

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. *George Miller* of California:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_.** None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to enforce section 4010(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to better protect the pension benefits of millions of Americans. Workers' retirement security has been taking it on the chin for the last 4 years. First, tens of thousands of workers and retirees lost their retirement savings after the Enron and WorldCom debacles. Then the Bush administration tried to restart the cash balance conversions and cut the pensions of millions of older workers. Under that proposal millions of older workers would have seen their pension benefits cut up to in half, and they would have had no way to return and repair the amount of money that they were planning to retire on. And now we find out that thousands of pension plans are, in fact, underfunded, and many are considering the termination and the dumping of billions of dollars of liability on the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the agency that ensures the workers of this country's pensions.

The Pension Benefits Guaranty Corporation has gone from a \$7 billion surplus to a \$10 billion deficit in just 2

[Page: H6853]

years. The GAO has it on its watch list of high-risk agencies. And a handful of airlines, including United, Delta, and US Air, may soon dump more liabilities on the Pension Benefits Guaranty Corporation that reach as high as \$30 billion.

One of the worst parts of this is that the workers have no idea that their pension funds are underfunded and at risk, that their employer could default on their pension promises. Let me say that again. That while these plans are underfunded, and while they are at risk, the workers are not informed of that information. Pension law requires underfunded pension plans to report their underfunding to the government, but not to the workers.

My amendment is simple. I prohibit the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation from enforcing the part of the law that prohibits them from disclosing to workers and to retirees the funding status of their pension plan. After all, this is their money. This is money that they have contributed to those pension plans. It is money that they are planning on for their retirement. It is money that they are planning on for their future, and it is money that they cannot replace if they are an older worker. They ought to have this information.

Most interesting is the fact that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation wants to make this information public. The Bush administration has said that they support making it public. But this provision in the law prevents them from doing this.

There is no reason why the government should know the status of company pension plans, but the workers should not. Workers are losing more and more each day under the administration's proposals on pension. Their jobs are being outsourced overseas. Their wages are falling. They have no protection of an adequate minimum wage. They are either losing their health care benefits or paying more in copays and deductibles and more of their wages on skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and they are losing their retirement security.

We have got to be able to provide them this information. This is very analogous to the workers at the Enron Corporation. The corporation knew that their 401(K) plans were in serious jeopardy. The corporation officers were unloading the stock because they knew they could not continue that criminal enterprise that they were engaged in in ripping off the energy consumers of this Nation. They unloaded. They got out. They took care of their golden parachutes. But the workers lost their 401(K) plans.

In this Congress we listened to the testimony of these workers as they talked about their entire retirement being destroyed, workers who were 60 years old, 65 years old, who had worked 10 and 15 and 20 years, who were planning to retire, no way to replace those savings. And now we see, and now we see, that there are hundreds of corporations that are underfunding; in fact, over 1,000 corporations that are underfunded according to the law in their pension plans, but this information is disclosed only to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and not to this.

Why am I here with this amendment on the floor? Because I have requested the chairman of the committee to ask to make this information public, and he has refused to do so. If he would do that, the law provides that it would be made available to the Members of Congress. At least we could start to see some of this information. But that will not be done.

The fact of the matter is this, and it is very simple: The workers in these corporations paid into these pensions. The corporations contributed to these pensions. The workers gave up other benefits to get these pensions. That money belongs to the workers. The workers ought to have the information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. *George Miller* of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is just a matter of decency. We see now major reforms going on in the administration of mutual funds and how their relationships are on behalf of workers, the disclosures of fees, the disclosures of their transactions, time days, one scandal after another, with people cheating the owners of the money out of their funds. Now we see the machinations of corporations as they try to cover up the potential liability or the potential failure or the loss of these pensions of the workers. Transparency is the watchword of the day. The workers of America, of corporations that are in danger of unloading these pensions and getting rid of these pensions, the workers of this country are entitled to that information.

I would hope that this House would support this in the name of the transparency, in support of the position of the Bush administration, in support of the position of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation that this information should be made available, and I would urge an aye vote.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in strong support of the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*). I think most Americans, Mr. Chairman, would be shocked to know that information about their pension which they own is not available to them at the same time it is available to a government agency.

When the President speaks about Social Security, he is fond of talking about trying to create accounts which are private property of citizens so that we can know what is ours. Pensions are already private property of citizens. When one contributes to a pension fund, or their employer contributes on their behalf to their fund, they own it. But under the present law, one of the more remarkable laws that we have on the books, if the pension fund that one's employer sponsors is in trouble, if it looks like it is going to be unable to pay benefits because its costs are exceeding its revenue, and it looks like the fund might crash so that the Federal Government, under the jurisdiction of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, will have to step in and make the pension fund whole, the law says that one's pension fund has to tell the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation that it is in trouble, and it has to disclose the nature of that trouble. So this government agency gets this information about one's pension fund being in trouble and their check being in jeopardy. Believe it or not, there is a statute that says once this government agency has this information that a person's pension is in trouble, it cannot tell him.

