

Whereas the national championship is the first for the Western Kentucky University football program since its inception in 1913;

Whereas the Hilltoppers had an impressive overall record of 12 wins and 3 losses during the 2002 season, which included 10 consecutive wins;

Whereas the Hilltoppers showed tremendous dedication to each other, appreciation to their fans, sportsmanship to their opponents, and respect for the game of football throughout their 2002 season;

Whereas Western Kentucky University was represented with integrity and principled leadership under the direction of Head Football Coach Jack Harbaugh, Athletic Director Dr. Wood Selig, and President Dr. Gary A. Ransdell; and

Whereas on December 20, 2002, the Western Kentucky University Hilltoppers, ranked 15th among Division I-AA teams, defeated the top-ranked McNeese State University Cowboys for the 2002 NCAA Division I-AA football championship in Chattanooga, Tennessee, by a score of 34-14: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives honors the Western Kentucky University football team from Bowling Green, Kentucky, for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I-AA football championship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 17.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, with Western Kentucky University's recent success on the basketball court and the Hilltoppers' first NCAA championship on the football field in 2002, Kentucky is now home to yet another top-ranked college sports program. I am proud to have Western Kentucky University in my district.

We were not in session on December 20 when Western Kentucky won its first Division I-AA football championship, but I wanted to take this opportunity in this session of Congress to acknowledge the team's achievements.

The 15th ranked Hilltoppers defeated top-ranked McNeese State 34-14 in the championship game. Western brought their best game to the playoffs and the championship, defeating the three highest ranked teams on their way to taking the title.

Just as they had all season, the Toppers again relied on their tough defense and strong running game. Jon Frazier rushed for 159 yards and two touchdowns, bringing his season total to 1,537 yards and moving him into second

place in Western's running records. The defense combined for three interceptions and a sack, holding McNeese State below its season scoring average.

In his 14th year at Western Kentucky, Coach Jack Harbaugh saw his and the team's hard work finally pay off. Coach Harbaugh has been committed to the Western football program and has built a successful program that the University, the Bowling Green community and the State should be proud of.

After starting the season with a 2-3 record, including a loss to McNeese State, the Hilltoppers relied on their teamwork and dedication to win 10 straight games, finishing the season with the national championship.

Mr. Speaker, I join Western Kentucky University and all of Bowling Green in congratulating the Hilltopper football team on its national championship season.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 17 congratulating the Hilltoppers of Western Kentucky for winning the 2002 Division I-AA national football championship. It is quite an achievement to win a national championship at any college level, and this championship is even more noteworthy due to the fact that it is Western Kentucky's first national championship since 1913.

Student athletes split their time between their athletic and academic pursuits. The student athletes that make up this year's national championship Hilltoppers' team must be commended because they did such a good job for their dual pursuit. I want to especially congratulate them for all their hard work, and also extend my hardy congratulations to head coach Jack Harbaugh for a great season and great win.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Res. 17 honoring the Hilltoppers of Western Kentucky University from Bowling Green, Kentucky for winning the 2002 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-AA football championship.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), for sponsoring this resolution and congratulate the gentleman for the success this school has had from his district and for his opportunity to represent them in Washington, D.C.

Today the House has recognized the outstanding athletic accomplishment of our Nation's young people. These championships are a testament to the spirit of athletic competition; and, frankly, they are enormous fun to watch. I congratulate all of the athletes and schools who have participated in collegiate athletics, and express my specific congratulations to Western Kentucky University.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 17.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR JUSTICES AND JUDGES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16) to authorize salary adjustments for Justices and judges of the United States for fiscal year 2003.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR FEDERAL JUSTICES AND JUDGES.

Pursuant to section 140 of Public Law 97-92, Justices and judges of the United States are authorized during fiscal year 2003 to receive a salary adjustment in accordance with section 461 of title 28, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 16, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes Federal judges to receive the same cost of living pay adjustment that all Federal employees, including Members of Congress, have received for calendar year 2003.

By way of background, Congress enacted the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act in 1975, which was intended to give judges, Members of Congress and other high-ranking Executive Branch officials automatic COLAs as accorded other Federal employees unless rejected by Congress. In

1981, Congress enacted section 140 of Public Law 97-92, which requires specific congressional action authorizing judges the COLA.

Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 107th Congress, we failed to provide a COLA for Federal judges. This constitutes an inequity, since Members of Congress and all other Federal employees did receive a COLA in 2003.

The bill is straightforward. It simply provides for a cost-of-living adjustment for Federal judges consistent with the law. The President and the Chief Justice of the United States support granting judges a COLA now. The bill will assist in the administration of justice in our Federal courts and is otherwise noncontroversial. I urge its adoption.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this critical legislation which provides the Federal judiciary with a much-needed cost-of-living adjustment. I also thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for his leadership on this matter, and the speed with which he has brought this legislation to the House floor.

Article I, Section III of the Constitution provides that the pay of Federal judges "shall not be diminished during their time in office." Unfortunately, by failing to provide Federal judges with annual COLAs over the last decade, they have faced the economic equivalent of a \$77,000 reduction in salary. In the last 30 years, while average pay has increased 12 percent for most workers, it has decreased 25 percent for Federal judges.

Currently, Federal district court judges earn \$150,000 per year. This is far less than they could earn in private practice, and is even less than an associate right out of law school earns in New York City. It has gotten so bad that employees of the Administrative Office of Courts, who work for the Federal judges, now enjoy greater salaries than the judges themselves. This is the equivalent of congressional staff earning more than congressmen and women. It is no wonder that Federal judges are leaving in droves, with nearly six dozen judges leaving over the last several years, and notably with many districts overloaded with cases and many citizens not able to have their grievances addressed. That certainly does not bear well for the Constitution.

There can be no doubt of the value and importance of ensuring that our Federal judges are fairly compensated. The Federal judiciary is the crown jewel of our democracy. If there is any single idea in the Constitution that has separated our experiment in democracy

from all other nations, it is the concept of a free and independent and just judiciary.

The Founding Fathers, in their great wisdom, created a system of checks and balances, granting independent judges not only lifetime tenure, but the right to an undiminished salary. It is no surprise that over the years, the Federal judiciary, more than any other branch, has served as the protector of our precious civil rights and liberties. I agree with Alexander Hamilton that the "independent spirit of judges" enables them to stand against the "ill humors of passing political majorities."

But we cannot have a qualified and independent judiciary if we do not pay them a just wage. Just last week Chief Justice Rehnquist declared that "providing adequate compensation for judges is basic to attracting and retaining experienced, well-qualified and diverse men and women." Justice Breyer was even more blunt when he stated "The gulf that separates judicial pay from compensation in the non-profit sector, in academia, and in the private sector grows larger and larger, and threatens irreparable harm both to the institution and the public it serves."

It is for these reasons that I was so shocked last November when the continuing resolution Congress approved gave a cost-of-living adjustment to nearly every Federal worker but the federal judges. The bill before us responds to that oversight by granting the judiciary a COLA retroactive to the start of the last fiscal year. I consider this to be a modest downpayment in the development of a more rational and fair system of compensating our Federal judges. I urge an enthusiastic yes vote for this bill.

I rise in support of this critical legislation, which provides the federal judiciary with a much needed cost of living adjustment. I also want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his leadership on this matter and the speed with which he has brought this legislation to the House floor.

Article I, Section III of the Constitution provides that the pay of federal judges "shall not be diminished during their time in office." Unfortunately, by failing to provide federal judges with annual COLA's over the last decade, they have faced the economic equivalent of a \$77,000 reduction in salary. In the last 30 years, while average pay has increased 12 percent for most workers, it has decreased 25 percent for federal judges.

Currently, federal district court judges earn \$150,000 per year. This is far, far less than they could earn in private practice and is even less than an associate right out of law school earns in New York City.

It has gotten so bad that employees of the Administrative Office of the Courts—who work for the federal judges—now enjoy greater salaries than the judges themselves. This is the equivalent of congressional staff earning more than Congressmen. It is no wonder that federal judges are leaving in droves, with nearly six dozen judges leaving over the last several years.

There can be no doubt of the value and importance of insuring that our federal judges

are fairly compensated. The federal judiciary is the crown jewel of our democracy. If there is any single idea in the Constitution that has separated our experiment in democracy from all other nations, it is the concept of an independent judiciary.

