

Bentsen	Green (WI)	Murtha	Traficant	Wamp	Wicker
Bereuter	Greenwood	Myrick	Turner	Watkins	Wilson
Berman	Grucci	Napolitano	Udall (NM)	Watt (NC)	Wolf
Biggert	Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Upton	Watts (OK)	Wu
Billirakis	Hall (TX)	Ney	Velazquez	Waxman	Wynn
Bishop	Hansen	Northup	Visclosky	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)
Blagojevich	Harman	Norwood	Vitter	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Blumenauer	Hart	Nussle	Walden	Weller	
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Ortiz	Walsh	Whitfield	
Boehlert	Hayes	Osborne			
Boehner	Hayworth	Ose			
Bonilla	Hefley	Otter	Ackerman	Johnson, E.B.	Sanders
Bono	Herger	Oxley	Becerra	Jones (OH)	Scarborough
Borski	Hilleary	Pallone	Brown (FL)	Moakley	Scott
Boswell	Hinchey	Pascarell	Cannon	Moakley	Shays
Boucher	Hinojosa	Pastor	Dooley	Owens	Sisisky
Boyd	Hobson	Paul	Doyle	Pickering	Toomey
Brady (PA)	Hoeffel	Pence	Edwards	Portman	Wexler
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Gekas	Putnam	
Brown (OH)	Holden	Petri	Gordon	Rothman	
Brown (SC)	Holt	Phelps			
Bryant	Honda	Pitts			
Burr	Hooley	Platts			
Burton	Horn	Pombo			
Buyer	Hostettler	Pomeroy			
Callahan	Houghton	Pryce (OH)			
Calvert	Hoyer	Quinn			
Camp	Hulshof	Radanovich			
Cantor	Hunter	Rahall			
Capito	Hutchinson	Ramstad			
Cardin	Hyde	Rangel			
Castle	Isakson	Regula			
Chabot	Issa	Rehberg			
Chambliss	Istook	Reyes			
Clement	Jackson (IL)	Reynolds			
Coble	Jenkins	Riley			
Collins	John	Rivers			
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Rodriguez			
Cooksey	Johnson (IL)	Roemer			
Costello	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)			
Cox	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)			
Cramer	Kaptur	Rohrabacher			
Crane	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen			
Crenshaw	Kelly	Ross			
Cubin	Kennedy (MN)	Roukema			
Culberson	Kerns	Royce			
Cummings	Kildee	Rush			
Cunningham	Kind (WI)	Ryan (WI)			
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Ryan (KS)			
Davis (FL)	Kingston	Sabo			
Davis (IL)	Kirk	Sanchez			
Davis, Jo Ann	Klecicka	Sawyer			
Davis, Tom	Knollenberg	Saxton			
Deal	Kolbe	Schaffer			
DeGette	Kucinich	Schiff			
DeLauro	LaHood	Schrock			
DeLay	Lantos	Sensenbrenner			
DeMint	Largent	Serrano			
Deutsch	Larsen (WA)	Sessions			
Diaz-Balart	Larson (CT)	Shadegg			
Dicks	Latham	Shaw			
Dingell	LaTourette	Sherman			
Doggett	Leach	Sherwood			
Doolittle	Levin	Shimkus			
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Shows			
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Simmons			
Dunn	Linder	Simpson			
Ehlers	Lipinski	Skeen			
Ehrlich	LoBiondo	Skelton			
Emerson	Lofgren	Smith (MI)			
Engel	Lucas (KY)	Smith (NJ)			
English	Lucas (OK)	Smith (TX)			
Eshoo	Luther	Smith (WA)			
Etheridge	Maloney (CT)	Snyder			
Evans	Maloney (NY)	Solis			
Everett	Manzullo	Souder			
Farr	Markey	Spence			
Fattah	Mascara	Spratt			
Ferguson	Matheson	Stearns			
Flake	McCarthy (MO)	Stenholm			
Fletcher	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland			
Foley	McCollum	Stump			
Ford	McCrery	Sununu			
Fossella	McHugh	Sweeney			
Frelinghuysen	McInnis	Tancredo			
Frost	McKeon	Tanner			
Gallely	McKinney	Tauzin			
Ganske	Meehan	Taylor (MS)			
Gibbons	Meeks (NY)	Taylor (NC)			
Gilchrest	Menendez	Terry			
Gillmor	Mica	Thomas			
Gilman	Millender-	Thompson (CA)			
Goode	McDonald	Thompson (MS)			
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Thornberry			
Goss	Miller, Gary	Thune			
Graham	Mollohan	Thurman			
Granger	Moore	Tiahrt			
Graves	Moran (KS)	Tiberi			
Green (TX)	Moran (VA)	Tierney			

