Evans	Latham
Blackburn	Gilchrest	McInnis	Skelton	Terry	Weller	Bass	Everett	LaTourette
Blumenauer	Gillmor	McIntyre	Smith (MI)	Thomas	Whitfield	Beauprez	Fattah	Leach
Blunt	Gingrey	McKeon	Smith (NJ)	Thompson (CA)	Wicker	Becerra	Feeney	Lee
Boehlert	Grijalva	McNulty	Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Wilson (NM)	Bell	Ferguson	Levin
Boehner	Goode	Meeks (NY)	Snyder	Tiaht	Wilson (SC)	Bereuter	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Bonilla	Goodlatte	Menendez	Solis	Tiberi	Wolf	Berkley	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Bonner	Gordon	Mica	Souder	Toomey	Wu	Berman	Fletcher	Lewis (KY)
Bono	Goss	Michaud	Stark	Turner (OH)	Wynn	Berry	Foley	Linder
Boozman	Granger	Millender-	Stearns	Turner (TX)	Young (AK)	Bilirakis	Forbes	Lipinski
Boswell	Graves	McDonald	Stenholm	Udall (CO)	Young (FL)	Bishop (GA)	Ford	LoBiondo
Boucher	Green (TX)	Miller (FL)	Strickland	Udall (NM)		Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Boyd	Green (WI)	Miller (MI)	Stupak	Upton		Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Lowey
Bradley (NH)	Greenwood	Miller (NC)				Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (KY)
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Miller, Gary				Blumenauer	Frost	Lucas (OK)
Brady (TX)	Gutknecht	Mollohan	Andrews	Lee	Sabo	Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch
Brown (OH)	Hall	Moore	Becerra	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin	Boehlert	Gerlach	Majette
Brown (SC)	Harman	Moran (KS)	Bell	Lofgren	Schiff	Boehner	Gibbons	Maloney
Brown, Corrine	Harris	Murphy	Conyers	Matsui	Slaughter	Bonilla	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Brown-Waite,	Hart	Murtha	Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (MS)	Bonner	Gillmor	Markey
Ginny	Hastings (FL)	Musgrave	Evans	McDermott	Tierney	Bono	Gingrey	Marshall
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Farr	McGovern	Towns	Boozman	Gonzalez	Matheson
Burns	Hayes	Nadler	Ford	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen	Boswell	Goode	Matsui
Burr	Hayworth	Napolitano	Hinche	Miller, George	Waters	Boucher	Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)
Burton (IN)	Hefley	Neal (MA)	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Watson	Boyd	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Buyer	Hensarling	Neugebauer	Jackson-Lee	Obey	Watt	Bradley (NH)	Goss	McCollum
Calvert	Herger	Ney	(TX)	Olver	Waxman	Brady (PA)	Granger	McCotter
Camp	Hill	Northup	Kildee	Owens	Wexler	Brady (TX)	Graves	McCery
Cannon	Hinojosa	Norwood	Kilpatrick	Rangel	Woolsey	Brown (OH)	Green (TX)	McDermott
Cantor	Hobson	Nunes	Kucinich	Rothman		Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	McGovern
Capito	Hoeffel	Nussle				Brown, Corrine	Greenwood	McHugh
Capps	Hoekstra	Oberstar	Biggart	Fossella	Meehan	Brown-Waite,	Grijalva	McInnis
Capuano	Holden	Ortiz	Crane	Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Ginny	Gutknecht	McIntyre
Cardin	Holt	Osborne	Cardoza	Gallegly	Rush	Burgess	Hall	Miller (MI)
Cardoza	Honda	Ose	Carson (IN)	Gephardt	Sessions	Burns	Hinchoy	Miller (NC)
Carson (IN)	Hooley (OR)	Otter	Carson (OK)	Gutierrez	Smith (WA)	Burr	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Carson (OK)	Hostettler	Oxley	Carter	Kirk	Spratt	Burton (IN)	Hobson	Miller, George
Carter	Houghton	Pallone	Case	Eshoo	Weldo (FL)	Buyer	Hoeffel	Mollohan
Case	Hoyer	Pascrell	Castle			Calvert	Hoekstra	Moore
Castle	Hulshof	Pastor	Chabot			Cannon	Holden	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hunter	Paul	Chocola			Cantor	Holt	Moran (VA)
Chocola	Hyde	Payne	Clay			Capito	Honda	Murphy
Clay	Inslee	Pearce	Clyburn			Capps	Hooley (OR)	Murtha
Clyburn	Isakson	Pelosi	Coble			Case	Hostettler	Musgrave
Coble	Israel	Pence	Cole			Cramer	Houghton	Myrick
Cole	Issa	Peterson (MN)	Collins			Crenshaw	Hoyer	Nadler