We do not understand that. We think if someone works for a company, and is counting on their pension being delivered, and has contributed to that pension, and has had the employer contribute to that pension, and the pension is in jeopardy so much that the trustees of the fund have to report that trouble to a government agency, we think that the citizens, the pensioners themselves, have a right to know.

That is what the gentleman from California's (Mr. *George Miller*) amendment does. It prohibits the administration, prohibits the executive branch, from enforcing this secrecy law. One's pension should not be held secret from them if they are an employee or a citizen or a future pensioner. That is what this says.

It is my understanding that, as the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*) said, in fact, the administration supports this change, wants this information to be made public.

I do not believe this is a partisan issue. I think that responsible Members on both sides of the aisle would understand that if their pension is in trouble, they ought to have a right to know it, not later after the pension fund has failed and they do not get their check, not after it is too late to do something about it, as was in the case of the Enron and WorldCom employees, but now, as soon as it is timely, so they can do something about it.

So if the Members believe, as I think people on both sides of the aisle do, that someone's pension is their property, and if they believe, as I think people on both sides of the aisle do, that they have the right to know about the dynamics and phenomena happening about one's own

property, and if they believe that some government agency has the right to know what is going on with their pension and they should, too, if they believe those things, then they ought to vote for the gentleman from California's (Mr. *George Miller*) amendment. It is an

[Page: H6854]

idea that is supported, to my understanding, by the administration. I hope it would be supported by both sides of the aisle here. I would urge a ``yes" vote.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve a point of order.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I appreciate the concerns of my colleagues on the other side, but I rise today in opposition to their amendment. And while they make it sound simple as it would normally be the case, there is nothing at all simple about the amendment that is being offered.

The 4010 information that is required to be submitted to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation would be for any defined benefit pension plan that has a negative balance actuarially of at least \$50 million, and these could be public companies, they could be private companies. And the information that has to be supplied to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is not just information about where the pension fund is. It also includes all types of detailed information about the finances of the company itself.

[Time: 17:00]

For private companies who may be in this position, this is very sensitive information.

The reason we have not dealt with the issue as yet is we have been working on a long-term fix for the defined benefit pension plans. As we get into those conversations, we have had a number of hearings over the past couple of years, we passed the Pension Equity Funding Act earlier this year, signed by the President, to fix the most immediate problems.

But as the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*), the author of the amendment, well knows, we have had a number of hearings last year and this year about the long-term problems facing defined benefit pension plans, a traditional pension plan, and what we hope to do is to have a bill next year that would revise all of the funding rules to make it easier for companies to comply with the rules and, most importantly, to ensure that companies are funding their pension plans.

As part of this overall bill, I think there may be a way to address the concerns raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*) in terms of who the companies are or the extent of their pension issue, without disclosing all of the sensitive financial data that must be submitted to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on the Miller amendment, and my colleagues should know that a commitment is on my part to the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*) and to all of my colleagues that we will address that portion that is not nearly as sensitive on the financial data as we deal with the broader overhaul of our defined pension benefit laws and regulations.

I would urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the comments of my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. *Boehner*), on this situation. But I must say I continue to disagree with the gentleman, and I disagree on two grounds.

First and foremost, we have made several requests to him to ask the PBGC, and we have specifically have asked, the Democrats on the committee have asked the PBGC for this information. They will not make it available to the committee, much less the public. They will not make it available to the committee because the chairman of the committee must make that request to them.

So when you talk about us going into long-term pension reform, Mr. Chairman, at a minimum we ought to have this information about the magnitude of the problem and the variations among the various corporations and the industries that are involved in this, if we are going to, in fact, deal with some kind of long-term and necessary fix, that I hope we will, and I thank you for holding those hearings. We need that information as members of the committee at a minimum.

But, furthermore, this information was available up until 1994. Then the Clinton administration cut a deal on the financing of GATT, and this information, the corporations prevailed on them to make this secret in exchange for a premium increase to pay for GATT. Who got left out? Who was not at the table? The American worker. So all of a sudden they did not get the information anymore.

The point and the magnitude and the necessity for this amendment, let me just point out that according to Standard & Poor, 290 of the 362 companies in the Standard & Poor's 500 that offer defined benefit plans are underfunded by \$165 billion in 2003.

The point is this, that this is a huge, looming problem. You know the people who just went through bankruptcy at U.S. Air and thought they had cured their problem? Well, when United said, we think we might offload our pension onto the public taxpayers, all of a sudden the people at U.S. Air are in trouble again.