The founding fathers, in their great wisdom, created a system of checks and balances, granting independent judges not only lifetime tenure, but the right to an undiminished salary. It is no surprise that over the years, the federal judiciary, more than any other branch, has served as the protector of our previous civil rights and civil liberties. I agree with Alexander Hamilton that the "independent spiral of judges" enable them to stand against the "ill humors of passing political majorities."

But we cannot have a qualified and independent judiciary if we don't pay them at a just wage. Just last week Chief Justice Rehnquist declared that "providing adequate compensation for judges is basic to attracting and retaining experience, well-qualified and divers men and women." Justice Breyer was even more blunt when he stated, "the gulf that separates judicial pay from compensation in the non-profit sector, in academia, and in the private sector grows larger and larger . . . and threatens irreparable harm both to the institution and the public it serves."

It is for these reasons that I was so shocked last November when the continuing resolution Congress approved gave a cost of living adjustment to nearly every federal worker but the federal judges. The bill before us responds to that oversight by granting the judiciary a COLA retroactive to the start of the last fiscal year. I consider this to be a modest down payment in developing a more rationale and fair system of compensating our federal judges. I urge a yes vote.

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

□ 1600

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this legislation to give our Federal judges a cost-of-living adjustment. There is no question that they deserve and need this COLA and more. In 2001, the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association released a report detailing a fundamental problem that has escalated over the past decade, the erosion of fair and adequate compensation for the Federal judiciary. These two well-respected groups issued this report because they found that the current salaries of Federal judges have reached such levels of inadequacy that, and I quote, "they threaten to impair the quality and independence of the third branch."

Yes, it is true that Federal judges earn a higher salary than many Americans, but it is also true that in many cases a first-year associate at law firm earns considerably more than does a judge. I think that all of us would agree that public service has its own rewards, but those rewards do not pay the bills.

Members may wonder why it is that we must take up this legislation to authorize a COLA for Federal judges. The short answer is that we should not have to do so. But because of a provision enacted back in 1981, every year, year in and year out, Congress must authorize the COLAs of Federal judges even though those COLAs are the very same COLAs that are automatically granted to Members of Congress and senior executive branch employees. It is inefficient and it is unfair to make judges scale this additional hurdle. That is why I soon will introduce legislation that puts judges back on the same track as Congress and senior members of the executive branch, automatic COLAs, unless Congress specifically votes against it.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Let us give our judges the pay they deserve, and let us eliminate the provision that requires us to take this action each year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all come from different congressional districts, but we are honored and cherish the right to represent Americans. I happen to come from a district with a sizable population of Hispanic Americans, African Americans and Asian Americans, a very diverse community.

In paying tribute to the Federal judiciary, might I make note of the fact that it is the Federal judiciary that most often has been able to create opportunities for groups who have felt disenfranchised and left out. It is the Federal judiciary that responded favorably in the Sixth Circuit on the positive aspects of affirmative action, recognizing that affirmative action is not a handout but a hand-up, and affirmatively approved the affirmative action program at the State university, the University of Michigan, allowing for that campus to have a diverse student body.

In particular, I happen to come from what is defined as a voter rights district, established under the Voter Rights Act of 1965. Since the creation of that district, held first by the Honorable Barbara Jordan, we have been in court over the years time after time. In the times that we have been in courts, it has been the Federal courts that have reaffirmed the value of having congressional districts that are able to give one-vote/one-person and provide the opportunities for, in this instance, minorities, African Americans and Hispanics, to vote for the person of their choosing, some now call it communities of interest, and to allow them to have a voice in the United States Congress. It has been the Federal courts that have heard these cases over and over and in many instances the Federal judiciary that has risen above their political persuasions and have offered opportunity and hope to my constituents.

Likewise, when there have been cases of discrimination, we have been most

gratified that it has been the Federal courts that have taken these cases and responded, on sexual discrimination, age discrimination, race discrimination; and for many Americans, this would be the only way that they would be able to seek opportunity and to address their grievances.

I believe this vital role that the third branch of government plays should be so noted when we cavalierly miss them, if you will, in compensation. This is a time to appreciate the very important role that they play in bringing justice to America. As I conclude my remarks, might I say that that is why so many of us play a role in the process of nominations and why we so vigorously fight in the struggle, if you will, for designing a Federal court judiciary that is truly reflective of all of America.

With that, I would say that I hope that my colleagues in the comments that I have made will reflect upon the high importance of the judiciary that is a key part of the democracy of this Nation, and I would ask my colleagues to enthusiastically both respect, admire, and support this legislation.

