

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1402, CONSOLIDATION OF MILK MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 294 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 294

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1402) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the Class I milk price structure known as Option 1A as part of the implementation of the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 3 of rule XIII or section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from New

York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 294 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1402, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the Class I milk price structure noted and known as Option 1-A.

The Committee on Rules met last week and granted a structured rule for H.R. 1402. This is a fair and balanced measure.

The Committee heard testimony from numerous witnesses and considered 39 amendments. Members offering amendments were able to combine similar amendments and the committee made a total of 9 in order.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided by the chairman and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture.

The rule waives clause 3 of rule XIII, requiring the inclusion in the report of a CBO cost estimate and a statement on certain budget matters if the measure includes new budget or entitlement authority, and section 308A of the Congressional Budget Act requiring a Congressional Budget Office estimate in the committee report on any legislation containing new budget authority against consideration of the bill.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Agriculture amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment, modified by the amendments printed in part A in the report on the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution.

Those amendments fix the budget problem. With the amendment, the bill actually saves money as opposed to spending it.

The rule further provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and waives clause 7 of rule XVI, prohibiting nongermane amendments against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution.

In addition, the rule provides that amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for revision of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

Additionally, the rule permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, during an address in Peoria, Illinois, President Dwight Eisenhower remarked that "farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you are a thousand miles from the cornfield."

And so it is with the business of America's dairy farms.

With images of athletes and celebrities donning milk mustaches, and an abundance of dairy products at the neighborhood grocer, it is easy for us far removed from the farm to forget the plight of the farmer.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1402 is a critical measure that targets a unique market: our Nation's independent and family-owned dairy farms.

Unlike other businesses that have the flexibility to get the best prices for their product, dairy farmers cannot stop milking cows if the price of raw milk suddenly drops. They must sell their product at the going price. Further, they are unique in a volatile market because they produce an extremely perishable product.

As President Kennedy once remarked, "The farmer is the only man in our economy who buys everything he buys at retail, sells everything he sells at wholesale, and pays the freight both ways." And as the son of an agribusinessman, having represented vast family farmlands throughout my career, and having grown up and around the farm and the dairy industry, I know how true President Kennedy's words ring, even today.

□ 1715

That is why Congress carefully crafted the Freedom to Farm bill in 1996. While this law set many important provisions in place, it did not strictly define consolidating milk orders. Subsequently, the administration proposed two options, and then opted for one that the majority in the House and Senate and the vast majority of the dairy community opposed.

Congress and the dairy community support Option 1A. This Class 1 pricing option is based on sound economic analysis by the USDA Price Structure Committee. Among other factors, it takes into account transportation costs for moving fluid milk, and the costs of producing and marketing milk.

Option 1A is currently the best alternative for our Nation's family dairy farms. This plan reforms the Federal Order system through a variety of means that include consolidating the 31 current Orders into 11, including previously unregulated areas into the plan, and reclassifying milk products.

In addition, by keeping in place price differentials, a system that has proven effective over many years, Option 1A diminishes market volatility and ensures that there will continue to be plenty of fresh milk in all markets of this country.

Our Nation's family-owned dairy farms are in a crisis. In New York alone, our State has seen a dramatic decrease in the number of dairy farmers and cows. From 1997 to 1997, the number of dairy farms decreased by 41 percent, and the number of cows by 15 percent.

Other areas of the United States have seen a similar decline, which takes away both a way of life that dates back to the birth of our Nation, and hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide. H.R. 1402 will go a long way towards fixing the current pricing inequity.

In fact, this bill is critical for the long-term viability of dairy farming in most States, including my own State of New York, which is the third largest dairy State in the country.

In New York, I represent Wyoming County, a community rich in agricultural history, and our State's most productive dairy county.

Further, Option 1A does not economically discriminate against one or more milk-producing regions of the country to benefit another. It is based on factors that recognize the importance and value of having fresh supplies of milk produced locally.

Our great Nation has a long tradition in family-owned businesses, especially in agriculture. America's independent and family-owned farms give our Nation the unique ability to provide for the needs of our people.

In order to maintain and allow the dairy industry and family-owned dairy farms to grow, we need to enact Option 1A.

