

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit a legislative proposal to establish the Millennium Challenge Account and the Millennium Challenge Corporation. Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

The Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) represents a new approach to providing and delivering development assistance. This new compact for development breaks with the past by tying increased assistance to performance and creating new accountability for all nations. This proposal implements my commitment to increase current levels of core development assistance by 50 percent over the next 3 years, thus providing an annual increase of \$5 billion by fiscal year 2006. To be eligible for this new assistance, countries must demonstrate commitment to three standards—ruling justly, investing in their people, and encouraging economic freedom. Given this commitment, and the link between financial accountability and development success, special attention will be given to fighting corruption.

The goal of the Millennium Challenge Account initiative is to reduce poverty by significantly increasing economic growth in recipient countries through a variety of targeted investments. The MCA will be administered by a new, small Government corporation, called the Millennium Challenge Corporation, designed to support innovative strategies and to ensure accountability for measurable results. The Corporation will be supervised by a Board of Directors chaired by the Secretary of State and composed of other Cabinet-level officials. The Corporation will be led by a Chief Executive Officer appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This proposal provides the Corporation with flexible authorities to optimize program implementation, contracting, and personnel selection while pursuing innovative strategies.

The Millennium Challenge Account initiative recognizes the need for country ownership, financial oversight, and accountability for results to ensure effective assistance. We cannot accept permanent poverty in a world of progress. The MCA will provide people in developing nations the tools they need to seize the opportunities of the global economy. I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2003.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY ON SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-38)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together

with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Agreement Between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Norway on Social Security, with a related administrative agreement, both signed at Oslo on November 30, 2001. This revised Agreement is intended to modify certain provisions of the original United States and Norwegian Agreement, which was signed in Washington on January 13, 1983, and, upon its entry into force, will replace the 1983 Agreement.

The revised United States-Norwegian Agreement is similar in objective to the other social security agreements already in force with Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Korea, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries. The revised United States-Norwegian Agreement contains all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions, which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4).

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the principal agreement and the administrative agreement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, a report on the effect of the Agreement on income and expenditures of the United States Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-Norwegian Social Security Agreement and related documents.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2003.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1803

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 18, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time, without intervention of any point of order, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 18) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes; the joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment; the joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 18, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 18) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 18 is as follows:
H.J. RES. 18

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-229 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "February 20, 2003".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House, H.J. Res. 18, will extend the current CR and allow the government to continue to operate until February 20, 2003. I think all Members know that we are currently working to conclude the conference agreement for an omnibus appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003. It is our hope that we are finally reaching a point in this process where we can look forward to having a vote on that conference report.

It is our plan to meet in formal conference on Monday evening, to conclude that conference as soon as possible, and to have this conference report before the House either Tuesday or Wednesday. We do hope to conclude fiscal year 2003 business. It has been a long time coming. There have been a lot of reasons why the fiscal year 2003 bills have not reached conclusion, but I will tell Members that the Committee on Appropriations in the House reported all of our bills except two which we introduced directly to the floor. I would stand in strong support and commendation of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle because, as a committee, we did our job.

There were other obstacles placed in our path as we moved along the process. Hopefully, we have overcome those, and we are now deciding how to settle the differences between the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be interesting for Members to see this. This is not a copy of the bill. This in small, fine print is merely a copy of thousands of differences between the House and the Senate that we have been working with diligently for the last couple of weeks. I hope that we can expedite this process.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth continuing resolution to come before this body necessitated by the fact that we are now in the fifth month of the new fiscal year and still do not have a budget. We have not provided the funds that should be provided for homeland security. The Congress has not provided the funds that should be provided for first responders, for education, to deal with some Medicare and Medicaid problems, and there are many other concerns as well associated with the late action of the Congress on the appropriation bills.

None of that fault lies with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has tried his dead level best to bring appropriations bills to the floor in a timely fashion. He has been shut off by decisions made at a higher pay grade. At this point, this House has no choice except to once again extend the continuing resolution.