## NOT VOTING—25

□ 1103

Messrs. GRUCCI, TERRY, BILLIRAKIS, AKIN, CAMP, BONILLA, STUMP, JOHN, BRADY of Texas, TOM DAVIS of Virginia, PAUL, and ROSS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MATSUI, CROWLEY, and INSLEE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 247, TORNADO SHELTERS ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time on this open rule.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have three speakers on this side.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest features of a deliberative body is adherence to the ordinary process unless there are extraordinary reasons. We have a process for the consideration of legislation. We have committees. We have subcommittees. We have hearings.

We have rules that a subcommittee should have a hearing and report a bill out or the committee should have the hearing; but in all events, committees should report a bill out. That is so that bills can be considered, deliberated, different people could be heard from whose perspectives one might never anticipate so that amendments could be offered to deal with difficulties that are perceived only during that process.

Now, I am not saying that that must be an ironclad process at all times. I am not saying that there cannot be exceptions because of exceptional circumstances.

But on this particular bill, the first I heard of it was last week when it was scheduled without my knowledge whatsoever for the Suspension Calendar. I communicated with Members of the

leadership on the committee; and I said, Look, we cannot do this. We have not had any hearings whatsoever. We have not had any discussion. Let us pull the bill off, let us have some opportunity to discuss it, and we can take it up in a few weeks or so, unless there is some compelling reason, some compelling urgency.

That was my understanding of what the process was going to be. I was flabbergasted when I found out this week that it was still coming to the floor of the House without hearings, without committee deliberation, without the ability to offer amendments, but most of all, without any consultation with either me or the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member of the relevant subcommittee.

That means something. That means no respect either. That means no collegiality. That is not the way for the new Committee on Financial Services to start out this Congress. That is not the best way to bring up the first bill from the Committee on Financial Services, as if the minority Members, the Democrats, do not exist; and if they do exist, their rights are non-existent.

It is not the bill so much, but it is this very offensive process. I do not want to unduly delay the deliberations of the body today. I am sensitive to the personal needs and times of the Members. But somehow we must be able to make this point. We do not want this to happen again. We want collegiality. We want bipartisanship. We have experienced it in the past. We expect it as Members of this body.

Now, with respect to the particular bill, it has a laudable goal; and I hope that I can wind up supporting it. I would like to. I have nothing but the highest regard for the sponsor of the bill. We have worked together on so many different causes over the years, particularly Third World debt. But, I really do not know the urgency. I suspect the Senate is not going to consider this until September. I could be wrong. But that means we do have some latitude of time.

Further, this deals with an amendment to the Community Development Block Grant program. Now, if we are going to deal with an amendment to the Community Development Block Grant program, I think that there are a number of things that we should consider.

First of all, if we are only going to make eligible shelters for tornados and storms, there is some technical issues that should have been considered not on the floor of the House, but in subcommittee. For example, should we really give public monies to private for-profit entities to use? That is a serious issue. We ought to talk about that, deliberate about it.

Secondly, if we are going to use community development moneys, should we have income-targeting provisions? That is a serious issue that should have been dealt with in subcommittee rather than taking up the time of the floor.

Third, should there be a nonexclusivity clause with respect to the use of the shelters? By that, I mean should the shelter be open to the public, because a good many of these shelters would not be.

There are a host of other issues, too, that should have been brought up in connection with this bill.

So I just want the minority Members to understand, I do not want to make the biggest case in the world out of this, but all Democrats, despite the fact that we are in the minority, demand respect. Respect means that one must recognize and maintain our rights rather than trample on them. This should not happen again.

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

Mr. Speaker, I assure our friends on the other side of the aisle that we mean no disrespect; that, quite on the contrary, we have great respect for their points of view as well as the fine work that they do on a daily basis.

We take note of the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE). All legislative bodies must balance, must balance a series of factors; and one factor, one such factor that is balanced in the equation is the need to proceed with important legislation. It is that factor that in our view outweighed other factors and today made us proceed, made the Committee on Rules come to the decision to proceed.

Now, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has worked long and hard, and I was pleased to see that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) recognized and commended his leadership as well on this issue of public safety. That is why we believe that it is important to move forward.