More than 250 years ago, George Washington wrote, "I know of no pursuit in which more real and important services can be rendered to any country than by improving its agriculture."

Madam Speaker, by adopting this rule and its underlying bill, we can improve our Nation's agriculture and the lives of our men and women of America's dairy farms.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and strongly support the bill, H.R. 1402. This bipartisan bill is brought to the House floor by the Committee on Agriculture chairman, the honorable gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture, the honorable gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

I am pleased that Midwestern Members will be able to articulate their op-

position to this bill and offer amendments highlighting their difference of opinion under this rule.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1402 would require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the Class 1 milk price structure known as Option 1A as part of the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders. H.R. 1402 would essentially maintain minimum farm milk prices close to the current levels. The bill would also extend the Federal dairy price support program by 1 year.

This legislation is necessary to prevent the USDA from moving forward with proposed changes that would be devastating for dairy farmers, not only in New York but across the country. Nationwide, dairy farmers would lose \$200 million under the USDA proposal scheduled to go into effect October 1. In the Northeast, dairy farm income would be reduced by \$84 million annually. In my State of New York alone, dairy farmers would lose \$30 million a year. Just as milk does the body good, H.R. 1402 does the dairy farmer and the economy good.

The critics of the legislation argue that farmers overwhelmingly voted to approve the USDA charges, milking this argument for all it is worth. What they do not point out is that farmers would have risked the loss of all Federal price supports in their region. Essentially, farmers had a choice between a flood or a drought when what they really wanted was a long soaking rain.

So the opponents of H.R. 1402 in the upper Midwest claim that the Administration's final rule helps to balance out a system that they claim results in lower prices to farmers in their region.

But a Hoard's Dairyman study shows that in 1998, the mailbox prices, the actual dollar amount that a farmer receives in the upper Midwest, were among the highest in the country. Despite this fact, the modified Option 1B that the Secretary of Agriculture has proposed actually further raises the prices in the upper Midwest while lowering prices paid to producers in most of the rest of the country.

Opponents also argue that the 1996 farm bill required USDA to develop a new, more market-oriented Federal Order system. However, Option 1A, also developed by USDA, is a more market-oriented system, yet will not result in concentrating milk production into one small region of the country.

If this concentration occurred, not only will thousands of dairy farmers be forced out of business, but consumers will also suffer increased prices as a reflection of forced transportation costs.

Some critics of H.R. 1402 have argued that this bill would mandate higher milk prices, milking the consumers' fears for all they are worth. The USDA even says that consumers would not pay more than 1 percent per gallon more for milk. An independent analysis conducted for the House Committee on Agriculture by the University of Missouri's Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute, one I am sure the

chairman knows well, also supports this finding. This means, in the worst case scenario, an average American will pay no more than 24 cents a year. That is less than one cup of coffee.

Opponents also argue that this bill will affect the cost of other milk products, such as cheese. But the provisions of H.R. 1402 that affect milk used to produce cheese, Class III, will not increase prices paid for this milk, and therefore will not affect the price of cheese to consumers.

In addition, a 1-year extension of the dairy price support program will actually reduce the cost of the dairy program by over \$100 million. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Very simply, taxpayers will not see increased costs because of the bill, farmers did not have a choice when the referendum was held, and consumers will not see savings if the bill is defeated.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan H.R. 1402 and this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, while we will see tomorrow how contentious debate on dairy policy can be, I want to make a brief statement this evening about the process that we have followed.

From the beginning, the Committee on Agriculture has tried to ensure a process that was fair and open to all Members. We announced our schedule well in advance, we provided an opportunity for all Members to offer their amendments, and we gave everyone an opportunity to vote on the policy option that they preferred.

I commend the Committee on Rules for continuing in this spirit. While not all of the amendments were made in order, it is my belief that the more than 6 hours of debate time that is permitted under this rule gives every Member an opportunity to make their case and cast their votes.

This is a fair rule, Madam Speaker. I urge its adoption so we can proceed with this much-anticipated debate, and I thank the Committee on Rules for the work they have done.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I will admit that the distinguished chairman has done a good job in terms of providing us with opportunities to offer amendments and to debate this bill. However, we need to go back to what happened when we passed the last farm bill and review that a little bit.