We think these people ought to have that information, so they, when they are negotiating, because if United does this, it is a likelihood that U.S. Air does it, and if U.S. Air does it, it is a likelihood that Delta will do it.

Well, that is a catastrophe for the PBGC and for those workers. There is something about transparency. We insisted in other financial arrangements where individuals have their money in the hands of third parties, and in this case we ought to do it for corporations.

So I appreciate, and I have said to the chairman very often, that he has given attention to this problem. We hope to have a long-term solution. But this is fundamental to the rights of workers at this most perilous time with respect to the security of their pensions.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. If I understand this correctly, the corporation would have to disclose information under the requirements of this section that would go beyond the pension part of their liability.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I appreciate that argument, but in reviewing the case, the Bush administration said they support the disclosure under this provision of the law, and the PBGC supports that. I do not think these two entities are interested in destroying these corporations. The fact of the matter is this information was made available for many years.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California, and I fully agree with his statement.

Mrs. *McCARTHY* of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, all day today we have been hearing so many different issues coming up onto the floor that are concerning so many people, and I thank the ranking member, and I thank the chairman, and I thank the ranking minority ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce for bringing these issues up.

I am here because I am not allowed to bring up the assault weapons bill onto the floor. With that, I will continue for the rest of the evening and all day tomorrow and all day Monday to talk about how we need to get the President involved to be able to make some phone calls to the Speaker of the House. I know that he supposedly is going to be meeting with all the police officers and chiefs that we met this morning to try and convince them that this is what the American people want, this is what our police officers want.

It comes down to a safety issue. There are so many things that we have to handle here, and we actually, in my opinion, have wasted an awful lot of time this year. We have done more politicking than we have done actual work, and that is too bad, because the only one that suffers is the American people.

If the assault weapons ban is not renewed, the American people in the end will suffer, our children will suffer, our communities will suffer, our health care system will suffer.

[Page: H6855]

This is a bill that is already in place. They say enforce the law. Well, let us continue enforcing the law. Let us make sure the assault weapons bill stays in place. It saves lives. It does not cost us a penny.

I just heard that one of the large gun manufacturers, with every assault weapons gun that they buy, they will get a free large-capacity clip. Is that not terrific? It is much easier to mow down our own citizens.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our colleague and join in offering the amendment by our colleague from California (Mr. *George Miller*). This amendment follows very closely legislation that the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*) and I introduced last year to address this problem.

There are at the moment that we gather here in Congress, I suppose, tens of millions of Americans who are out working, trying to ensure that their families have a better future. As they do their work and they look forward to payday to get their paycheck, one of the things they also consider are whatever benefits that they get with their work. For many workers, particularly those that move in their forties and fifties to begin to think about what retirement lies ahead, they have a particular concern with the retirement plan for their company and whether it will, in fact, allow them to retire in dignity and enjoy the fruits of their labor after they have provided for their family and community, to be able to enjoy a decent, dignified retirement.

In recent years, American employees, American workers, have had good reason to be fearful that that very significant benefit of retirement that they have worked for, with some companies perhaps for 20 or 30 years, will not be there when they need it in full amount.

First there were the employees of Enron. Thousands of them, through no fault of their own, lost their retirement. Then the same thing happened at WorldCom. Thousands of people who had worked for that company almost since its origin losing their retirement future, the hope of a dignified retirement, many of them having to go back into the workforce.

Really, when you look back over the activities of this Congress since the Enron debacle, as far as preventing another debacle for employees at Enron and their retirement futures, or WorldCom, this Congress has done next to nothing to prevent other employees from suffering the same fate.

As the years have gone by and Congress has been inactive, our economy has struggled, and we have begun to see more major companies, particularly in the airline industry, begin to raise questions as to whether they were going to put their pension plan into bankruptcy, whether they were going to stop making pension payments.

This amendment does not solve all those problems. It is a very modest amendment. It simply expresses confidence in the employees, that they deserve to know the same information that their employer is filing with the government bureaucracy.

As my colleague from California just pointed out, were it not for the fine print in legislation that was approved in 1994, we would have the right to know this information. This amendment is based on the principle that if the employee has the information, they can choose to go to another employer who has a fully funded pension plan, or they can turn to their employer and ask, why not? Why am I being given a false promise of a secure retirement, when, in fact, this plan is not funded at a sufficient level to assure that all workers who work here and retire will be able to enjoy their retirement with dignity?

Of course, there is another public policy consideration here, and that is that there is a government agency, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, that is responsible for ensuring and protecting against those plans that fail. From all of the recent reports about the status of that corporation, we face the potential of something that will make the savings and loan bailout of a

few decades back look modest in comparison to the dangers of major pension funds, one after another, going under and placing a burden on this corporation.

The Bush administration came out in support of the very kind of amendment that is being offered here today. As usual, once some special interest began to question the wisdom of this provision, they fell moot. But their recommendation is a matter of public policy; it is clear, and it is out there.