But there are, nonetheless, some items which I think are necessary to take action on because time is running

out. The clock is running on a number of crucial problems. For that reason, and I will take the time to explain it now so I do not have to do it twice in the interest of saving time. For that reason, at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit which instructs the Committee on Appropriations to report back an amended version of the continuing resolution that adds two urgent provisions related to payment rates for medical services to Medicare patients.

The existing continuing resolution already contains several provisions relating to entitlement benefits, including extensions of the Transitional Assistance to Needy Families program, TANF, and the transitional Medicaid benefits program. This motion simply adds two more time-sensitive items relating to Medicare.

First, the motion calls for continuation of Medicare payment rates for doctors at the current level, thereby suspending the 4.4 percent cut now scheduled to take place on March 1.

There has already been a 5.4 percent cut in Medicare payments to doctors that took effect in January, 2002. These payment cuts make it difficult for doctors to meet their expenses and can only make it harder for Medicare patients to find a doctor willing to treat them. The problem is especially acute in rural areas which are already suffering from shortages of doctors and other health care providers.

Second, the motion would take a first step toward redressing the imbalances in the Medicare payments rate that right now puts rural hospitals at a serious disadvantage. Under current law, hospitals in large urban areas receive a base payment rate that is higher than the rate for all other hospitals. The Medicare Payments Advisory Commission has recommended eliminating this differential, noting that Medicare operating margins for rural hospitals are now substantially lower than for large urban hospitals. That just confirms what many of us have been hearing back home, that most rural hospitals are facing serious financial difficulty that jeopardizes their ability to provide quality care.

This motion calls for raising base payment rates for rural and small city hospitals up to the rate for large urban areas. These two provisions are just first steps toward redressing imbalances in Medicare payment rates. Congress needs to overhaul the faulty formulas that led to the steep cuts in payment rates and to address a range of issues that place rural areas and many States at a disadvantage. But to gain time for the appropriate committees and the Congress to deal with these broader issues, we need immediate fixes to the immediate problem. That is what this motion seeks to do.

Both of these items in the motion are also included in the Senate-passed omnibus appropriations package that is now in conference, the conference to which the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

YOUNG) just referred. Hopefully, a conference agreement on that measure will be finished quickly and with these items included. But we should also include these measures in the continuing resolution as a backup, which is what this motion would do.

Furthermore, adoption of this motion would also send a strong signal to House conferees on the omnibus appropriations package and to the House leadership regarding the sentiment of the House on the urgent need to fix Medicare payment rates. Even though the 4.4 percent cut in Medicare physician payments is just weeks away, the House has done nothing effective to forestall that cut. The problem is urgent. The House needs to act now. That is what this motion will attempt to do.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing this bipartisan motion to recommit and giving us all an opportunity to correct some technical problems in Medicare that both parties have agreed to.

The physician payments were cut last year; and if nothing is done, they will be cut again. There is absolute agreement between the administration and those of us on the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means that that was an error in the calculation formula and it must be fixed. There has been a great deal of gamesmanship over this area, but I think it is time to take care of it.

The Senate in its omnibus funding bill increased the Medicare payments for physicians and rural hospitals. This provision for physicians is temporary but would be in effect for the rest of this year.

□ 1815

I do not normally favor, much less encourage, legislating Medicare provisions in an appropriations bill; but it is clear that this is the only way to get this done in a timely fashion. The Senate has passed these provisions. And so it clearly need not hold up the CR. A few hours ago, in a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means, when asked whether the President supports the Senate-passed physician fix, OMB Director Daniels testified that he did. In fact, he said yesterday that the President would support any number of measures to fix it.

I realize that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means may not be happy with this, but the Committee on Ways and Means has looked the other way when the leadership puts wage reclassifications and other targeted Medicare provisions in appropriations bills. So I would hope for those of you who come from rural districts, and we are only talking about \$250 million for rural hospitals, it is a provision that was consistent with the non-partisan adviser to the House,

MedPAC, who recommended that we help these rural hospitals with this small amount. It is consistent with the Health and Human Services provision that we must change the physician reimbursement. It is not permanent. It helps cure the problem for the remainder of this year.