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

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

I think at this point in the debate, it is proper to give a little history of how judicial salaries have been set. The last time Congress visited the whole issue of executive, legislative, and judicial salaries was in the Ethics Reform Act in 1989. Prior to 1989, there was a quadrennial commission that met every 4 years to decide what would be fair compensation for Federal judges, Members of Congress, and senior members of the executive branch, except the President whose salary was set through another process. This commission, which was comprised of people outside government, always recommended that there be significant pay raises for all of the officials covered in the old law. The pay raises were so significant that there was a huge public outcry, and Congress ended up rejecting those recommendations almost uniformly because of pressure from our constituency.

So in 1989 when Congress passed the Ethics Reform Act, it abolished the quadrennial commission, and it replaced it with a citizens' commission on public service and compensation. That was 14 years ago, and the new commission has never met. This same law stated that the salaries of the district judges would be the same as salaries of Members of Congress, and there has been a linkage of the district judges' salaries and that paid United States Senators and United States Representatives since. So as our salaries have gone up through cost-of-living increases, the judicial salaries have also gone up; and it was usually because there was a provision put in an appropriations bill that gave the judges the same COLA as Members of Congress and executive branch officials.

I know every year the Chief Justice talks about the inequity in pay of Federal judges and those who practice before them. I think he has a very valid point. But the points that the Chief Justice makes miss the point of the 1989 law completely; and I think that if we are talking about a judicial pay raise, it is incumbent upon those who are supporting it, which is not me at this time, to answer two questions: What should be the compensation of district judges, appeals judges, and justices of the Supreme Court of the United States? And why are the responsibilities of the Federal judiciary so much more than the responsibilities of United States Senators and United States Representatives that they deserve to be paid out of the taxpayers' treasury a considerably higher pay than the Senators and the Representatives, which I think have at least equal and probably much greater responsibilities on a day-to-day basis than members of the Federal judiciary have.

The burden of proof, to use a judicial term, on why the judicial salaries should be delinked from the legislative and executive branch salaries is on the Federal judiciary and those who advocate such a delinkage. In none of the statements that I have seen from the advocates of higher judicial salaries has there been one argument in favor of why these salaries should be delinked.

Because the Congress last fall failed to pass the same COLA as Members of Congress and the executive branch received, this bill is fair, this bill is necessary, and this bill should be supported. But until we get answers to the other two issues that I have raised, I do not think we should amend the basic law that was passed in the Ethics Reform Act of 1989.

I urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support this measure to give Federal Judges a cost-of-living adjustment.

Just today, the Washington Post reported the findings of a non-partisan National Commission on the Public Service, led by former Federal Reserve chairman Paul A. Volker.

One of the first steps the Commission recommends is to give federal judges an "immediate and significant" increase in pay.

As it is, judges make far less than they could earn in private firms, and there is certainly no monetary incentive for top lawyers to accept nomination to the Federal judiciary.

Though there is prestige in serving as a Federal judge, many of this country's best lawyers simply cannot justify leaving private practice during their prime earning years to serve on the bench.

In the long run, this phenomenon will affect the quality of people we can attract to serve as federal judges. It doesn't mean that we ought to be matching partner bonuses dollar-for-dollar, but it does mean that we have to consider what the private sector offers if we want to ask our best and brightest to become public servants.

Though a 3.1 percent COLA may not be all that "significant," it is a small step toward creating enough incentive for Judges to remain on the Bench.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 16, which authorizes salary adjustments for the federal judiciary during fiscal year 2003.

Before the 107th Congress adjourned sine die, the House failed to authorize a necessary pay adjustment for the federal judiciary. The continuing resolution that the House passed on November 13, 2002, did not include the 3.1 percent cost-of-living adjustment for FY 2003 that federal judges were supposed to have received on January 1, 2003. The Ethics Reform Act of 1989 assures federal judges an annual adjustment based upon the Employment Cost Index [ECI], and Congress's failure to live up to its promise under that Act could have dire consequences for our legal system.