In addition, we have, Mr. Speaker, another guarantee built in so that the minority will be respected in this process, cognizant as we are of the arguments made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE); and that is that the rule that we have brought forward is an open rule so that at least at this stage, the stage of the plenary consideration of the legislation, any Member can introduce and have considered any amendment to improve this important legislation.

So in that sense, we feel that, having taken notice of the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), we nonetheless are providing a mechanism and a vehicle for and of intrinsic fairness, which is the vehicle of an open rule and which I think that all of the Members should support as the goal for the functioning of this House whenever possible.

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

□ 1115

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rule here today, and I hope that Congress is listening because if you listen very carefully, you will find out that you do not like this resolution, and you do not like this bill, and this is not the way the House should be operating and each of you should be aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, why are we ignoring the regular order? Why is it so important that it is brought to the floor without having the scrutiny of anyone. Tell me why. Is it urgent or is it an attempt to confuse or snooker? Is it an attempt to bring something to the floor that is needed by someone, and someone that will perhaps benefit from this piece of legislation? It looks like a relief act to me for somebody. Please look at this piece of legislation; and when you look at it, you will not like it because what it is doing is bringing to the floor a bill that would make a significant change in the Community Development Block Grant program.

Mr. Speaker, every time a bill like this comes to the floor, I come forward to speak against it because it is just another way of using the Community Development Block Grant funds to subvert general revenue funds and funds that should be used from that particular area.

All of us know that we can improve our bills more by sending them to committee. The gentleman spoke about an open rule. An open rule is fine, but it does not give the kind of substantive look and scrutiny that a committee can give, and we have a very strong committee to look at this.

President Bush talked about bipartisanship, and just a few weeks ago we went on a retreat where we talked about bipartisanship and respect. We talked about comity. You know what this particular process that they are using does, it undermines the bipartisan way we do things. It undermines the respect we have for each other. It undermines every tenet of bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, there are several issues raised by the bill which I disagree with, but the committee has not had a chance to look at it. If we adopt this proposed rule and consider this bill, you could fund tornado shelters at mobile home sites which do not even have low-income or moderate-income residents.

You could take that money and help some of the low- and moderate-income people in your community build homes or get jobs, but if you do this, which is within the law, you could do this, but if you did it, you would be taking the funds away from people who really need it.

Secondly, if you do this, some contractor or developer could build these shelters around their property using government funds; and when this is all over, that shelter belongs to that developer or property owner; and when someone in your district who might need a home, a moderate-income per-

son, and you know how hard it is to get affordable housing in this country, you know how hard it is to get a house.

Mr. Speaker, nonetheless, I would have a hard time supporting this particular rule, and the bill as well, because I feel very deeply about the Community Development Block Grant program, and I have seen several runs on these funds. Each of you who have a pet project that you want, you come to the floor and make a run on the Community Development Block Grant funds. This was really a very bad way of doing it, and I think you should rethink this and go back to the bill and let them look at it. Go back to the committee and let them look at what you are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, Congress intended for these funds to be used for a distinct purpose. It did not mean for you to come to the floor with an emergency all of a sudden, look, here is a pile of money, let us use this for that emergency. Congress intended for you to take these moneys and help low- and moderate-income people. So this is inconsistent. It is very inconsistent with the core principle of Community Development Block Grant funds.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you, but I hope my colleagues who brought this to the floor will reconsider it because it does not lead to the kind of thing that we preach here in the Congress.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 23 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the author of this important legislation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I think we have been asked a fair question here. Is this an attempt to snooker? Is this an attempt to deceive? No, it is an attempt to do neither. It is an attempt to save lives. It is an attempt to quit treating people who live in mobile home parks as second-class citizens under the HUD regulations.

The program director at HUD for shelter programs, for storm mitigation, is the one that suggested this language to us. My county, which was hit by a tornado, 12 people, 10 of them in a mobile home, and during the main debate on the floor I will show you a picture of one of the young victims. She was alive being carried from her manufactured home. Her father and her 16-month-old baby were not as fortunate. They died.

Mr. Speaker, when the county approached the government and asked for Community Development Block Grant funds, they were told that mobile home sites do not qualify. Clearly that is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, never consulted we are told. In fact, the committee had extensive talks with committee staff on the other side. I talked to one Democratic staffer myself. He asked, Do we need

this. I told him what our answer had been. He called the program director. He got the same answer. He called me back and said, You are right.