I hope that all Members will take this opportunity to see this as a carefully crafted way to help our physician community and to provide for the rural hospitals this small amount that is needed. There is no reason to oppose it. I know of no reasonable opposition. It has been passed in the Senate overwhelmingly, I think unanimously; and it is under the Republican leadership. With the White House supporting it, with Health and Human Services supporting it, who could be against it? I urge all my colleagues to accept the motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), well known for his objection to short debates.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, knowing that we are not going to vote before 6:30 regardless of the situation, I thought I would put my suggestion in about Medicare reimbursement. I see the chairman of the committee here, my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS). There is no person that has more concern about the hospitals than him. In my latest campaign, all I heard from my hospitals, in a rural area, We need more reimbursement. I know this is not the right vehicle. I know the vehicle should be the Committee on Ways and Means. I understand that. But these hospitals are bleeding. They are losing money. The biggest employer in every single community that I have is the hospitals and people related to the hospitals. If we do not do something, and I do not have to tell the Members who are here on the floor, if we do not do something, the doctors' reimbursement is going to go down 4.4 percent.

This will raise, not a lot, but it will raise the percentage that rural hospitals get equal to the urban hospitals. There can be all kinds of excuses why urban hospitals ought to get better reimbursement, but their problem is, the facts of life, we are having a difficult time in Pennsylvania, in my district in western Pennsylvania. Because of malpractice, we are losing doctors. That has got nothing to do with this bill, but the other thing is reimbursement for small hospitals. I meet periodically, I would say every 6 months, with administrators from hospitals. These instructions do not mean anything. It is like some of the resolutions we pass. They do not mean a damn thing, and all of us know they do not mean anything; but the point is we would send a signal, hopefully, to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that we have got to do something about this.

A lot of times we passed instructions by unanimous vote and we went into

committee and we obviously had no jurisdiction; we did not do anything about it. But here where this is so serious and so many hospitals are suffering, we need to voice our concern about the reimbursement in rural hospitals. I would hope that my good friend, the chairman of the committee, would listen to us and when he comes into his first meeting, one of the first things that he does in the Committee on Ways and Means, and I hope he would join us today in urging that something be done about this. I know, I voted a lot against instructions, because I felt like we did not need to be instructed; but in this particular case, I think it is so important that I would hope that all the Members would join the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in passing this instruction to the conferees to do something about Medicare.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, this continuing resolution merely extends the date of the previous CR until February 20 to give us time to conclude the conference meetings. For those who were not on the floor when I made the point before, what I am holding in my hand here is not a copy of the bill. It is a copy of the thousands of differences that we have in this bill between the two bodies. We are closing in on this. We plan to have the conference meeting on Monday evening. I would really not like to interrupt the process that is ongoing now that looks like it might give us a successful conclusion. So when we get to the issue of the motion to recommit with instructions, I would hope that the membership would understand that we are at that delicate stage now. We are about to wrap up the fiscal year 2003 business. We are already beginning the fiscal year 2004 process. Let us defeat the motion to recommit with instructions.

I compliment my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). Every one of his motions to instruct is really appetizing and they are really inviting and they are really votes that you would like to cast; and he works hard at developing these really good motions. I would make a deal with him if we cannot conclude this by the 20th, then I think we will give serious consideration to his next motion to instruct, but I really feel confident that we are going to conclude this with this last CR.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we defeat the motion to instruct and that we pass the CR; and hopefully the next time Members see me here at this microphone, I will be promoting a conference report that we will all love to hate. I do not think any of us are going to like it, but it will be a way to conclude the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and pursuant to the previous order of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. Without the motion's adoption, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 18) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back promptly with an amendment further amending Section 101 of Public Law 107-229 to:

1. Maintain Medicare payment rates for physician services at FY 2002 levels; and
2. Set the base amount for computing Medicare payments to hospitals in small urban areas and rural areas equal to the higher base amount applicable to hospitals in large urban areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes. I have already explained the motion. Let me simply say I think the need for it is self-evident. It is certainly obvious that small rural hospitals are in a tough financial situation and need relief, and it is certainly obvious that if the scheduled reduction in physician payments under Medicare goes into effect that it will negatively affect many, many Medicare patients.