The Government Accountability Office, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation itself, all of these have recommended that this information that they get be made available to the employee so that the employee will be empowered.

This amendment is based on the principle that the workers that are out there deserve the right to know, they deserve the right to be empowered about their pension future, and I can see no good reason not to provide that information.

The suggestion by the chairman of the committee that he has a long-term plan to deal with this is great, but it is a little too long for the term of those who are concerned about their retirement safety and, one after another, pension plans failing.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. *Regula*) insist on his point of order?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I do. But we recognize that since it is a limitation amendment, that it would not be in order. On that basis, I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

---

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. *George Miller*) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.



A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were--ayes 268, noes 148, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]  
AYES--268

Abercrombie

Ackerman

Aderholt

Allen

Andrews

Baca

Baird

Baldwin

Bass

Becerra

Bell

Berkley

Berman

Berry

Bilirakis

Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer

Boehlert

Boswell

Boucher

Boyd

Bradley (NH)

Brady (PA)

Brown (OH)

Brown, Corrine

Brown-Waite, Ginny

Burr

Butterfield

Camp

Capito

Capps

Capuano

Cardin

Cardoza

Carson (IN)

Carson (OK)

Case

Castle

Chabot

Chandler

Clay

Clyburn

Coble

Conyers

Cooper

Costello

Cramer

Crowley

Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr

Fattah

Ferguson

Filner

Ford

Fossella

Frank (MA)

Frost

Gallegly

Gerlach

Gibbons

Gilchrest

Gonzalez

Gordon

Green (TX)

Grijalva

Gutierrez

Harman

Hart

Hastings (FL)

Hefley

Herseth

Hill

Hinchey

Hinojosa

Hoefel

Holden

Holt

Honda

Hooley (OR)

Houghton

Hoyer

Hyde

Inslee

Israel

Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee (TX)

Jefferson

Jenkins

John

Johnson (CT)

Johnson (IL)

Johnson, E. B.

Jones (NC)

Jones (OH)

Kanjorski

Kaptur

Kelly

Kennedy (MN)

Kennedy (RI)

Kildee

Kilpatrick

Kind

King (NY)

Kirk

Kleczka  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)

McCarthy (NY)

McCollum

McCotter

McDermott

McGovern

McHugh

McIntyre

McNulty

Meehan

Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)

Menendez

Michaud

Millender-McDonald

Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)

Miller, George

Moore

Moran (KS)

Murphy

Murtha

Nadler

Napolitano

Neal (MA)

Oberstar

Obey

Olver

Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)

[Page: H6858] [GPO's PDF](#)

Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sabo



Sánchez, Linda T.

Sanchez, Loretta

Sanders

Sandlin

Schakowsky

Schiff

Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)

Serrano

Shays

Sherman

Shimkus

Shuster

Simmons

Skelton

Slaughter

Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)

Snyder

Solis

Spratt

Stark

Stenholm

Strickland

Stupak

Sweeney

Tanner

Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (NM)  
Wolf

Woolsey

Wu

Wynn

NOES--148

Akin

Alexander

Bachus

Baker

Barrett (SC)

Bartlett (MD)

Barton (TX)

Beauprez

Biggert

Bishop (UT)

Blackburn

Blunt

Boehner

Bonilla

Bonner

Boozman

Brady (TX)

Brown (SC)

Burgess

Burns

Burton (IN)

Buyer

Calvert

Cantor

Carter

Chocola

Cole

Collins

Cox

Crenshaw

Cubin

Culberson

Davis, Jo Ann

Davis, Tom

Deal (GA)

DeLay

DeMint

Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.

Doolittle

Dreier

Dunn

Everett

Feeney

Flake

Foley

Forbes

Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen

Garrett (NJ)

Gillmor

Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harris  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hostettler  
Hulshof  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Johnson, Sam  
Keller  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Kline

Knollenberg

Kolbe

LaHood

Latham

Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)

Lucas (OK)

McCrery

McInnis

McKeon

Mica

Miller (FL)

Miller, Gary

Musgrave

Myrick

Neugebauer

Northup

Norwood

Nunes

Osborne

Ose

Otter

Oxley

Paul

Pearce

Pence

Peterson (PA)

Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Saxton  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Sherwood  
Simpson  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder

Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Weldon (FL)  
Wicker  
Wilson (SC)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING--17

Ballenger  
Bono  
Cannon  
Crane  
Engel  
Gephardt  
Goss  
Hunter  
Mollohan  
Moran (VA)  
Nethercutt



Ney

Nussle

Ryan (OH)

Schrock

Tauzin

Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

[Time: 18:05]

Messrs. TAYLOR of North Carolina, ADERHOLT, SHUSTER, SWEENEY, WAMP, Ms. HART and Mr. WALSH changed their vote from ``no" to ``aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.