Currently manufactured housing communities, mobile homes, are excluded from these grants. Low-income site-built homes qualify. Apartment buildings qualify. And not only that, but a \$500,000 site-built home, permanent home, qualifies for a grant from FEMA to build a safe room, but a mobile home does not qualify for a safe room because it does not have an interior hall, it does not have a room that does not have a window facing the outside. These shelters are, in certain cases, as the gentlewoman from Florida has said, going to be sited on mobile home parks; and the owners of those parks are going to be making money. It is a for-profit mobile home park. But I can tell my colleague that though it is going to turn a profit for the mobile home park operator, it is going to be a safe shelter in a storm for the people that live in those mobile homes, and this arcane argument is not going to sell with them.

Let me tell my colleagues something. This is an idea whose time has come. I have talked to at least 100 mobile home residents since this bill has received the endorsement of every major paper in Alabama, and they tell me about getting a warning that in 25 or 30 minutes a tornado is going to bear down on their home and they plot it there and they watch the TV as it bears down on them, as people say get in the basement, get inside, get in an interior hallway if you do not have a basement, and yet they have to sit there and listen to the warning and not heed that warning.

This is not my idea. This is the idea of a county that lost 12 people. It was their idea. They came to me. They went to the Federal Government. So did a community in Missouri. Both those communities were told they did not qualify.

Now, it will not be my decision and it will not be the decision of the gentlewoman from Florida as to whether this money will be spent. It will be the local community. There are no mandates; there are no restrictions. The local community, a city, a county, can go to a mobile home park and they can build a shelter, which may be beside or between two or three. In fact, both the gentlewoman from Florida and I would agree when we say mobile home park operators, sometimes we are talking about a widow who has seven trailers on an acre lot and who wants to build a shelter for 15 people there.

Now, the fatality that I will show my colleagues, the so-called mobile home park this little girl was, was a half acre lot with four trailers on it owned by a relative. We believe that the little girl, and her brother and father, the two which are dead right now, we believe they ought to have the same right as someone living in a \$400,000 house to go to the government and get assistance

for shelter. Anyone today can qualify for a safe room in their house. They can get \$2,000 to reinforce a room. But mobile home residents cannot.

Tornadoes do not make distinctions between site-built homes and manufactured homes. Neither should we. And this is of the essence. It is of the essence because I lost 41 citizens to a tornado 3 years ago and I lost 12 this past fall and it is past time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the gentleman from Alabama would suggest that we were trying to delay this. The majority has been in control of this Congress last year; this year. This could have been brought to our subcommittee and our committee at any time. No one is trying to delay this. The suggestion that the orderly process of subcommittee and committee is somehow a delay is nonsense.

Let us talk about why this bill is really up today. We ought to keep to an unavoidable minimum the times when people say things that are unlikely to be believed. We are not here because we expect a tornado tomorrow. If in fact this was important, we could have had the hearing last week, 2 weeks ago. This bill could have been on the floor today after a subcommittee and committee process.

We offered that to the gentleman from Alabama. Indeed, to his credit when I talked to him on Monday and said we just have a couple of questions about the bill, he said, let us pull it. But he was overruled by his leadership. Why? Because last night the Republican schedule called for the budget to be voted out, and today the Republican schedule calls for a vote on taxes. Now, we are not working very hard on anything that is not part of the President's agenda. Apparently, we are on the limited attention span approach. The people can only keep track of one or two things at a time, so let us only do one or two things at a time.

The problem is that when we finished this hard-working Congress' business yesterday, at about noon, maybe it was 1 o'clock, I should not exaggerate, Members would have left. There was nothing to keep them for the week. And the Republican leadership was afraid they would not have the quorum they needed to put through the budget last night and to put through the tax bill today. So that is why this bill is on the floor today and everybody knows that, despite what they say.

Of course, it is important for us to provide help, but there is another issue I want to raise. If it so important to provide help, as I believe it is to these people living in the mobile home parks, why are we doing it without adding a penny to the pot from which it comes? That is part of the problem the gentlewoman from Florida and I have. We are expanding more and more the purposes of CDBG while providing CDBG with

less and less. The whole Community Development Block Grant money now, thanks to the other party, has less money in its authorization and appropriation than it had years ago.

I would love to do this, but I would like to do it with an expansion of the money so that protecting these people who ought to be protected does not come at the expense of other important purposes.

And then there is one substantive question. This bill does not just say cover manufactured housing, which is a very important resource for low-income people in order to be better protected than they are, it says that the entity getting the Federal funds can give them to a for-profit entity, who presumably could then own the shelter.