Madam Speaker, I am a member of the committee who has dealt with this all through the process. If Members will remember, back in 1995-1996 we tried to overhaul legislatively the dairy system in this country. We were told at that time that it is too complicated, that we did not have enough input for the public, so we should put this over to the Department and let them go through a process so everybody in the country could be heard.

That is what ended up happening. Since that time, the Department has gone out and held hearings all over this country, taken thousands of pages of testimony, taken letters and e-mails and telephone calls from all over the country, listened to lots of folks, studied the best economists in the country, and have ended up with this rule which we in the Midwest think moves us in the right direction, but we would like to see go frankly even further towards a more market-oriented, sensible dairy policy.

So we feel like the bargain that we struck to have this go through the process within the Department is now being violated by bringing this rule forward and by bringing this bill forward, because we entered into this in good faith, and we feel like now we are being a little bit blind-sided.

People need to understand, as I said, that the Department put a lot of time into this. They did not come up with this out of thin air. They took the Cornell model, which is, by all of the dairy folks, determined to be one that best understands how this milk pricing system works in this country.

They have tried to set up a system whereby we do not use the Federal Government's power to distort the way milk is produced in this country.

Members have to remember that we are operating under a system on the fluid milk side that was developed by Tony Coelho in this body in 1985, which is basically a legislative, political fix that was put in place, and there never was any real economics put into that.

What we are trying to do today is more closely mirror the economics of the dairy industry. In this rule, they took into account how much it takes, how much money it takes to move milk from one area of the country to the other. They have tried to establish a system that does not price fluid milk above what it is actually worth, so those parts of the country that have these higher differentials end up producing more milk that gets dumped into manufacturing markets like Minnesota and other parts of the country.

Probably a lot of people do not even realize that in this rule is a new Class III and Class IV milk pricing system which, in my opinion, is more important than the fluid milk part of this bill, but hardly anybody talks about it.

This bill that is before us only addresses the Class I fluid milk part of that rule. It is the thing that we have been concerned about. Again, in summarizing, we feel that people have gone

back on their word. I would encourage us to not support this rule and not support this bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1402, is an attempt to force this Congress to continue to operate an antiquated system of price-fixing that violates the free market principle.

What we are talking about today, and the legislation we are bringing to the floor tomorrow, should this rule pass, is basically this. In 1937 we started with a milk pricing system that said, the farther away from Eau Claire, Wisconsin, you live, the higher you get a price for milk.

We have this in law today. In 1937, we did not have an interstate highway system. We did not have refrigerated trucks or railcars to ship milk around. Wisconsin was the only surplus-producing milk State at that time.

That was 1937. This is 1999. We have interstates, we have very good highways, we have refrigerated milk trucks. Yet, we have an antiquated, socialistic style milk-pricing system that says if you live farther away from Eau Claire, Wisconsin, you are going to get more for your production of milk.

This is a system that is anti-free market, it is anti-free market principles that we all espouse to support, but more importantly, it comes right at the bottom line of upper Midwest dairy farmers.

□ 1730

This is a system, should this rule pass and should this bill pass, that will stop the USDA from implementing very modest reforms that they are proposing to implement 9 days from now.

So let us make this very clear. What we are about to do here is pass the bill, if this passes, that blocks the USDA from putting together modest reforms on behalf of all Nation farmers, all of our farmers so that they can go back to farming regardless of where they live in this country.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule, and I urge a "no" vote on final passage on H.R. 1402.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, for the last 10 years, we have had a lot of people on this House floor demanding that Russia move from a Marxist market system to a free market system. Yet, they are going to come to the floor tomorrow and support this bill which says that we must keep in place the most Soviet-style pricing system in the history of this country. That is what the existing status quo is.

What they are saying is, if it was good enough for us in 1937, it is good enough for us right now. With all due respect, I disagree. What existing law

says and what this bill seeks to continue is that, if one produces 100 pounds of milk in one place in this country, one is mandated by the government to get \$2 to \$3 more for 100 pounds of milk than one would if one produced that same amount of pounds of milk someplace else in the country. That is nuts. That is absolutely nuts.