It is imperative that Congress takes every action necessary to ensure the viability of the federal judiciary. In his 2001 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary, Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist stressed the importance of annual pay adjustments and requested that Congress increase salaries as a means of attracting and retaining qualified judges. Federal judicial salaries are relatively small compared to the salaries that are earned by experienced attorneys in private practice. Relatively low judicial pay, combined with a complicated and lengthy judicial confirmation process, acts as a disincentive for qualified, dedicated attorneys to join the federal judiciary. When judicial vacancies go unfilled, the American legal system suffers.

It is inexcusable that the House failed to pass the FY 2003 Commerce, Justice and State appropriations bill, which contains the necessary authorization and appropriation for a federal judicial pay adjustment, during the 107th Congress. While Congress managed to give itself a pay raise for the current fiscal year, the federal judiciary was hung out to dry.

Mr. Speaker, our system of justice is among the best in the world, and as the peoples' representatives, we should do all that we can to ensure the future viability of the judiciary. I am pleased that the House has finally considered this long-overdue legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this critical legislation, of which I am an original cosponsor. This bill provides the federal judiciary with a much needed cost of living adjustment (COLA) for their salary. I also would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his leadership and bipartisanship on this issue.

The Constitution mandates that the pay of federal judges "shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office." Unfortunately, by failing to provide judges with annual COLA's over the last decade, they have faced the equivalent of a \$77,000 reduction in salary. Currently, federal district court judges earn \$150,000 per year. This is much less than they could earn in private practice; in fact, it is less than an attorney right out of law school can earn in private practice. Even the judges' employees, those who work at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts make more than their employers. In the last 30 years, while average pay has increased 12 percent for most workers, it had decreased 25 percent for federal judges.

This issue can seem to be just a matter of salary, but it extends deeply into our concept

of a democracy and judicial independence. The Constitution establishes a system of checks and balances, granting independent judges lifetime tenure and the right to an undiminished salary, in order to ensure the judiciary remains independent of financial, political, and social pressures. Unfortunately, many federal judges are leaving the bench for private practice, and many experienced and qualified private practitioners are deterred from serving in the judiciary. The pay disparity has diminished the independence of our third branch and made it difficult to attract and retain qualified attorneys.

This is why I was surprised when the continuing resolution Congress approved last session gave a cost of living adjustment to most federal employees except judges. The bill before us remedies this oversight by authorizing a COLA for the judiciary that is retroactive to the start of the 2003 fiscal year.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). 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. 16.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

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 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1850

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 95, nays 315, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Hill	Pallone
Allen	Hinchey	Pastor
Andrews	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Bell	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Berman	(TX)	Rangel
Berry	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Bishop (GA)	John	Ross
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardoza	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Kleczka	Sanders
Clay	Lampson	Sandlin
Clyburn	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cooper	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Cummings	Lee	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lowe	Stark
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Stenholm
DeFazio	Maloney	Tauscher
Delahunt	Markey	Taylor (MS)
DeLauro	Marshall	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Meehan	Tierney
Doggett	Menendez	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Millender-	Velazquez
Evans	McDonald	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watson
Filner	Neal (MA)	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Frost	Obey	Wynn
Grijalva	Olver	
Hastings (FL)	Owens	

NAYS—315

Abercrombie	Brown-Waite,	Deal (GA)
Aderholt	Ginny	DeGette
Akin	Burgess	DeLay
Baca	Burns	DeMint
Bachus	Burr	Diaz-Balart, L.
Baker	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Baldwin	Buyer	Dicks
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Dooley (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Camp	Doolittle
Barton (TX)	Cannon	Doyle
Bass	Cantor	Dreier
Beauprez	Capito	Duncan
Becerra	Capps	Dunn
Bereuter	Carson (OK)	Edwards
Berkley	Carter	Ehlers
Biggert	Case	Emerson
Bilirakis	Castle	Engel
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	English
Bishop (UT)	Chocola	Eshoo
Blackburn	Coble	Etheridge
Blumenauer	Cole	Everett
Blunt	Collins	Fattah
Boehlert	Combest	Feeney
Boehner	Costello	Ferguson
Bonilla	Cox	Flake
Bonner	Cramer	Fletcher
Bono	Crane	Foley
Boozman	Crenshaw	Forbes
Boswell	Cubin	Ford
Boyd	Culberson	Fossella
Bradley (NH)	Cunningham	Franks (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Davis (FL)	Galleghy
Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)	Garrett (NJ)
Brown (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gephardt
	Davis, Tom	Gerlach