□ 1130

The gentleman from Alabama conjured up the favorite device here, the ubiquitous poor widow. I sometimes think that poor widows must own about 97 percent of America, given the frequency with which they are the justification for various grants of money to private owners.

If in fact we are talking about providing special assistance to lower income owners, let us put that in the bill. That is why you have subcommittees. That is why you have committees. That is why you legislate. But, as I read this bill, nothing would prevent a community from helping to build a shelter for a wealthy owner of second-home manufactured housing which could then be part of that property and sold. Maybe I am wrong, and maybe that is not the case. I do not know that because we have not had a chance to discuss it in the kind of forum we ought to have. That is the issue here.

For scheduling purposes, the Republican leadership took a bill that should not have been controversial, that has got a very laudable goal, as the gentleman from Alabama points out, and that could have been refined in subcommittee and committee.

I have to say one other thing that bothers me and the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentleman from New York. They would not do this to a banking bill. They would not do this to the securities industry. Community Development Block Grants is a disfavored program under this congressional regime. It is about poor people's needs, and poor people's needs are not often given that same consideration.

It is not an accident that the committee that used to be the Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs is now just the Committee on Financial Services. Not only did the title disappear but so did some of the concerns. We have real concerns about the ability of the CDBG program to meet all of its needs. When you continually add in new functions and do not give it any money but in fact reduce money, you cause stresses.

The goal of providing shelters for people in manufactured housing is

wholly noncontroversial, and we would be glad to work on it. We would have been glad to work on it a month ago. This bill could have been brought up before that. We had a hearing in the subcommittee on the FHA. It was a very good hearing that the Chair called. I was glad that she did. But we could have used that time for this.

I should say, by the way, it does not occur to me that this decision was made anywhere but at the Republican leadership. I do not think we have an intracommittee problem here. We have a problem that the Republican leadership had a need to keep the Members here. They could not ground the planes and they could not force people to stay, so they put a bill on the floor. That is our method of house arrest. That is what we have got. It is a shame that this bill is being used for that purpose.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this is obviously not an issue simply for Alabama and Florida. I want to say that, believe it or not, we had tornadoes in southern California 2 years ago where the roofs came off of parks in one of my cities, Paramount, where there is any number of parks there where people have moved out of their homes and lived in a much smaller level than they did when they were in those homes. But their houses are now gone.

This can happen in any particular State in this Union. Rather than argue over subcommittee, full committee and all that, it seems to me we are big enough to solve it in this Chamber. Those are simply tools of the House on some things. This is very clear, the use of Community Development Block Grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks. That is what a lot of home parks are nowadays. I think a lot of us in this Chamber have fought for the rights of people in those parks.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his kindness at the beginning of the debate in taking some time. We were surprised how fast this came up for a debate. He gave us some time to get over here and be prepared. We thank him very much.

They have heard our concerns. They are credible. We hope that they listened to them. We do not like to have our rights trampled upon.

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

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

I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kindness and, quite frankly, all of our friends on the other side of the aisle who have brought forth concerns which we note. But, as I stated before, in the balancing of interests before the Congress and in fact

when we are dealing with the most instantly devastating natural disaster conceivable, we have brought forth in a very rapid fashion legislation to the floor of this House with an open rule that will save lives.

So for that fundamental reason, this legislation, which is a local option legislation, which does not force local communities to do anything but does provide the option for local communities to take steps to save lives, we believe that it is important to bring it forth. We believe that it is important to bring it forth rapidly, and in rapid fashion we are dealing with the most dangerous, instantly devastating natural disaster, which is the tornado.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) once again for his leadership on this issue.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support not only the underlying legislation but the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. 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, the Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes the time for electronic voting on motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 1099 and H.R. 802 following the vote on House Resolution 93.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 169, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—246

Aderholt	Collins	Gibbons
Akin	Combest	Gilchrest
Army	Cooksey	Gillmor
Bachus	Cox	Gilman
Baker	Cramer	Goode
Ballenger	Crane	Goodlatte
Barcia	Crenshaw	Goss
Barr	Cubin	Graham
Bartlett	Cuberson	Granger
Barton	Cunningham	Graves
Bass	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Davis, Tom	Green (WI)
Berry	Deal	Greenwood
Biggart	DeLay	Grucci
Bilirakis	DeMint	Gutknecht
Boehler	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Boehner	Dicks	Hansen
Bonilla	Doolittle	Hart
Bono	Dreier	Hastings (WA)
Boswell	Duncan	Hayes
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hayworth
Brown (SC)	Ehlers	Hefley
Bryant	Ehrlich	Herger
Burr	Emerson	Hilleary
Burton	English	Hobson
Buyer	Eshoo	Hoefel
Callahan	Everett	Hoekstra
Calvert	Ferguson	Horn
Camp	Flake	Hostettler
Cantor	Fletcher	Houghton
Capito	Foley	Hulshof
Cardin	Fossella	Hunter
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Hutchinson
Chabot	Gallegly	Hyde
Chambliss	Ganske	Isakson
Coble	Gekas	Issa