So what we are trying to do is to have this Congress live up to the promise it made a few years ago. When the Freedom to Farm bill was on this floor a few years ago, Congressman Gunderson, Republican, chairman of the dairy subcommittee, was trying to get on this floor an amendment to change the existing system. He was told by his own party leadership, "Sorry, you are not going to get a legislative remedy. You are going to have to rely on what USDA does." So that is what we did.

Under that limited authority, USDA tried in a modest way to make the system more equitable. Now that the folks who denied us the legislative remedy 3 years ago do not like what the administrative remedy has produced, they are now flipping their word. Now what they are saying is, oh, forget what we said about doing it administratively, we are now going to overturn the USDA and impose our own will.

What does that mean? It means this decision will not be made on the basis of economics. It will not be made on the basis of economic fairness. It will be made on the basis of raw political power. Simply put, that is what the issue is before us. That is why this rule should be defeated. That is why this bill should be defeated.

The folks who are defending the status quo told us, Rely on the fair shake that we can get from USDA. We did it. Now they are trying to bust the deal. That is not the way the people's house is supposed to work.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I would agree with my colleague that the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I think, did a good job in trying to balance the opportunities for Members to make comment. But I think the larger issue is that we should not even be here today. We should not be here in this House today taking up this rule or taking up H.R. 1402 tomorrow.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), I think, has eloquently talked about the institutional history here about the fact that bringing this bill up breaks a deal that was struck across the Nation some years ago when this institution was floundering over dairy reform, unable to reach a consensus.

So it was agreed to refer this to an outside observer. Now that that outside observer, the USDA, has come forward, it seems as though a number of Members want to take their marbles and go home.

Also, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said, consideration of this bill contradicts our work in the international community. At the very time that we are preaching the gospel of free trade, forcing nations all across the world to break down barriers, to lower tariffs, we are poised in this House to reinforce and reimpose those very trade barriers between the States.

Late last week, USDA Secretary Glickman has disclosed or did disclose that he was recommending a Presidential veto.

So why are we taking this bill up? Why are we taking on another fight with the White House at the very time that our constituents want us to get down to work and do the people's business, tax cuts, saving Social Security, not to get once again bogged down in these regional interests?

Finally, let us not forget who opposes H.R. 1402. A coalition ranging from Americans for Tax Reform to the AFL-CIO, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Teamsters, group after group is telling us this is the wrong thing to do, and, yet, this House wants to move forward.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today urging my colleagues for a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on H.R. 1402. We are going to have plenty of time over the next day, 24 hours, to talk about the policy merits of H.R. 1402, the bad policy implications involved with it.

I think we can all stipulate that family farmers across the country, no matter what region they happen to be living and working in, are going through some very tough times. The farmers in western Wisconsin who I represent and one of the largest dairy producing districts in the Nation do not want any further hardship to fall on any other family farmer, in any other aspect of the country.

They are not looking for any special advantage. All they are asking for is a level playing field and the ability to compete fairly in our own domestic market when it comes to making a living on a dairy farm. That is all they want.

We will have time to get into the policy implications behind H.R. 1402, but I think the Members should vote against H.R. 1402 because this legislation should never have been brought to the floor to begin with. I believe that the institutional integrity of this place is on the line with the introduction of this legislation in the 11th hour.

Let me explain. Back in 1996, my predecessor, Steve Gunderson, who was

chairing the dairy subcommittee was going to legislate in the Freedom to Farm bill some corrective changes on the milk pricing system, a system that was in place during the Great Depression, a stopgap, short-term measure in order to deal with the problems that this country was experiencing during the Great Depression.

But sometimes one of the hardest things to change in this place is the status quo. But instead of allowing Representative Gunderson and his supporters to go forward with legislation in Freedom to Farm, they said, no, instead, let us let the regulatory and rulemaking process at the Department of Agriculture deal with this. They have through that mandate in Freedom to Farm.

Over the last few years, they have held countless hearings across the country. They have taken testimony from experts in the field, from the dairy producers, public comments through e-mail, letters, personal testimony even from Representatives of Congress.