I might not offer this amendment if I thought that the conference was going more smoothly than it is, but certainly in a number of subcommittees there are raging controversies yet to be resolved, and I think under those circumstances it is important that we go on record in support of this proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Florida in opposition to the motion to recommit?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Well, here we go again. I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin say that he was opposed to the continuing resolution without the motion to recommit added to it. If you read the motion to recommit very carefully, it uses a word

□ 1830

which, if that word is used and the motion to recommit passes, it will kill the continuing resolution. I know one word sometimes does not mean a lot. If you say "I you" and do not say "love" or "hate," you really do not get the meaning of what you are trying to say.

The word the gentleman from Wisconsin included in his motion to recommit is "promptly." What in the world is the difference between "promptly" or, let us choose another word, "forthwith"? The difference is the difference between "I love you" and "I hate you." Why? Because if you include "forthwith" in the bill, it means it would be immediately changed as the gentleman says he wants, it is reported right back on the floor, and we go forward. If you include the word "promptly," it kills the bill.

So do not pay attention to anything that is said after the word "promptly," because it does not mean anything. If you pass the motion to recommit with "promptly" in it, it kills the measure.

Let us examine what he says he wants. He has picked two items out of the motion to recommit. There are more provisions, you can imagine the Senate could not limit itself to two provisions, that they would want to try to legislate on an appropriations bill. They also said, Let's help Home Health Services, \$40 million. Let's put \$492 million in for bioterrorism. Let's put \$120 million in for community access. Those are not in here.

So if you really want to help folks, they should have put everything in that the Senate did. The trouble is, it is all headed with "promptly," which means it does not make any difference what you put in here.

My friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, made an offer to my friend from Wisconsin about future motions to recommit. I will give you a flat-out promise. If you will change "promptly" to "forthwith" and if you will heed the advice of our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and say, Let's have malpractice reform, and you put that in your motion to recommit, the House has passed it a number of times; the Senate will not.

If we really wanted to make a difference, we would not stand up here with a motion that kills the bill and say, This is what we want. Let us get serious. Do we have to address problems in Medicare? Of course we do. Do we have to do something about the flawed physicians formula? Of course we do. Will we? Yes, we will.

What we should not be doing is holding out a false promise of part of what the Senate wants to do under a motion to recommit, that if you believe the promise is real and vote for the motion to recommit, you in fact kill the continuing resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, tell me then, is the gentleman objecting to the fact that the Republican chairman of the Committee on the Budget and the Republican chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has asked us to take this action?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if the term "promptly" is in a motion to recommit, you kill the CR. You do not help it. You do not nurture it. You do not defend positions that the Senate has placed in the appropriations. You kill it.

If the gentleman had put "forthwith," he would have been helping. I cannot believe, based upon the time and experience the gentleman from Wisconsin has had in this body, that he does not know that "promptly" kills it and "forthwith" helps it. That is the difference between "I love you" and "I hate you."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue to Iowa and many States, but am I understanding the gentleman correctly? Not only will it kill this bill but does it not also shut down the government? So if I vote for this and it fails and the CR does not pass, it shuts down the government and we do not get anything we want?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. It not only kills the bill; it stops the government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate on the motion to recommit has expired.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 the provisions of clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage and then on the question of adoption of H. Res. 51.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 215, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—195

Abercrombie	Berman	Cardin
Ackerman	Berry	Cardoza
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Carson (OK)
Andrews	Blumenauer	Case
Baca	Boswell	Clay
Baird	Boucher	Clyburn
Baldwin	Boyd	Conyers
Ballance	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Cramer
Bell	Capps	Crowley
Berkley	Capuano	Cummings