Istook	Northup	Shays
Jenkins	Norwood	Sherwood
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Shimkus
Johnson (IL)	Ortiz	Simmons
Johnson, Sam	Osborne	Simpson
Jones (NC)	Ose	Skeen
Kaptur	Otter	Skelton
Keller	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Kelly	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (MN)	Pence	Smith (TX)
Kerns	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Kingston	Petri	Spence
Kirk	Pickering	Stearns
Knollenberg	Pitts	Strickland
Kolbe	Platts	Stump
LaHood	Pombo	Sununu
Lampson	Pomeroy	Sweeney
Largent	Pryce (OH)	Tancredo
Latham	Putnam	Tauzin
LaTourette	Quinn	Taylor (NC)
Leach	Radanovich	Terry
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Thornberry
Linder	Rehberg	Thune
LoBiondo	Reynolds	Tiahrt
Lucas (KY)	Riley	Tiberi
Lucas (OK)	Rodriguez	Trafficant
Luther	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Maloney (CT)	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Vitter
Matheson	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
McCarthy (NY)	Ross	Walsh
McCollum	Roukema	Wamp
McCrery	Royce	Watkins
McHugh	Ryan (WI)	Watts (OK)
McInnis	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Sandlin	Weldon (PA)
McKinney	Saxton	Weller
Mica	Schaffer	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Schroek	Wilson
Moore	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Moran (KS)	Sessions	Wu
Nethercutt	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Ney	Shaw	Young (FL)

NAYS—169

Abercrombie	Filmer	McIntyre
Allen	Ford	McNulty
Andrews	Frank	Meehan
Baca	Frost	Meek (FL)
Baird	Gephardt	Meeks (NY)
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Menendez
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Millender
Barrett	Hall (TX)	McDonald
Bentsen	Harman	Miller, George
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Berman	Hill	Mollohan
Bishop	Hilliard	Moran (VA)
Blagojevich	Hinchey	Murtha
Blumener	Hinojosa	Nadler
Bonior	Holden	Napolitano
Borski	Holt	Neal
Boucher	Honda	Oberstar
Boyd	Hoolley	Obey
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Olver
Brown (OH)	Insole	Owens
Capps	Israel	Pallone
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Carson (OK)	(TX)	Payne
Clay	Jefferson	Pelosi
Clayton	John	Phelps
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Conyers	Kildee	Rangel
Costello	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Crowley	Klecicka	Roemer
Cummings	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	LaFalce	Rush
Davis (FL)	Langevin	Sabo
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Sanchez
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sanders
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sawyer
Delahunt	Lee	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Levin	Scott
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Dingell	Lipinski	Sherman
Doggett	Lofgren	Shows
Dooley	Lowey	Slaughter
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Markey	Solis
Engel	Mascara	Spratt
Etheridge	Matsui	Stark
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Stenholm
Farr	McDermott	Stupak
Fattah	McGovern	Tanner

Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Tierney

Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Waters

Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman  
Becerra  
Blunt  
Brown (FL)  
Cannon  
Clement

Gordon  
Johnson, E.B.  
Jones (OH)  
Moakley  
Morella  
Myrick

Portman  
Rothman  
Scarborough  
Sisisky  
Toomey

□ 1201

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BALDACCIO and Mr. HILLIARD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for electronic voting on motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 1099 and H.R. 802.

COAST GUARD PERSONNEL AND MARITIME SAFETY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1099.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1099, 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 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt

Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss

Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt

DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hillhard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Insee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam

Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Nethers  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul

Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns

Trafigant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh

Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller

Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman  
Becerra  
Brown (FL)  
Cannon  
Etheridge  
Gordon

Horn  
Istook  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Moakley  
Morella

Portman  
Rothman  
Scarborough  
Sisisky  
Toomey

□ 1212

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 802, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 802, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham

Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Ford