They have come forward with a proposed reform that is due to take effect on October 1, a reform that was voted by over 96 percent of the dairy producers in this country, to take effect on October 1.

Now, in the 11th hour, regardless of the agreement that was reached back in 1996 in the Freedom to Farm debate, this legislation is coming to the floor; and that is wrong.

I fear to think what this place will become if people's words do not count for anything anymore, if agreements do not matter. I believe that is what is at stake here. Besides the fairness and the policy implications behind reforming the milk pricing system, if we cannot reach agreements in this body and live up to those agreements in future years, then I shudder to think what this environment is ultimately going to look out.

So I would encourage my colleagues vote against the rule, to vote against final passage, and cast a vote in favor of the institutional integrity of this House of Representatives.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, will the Chair please inform me how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, because this rule is so fair, we want to continue to allow the debate even though we have taken warning of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that we will see some of that debate tomorrow. I am sure it will spill over in some of our rule today, but we will continue on the debate.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for 2 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his inherent fairness.

But what is unfair is the current milk pricing system we have in this country today. The farmers of Wisconsin, the farmers of my district, the First District of Wisconsin, are suffering because they live too close to Eau Claire, Wisconsin. They are not suffering because they run a shoddy operation or it is inefficient. No, they are suffering because they live too close to Eau Claire, Wisconsin. Does that make sense to anybody?

We are losing more family farms in Wisconsin than many of my colleagues have in their States in totality. The USDA reform initiative is a small step to alleviate a situation that has been plaguing dairy farmers in the midwest for far too long. This system needs to be reformed not because it unfairly penalizes the midwest dairy farmers but because it hurts taxpayers and consumers.

They are being asked to subsidize inefficiencies in the production of dairy product. They are being asked to pay for a program that continues to waste their taxpayer dollars. They are being asked to pay higher prices at the supermarket.

We are no longer giving farmers in certain areas of the country an incentive to produce milk. We are now giving them an incentive to overproduce milk. That is where we are today.

This type of system does not provide an incentive for farmers to operate efficiently or produce items that are natural to their agricultural environment.

If this bill passes, we will be silencing the voices of millions of farmers around the country who have already been heard on this issue by the USDA and deserve a right to vote on this reform. This reform in this August was supported by over 95 percent of farmers nationwide. If we pass this bill, we are rolling back that mandate. I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, while this rule makes in order several amendments, it does not make in order any amendments that focus on the negative impact that the underlying bill has on taxpayers and consumers, especially low-income families.

This bill would scrap the very modest market-oriented reforms put forward by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, instead of just leaving the current pricing scheme in place, which is still terribly unfair to upper Midwestern dairy farmers, the bill actually raises prices of milk beyond the current pricing structure in some locations. The increase in milk prices given to some dairy farmers will be passed on to consumers. It is an economic reality. Low-income families will be hurt most because they spend a higher proportion of their income on food.

For example, the Women, Infants, and Children program, commonly

known as WIC, provides assistance to low-income families to buy nutritious food. But under this bill, because of the increased cost of purchasing milk, a nutritious staple food, the WIC program will be short over \$10 million per year. The WIC program is not an entitlement. So without additional tax dollars put into this program, H.R. 1402 could squeeze about 3,700 women, infants, and children out of the program every year.

Madam Speaker, this bill is unfair to Midwestern dairy farmers, to taxpayers, to consumers.

I am sorry that the rule did not permit consideration of an amendment to protect consumers and taxpayers from the effects of H.R. 1402.

I urge a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this well-crafted rule which would allow us to consider legislation that is vital to dairy farmers throughout the vast majority of the country.

Support for the bill, H.R. 1402, for which this rule is being considered, is overwhelming. Irregardless of what we have just heard in the last few minutes, let us look at the numbers. Two hundred twenty-nine Members of Congress representing 43 States have co-sponsored H.R. 1402.

□ 1745

One of those represented States is my home State of Pennsylvania. We are the fourth largest producer of fluid milk in the country, behind California, Wisconsin, and New York. Now, of those top four States, not to mention all the other 43 States, the only one that would benefit by Dan Glickman's mistake would be Wisconsin. And if we cannot in this House correct a mistake that the Secretary of Agriculture made, what are we here to do?