Davis (AL)	Klecza	Peterson (MN)
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Davis (FL)	Lampson	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Rahall
Davis (TN)	Lantos	Rangel
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Reyes
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
DeLauro	Leach	Ross
Deutsch	Lee	Rothman
Dicks	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)
Dooley (CA)	Lowey	Sabo
Edwards	Lucas (KY)	Sanchez, Linda T.
Emanuel	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Engel	Majette	Sanders
Eshoo	Maloney	Sandlin
Etheridge	Markey	Schakowsky
Evans	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Farr	Matheson	Serrano
Fattah	Matsui	Sherman
Ford	McCarthy (MO)	Skelton
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Frost	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Gordon	McDermott	Snyder
Green (TX)	McGovern	Solis
Grijalva	McIntyre	Spratt
Gutierrez	McNulty	Stark
Hall	Meehan	Stenholm
Harman	Meek (FL)	Stenlund
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Hill	Menendez	Tauscher
Hinchey	Michaud	Taylor (MS)
Hinojosa	Millender-McDonald	Thompson (CA)
Hoefl	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Holden	Miller, George	Tierney
Holt	Mollohan	Towns
Honda	Moore	Turner (TX)
Hooley (OR)	Moran (VA)	Udall (CO)
Hoyer	Murtha	Udall (NM)
Inslie	Nadler	Van Hollen
Israel	Napolitano	Velazquez
Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Viscosky
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oberstar	Waters
John	Obey	Watson
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Watt
Jones (OH)	Ortiz	Waxman
Kanjorski	Owens	Weiner
Kaptur	Pallone	Wexler
Kennedy (RI)	Pascarell	Wilson (NM)
Kildee	Pastor	Woolsey
Kilpatrick	Payne	Wu
Kind	Pelosi	Wynn

NAYS—215

Aderholt	Crane	Hastings (WA)
Akin	Crenshaw	Hayes
Bachus	Culberson	Hayworth
Baker	Cunningham	Hefley
Ballenger	Davis, Jo Ann	Hensarling
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Tom	Herger
Bartlett (MD)	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Barton (TX)	DeLay	Hoekstra
Bass	DeMint	Hostettler
Beauprez	Diaz-Balart, L.	Houghton
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hulshof
Biggert	Doolittle	Hunter
Billrakis	Dreier	Hyde
Bishop (UT)	Duncan	Isakson
Blackburn	Dunn	Issa
Blunt	Ehlers	Istook
Boehrlert	Emerson	Janklow
Boehner	English	Jenkins
Bonilla	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bonner	Feeney	Johnson (IL)
Boozman	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Bradley (NH)	Flake	Jones (NC)
Brown (SC)	Fletcher	Keller
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Kelly
Ginny	Forbes	Kennedy (MN)
Burgess	Fossella	King (IA)
Burns	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Calvert	Gerlach	Kline
Camp	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Cannon	Gillmor	Kolbe
Cantor	Gingrey	LaHood
Capito	Goode	Latham
Carter	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Castle	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Choccola	Graves	Linder
Coble	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Cole	Greenwood	Lucas (OK)
Collins	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Combest	Harris	McCotter
Cox	Hart	McCrey

McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tausz
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Costello
Cubin
DeGette
Doyle
Filner
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Jefferson
Lipinski
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Ose
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Sullivan
Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are approximately 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1849

Messrs. TANCREDO, WALSH, CRENSHAW, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Ms. DUNN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MATSUI changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 18, the Obey motion to recommit with instructions, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 18, due to the arrival of my first grandchild, Madeline, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 18, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE TO THE FAMILIES OF THE CREW MEMBERS OF THE “COLUMBIA” SHUTTLE MISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Reso-

lution 51, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—404

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

Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tausz
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—30

Ballenger
Beauprez
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Costello
Cubin
DeGette
Doyle
Filner
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hefley
Jefferson
Lipinski
McKeon
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Ose
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (NC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair would announce to all Members there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1856

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.

Stated for:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 19 had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 2003, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote on H. Res. 51. However, had I been here I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 19, due to the arrival of my first grandchild, Madeline, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 19, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”