Collins	Istook	Peterson (PA)	Cooper			Castle	Hulshof	Napolitano
Cooper	Janklow	Petri	Costello			Chabot	Hunter	Neal (MA)
Costello	Jefferson	Pickering	Cox			Chocola	Hyde	Nethercutt
Cox	Jenkins	Pitts	Cramer			Clay	Inslee	Neugebauer
Cramer	John	Platts	Crenshaw			Clyburn	Isakson	Ney
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Pombo	Crowley			Coble	Israel	Northup
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Pomeroy	Culberson			Cole	Issa	Norwood
Culberson	Johnson, E. B.	Porter	Cummings			Collins	Istook	Nunes
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Portman	Cunningham			Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Cunningham	Johnson (NC)	Portman	Davis (AL)			Cooper	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)	Davis (CA)			Costello	(TX)	Obey
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Price (OH)	Davis (FL)			Cox	Janklow	Olver
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Putnam	DeLay			Cramer	Jefferson	Ortiz
Davis (TN)	Keller	Quinn	DeMint			Crenshaw	Jenkins	Osborne
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Radanovich	Diaz-Balart, L.			Crowley	John	Ose
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Rahall	Diaz-Balart, M.			Culberson	Johnson (CT)	Otter
Deal (GA)	Kennedy (RI)	Ramstad	Dicks			Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Owens
DeFazio	Kind	Regula	Dingell			Cunningham	Johnson, E. B.	Oxley
DeGette	King (IA)	Rehberg	Dooley (CA)			Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
DeLahunt	King (NY)	Renzi	Doolittle			Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Pascrell
DeLauro	Kingston	Reyes	Dreier			Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Pastor
DeLay	Kleczka	Reynolds	Duncan			DeFazio	Kanjorski	Paul
DeMint	Kline	Rodriguez	Dunn			DeGette	Kaptur	Payne
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)	Edwards			Delahunt	Keller	Pearce
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kolbe	Rogers (KY)	Ehlers			DeLauro	Kelly	Pelosi
Dicks	LaHood	Rogers (MI)	Emerson			DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Pence
Dingell	Lampson	Rohrabacher	Engel			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Dooley (CA)	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen	English			Dicks	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
Doolittle	Lantos	Ross	Etheridge			Dingell	Kilpatrick	Petri
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	Everett			Doggett	Kind	Pickering
Dreier	Latham	Royce	Fattah			Dooley (CA)	King (IA)	Pitts
Duncan	LaTourette	Ruppersberger	Feeney			Doolittle	King (NY)	Platts
Dunn	Leach	Ryan (OH)	Ferguson			Doyle	Kingston	Pombo
Edwards	Levin	Ryan (WI)	Filner			Dreier	Kleczka	Pomeroy
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Ryun (KS)	Flake			Duncan	Kline	Porter
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez, Linda	Fletcher					
Engel	Linder	T.						
English	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta						
Etheridge	LoBiondo	Sanders						
Everett	Lowey	Saxton						
Fattah	Lucas (KY)	Schakowsky						
Feeney	Lucas (OK)	Schrock						
Ferguson	Lynch	Scott (GA)						
Filner	Majette	Scott (VA)						
Flake	Maloney	Sensenbrenner						
Fletcher	Manzullo	Serrano						
		Shadegg						

NOES—43

NOT VOTING—21

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1313

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.

RECOGNIZING SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE OF SEQUENCING OF HUMAN GENOME AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR GOALS AND IDEALS OF HUMAN GENOME MONTH AND DNA DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 110.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 110, 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 414, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Akin	Andrews
Ackerman	Alexander	Baca
Aderholt	Allen	Bachus