All these scare tactics about the raise in the price of milk and people on WIC and so forth are just that. The biggest scare would be that we do not have farm fresh, locally produced milk in all areas of the country from our family farm system. If we do not pass this bill, we will sacrifice the family farm on the altar of agribusiness and a few large cooperatives in the upper Midwest.

Madam Speaker, I will leave my colleagues with one final statistic. According to the dairy farmers of America, 25 percent of the dairy farms in the United States have ceased to exist in the last 6 years. We must stop this unacceptable trend by passing this rule and then passing the bill H.R. 1402 offered by my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Sanders).

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this

this time, and I rise in strong support of our Nation's dairy family farmers, strong support for this rule, and strong support for H.R. 1402, without the poison pill amendments.

What this legislation is about is protecting family farms all over this country. I have heard some discussion tonight that what we are doing here is not democratic. Well, when we have 229 Members who are cosponsoring this legislation, I think that is democratic. If we have legislation which protects family farmers in 45 out of 50 States, I think that that is democratic. And I think we should pass this rule and pass the legislation.

This legislation would implement the Class I milk price structure known as Option 1-A as part of the final rule to consolidate federal milk marketing orders. It will protect family dairy farmers in Vermont and throughout this country from the drop in fluid milk prices that is expected in just 9 days if the proposal introduced by Secretary Glickman and the United States Department of Agriculture is implemented.

I understand that there is some confusion about the recent referendum results on USDA's federal milk market order reform plan. I have heard from many dairy farmers in Vermont saying that they had no choice. I have heard about Soviet-style legislation. This is what Soviet style legislation is: either you vote for it or you vote for nothing. And that is why the Soviet rulers always used to get 96 percent of the vote, which is what I gather this legislation has gotten. Well, the farmers in Vermont want something, not nothing, and what they want is 1-A. They want a fair price for their product.

In my State, and in virtually every State in this country, a great tragedy is occurring in rural America. It is heartbreaking and it is terrible for consumers, terrible for the environment, and terrible for the economy. What we are seeing throughout this country in rural America are family farmers, many whose families have owned the land generation after generation being driven off the land.

And if the opponents of this legislation think that it is a good idea that a handful of agribusiness corporations will control the production and the distribution of dairy products in this country, they are dead wrong. It will not be good for the consumer. The best thing that we can continue to have and to expand is family farming all over this country; to know that in our own communities, in our own States there will be family farmers producing fresh dairy products and other commodities that we desperately need.

This is a life and death issue for family farmers all over this country. I urge support of the rule and support of the legislation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this

time and for bringing this issue to the floor today for this rule to be voted on.

I, of course, encourage that the rule be approved. I think it does give plenty of opportunity to debate the issue and a number of amendments that the will of the House will be known on. As my colleague from Vermont just said, there are 229 cosponsors of this legislation. A handful or more Members contacted me in the last 2 weeks, after it was too late, to cosponsor and ask what could they do to join this legislation.

One of the things that prompted them to want to become part of this was the calls they were getting, the frustrated calls they were getting from their dairy farming families who saw the choice they had of no milk marketing structure at all or 1-B as the choice between capital punishment and cutting off their hand. Well, given those two choices, you will always vote to cut off your hand. That is what American dairy farm families felt like they did as they cast those votes. They are overwhelmingly for the 1-A marketing structure. They overwhelmingly believe that the mapping consolidation, where we have now 11 orders, is a good thing.

But this is about families. It is about dairy farming families and whether they continue to be able to have a family farm, a family dairy farm. It is about American consuming families and whether they continue to have a fresh supply, a locally produced supply of milk, something that this Government and State governments have been committed to for a long time.

This is about families, and it is about dairy farming families that would lose its estimated \$200 million every single year if 1-B goes into effect. If 1-B had been a hurricane, it would be in the top 10 most destructive hurricanes in the history of the country. Well, let us not let American dairy farming families be hit by Hurricane Dan. Let us get to work and let us pass this rule today, have this debate for American families tomorrow and pass this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I rise also in opposition to the bill.

It was back in 1933, during the depths of the Great Depression, that Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace introduced our farm programs with the statement that these are temporary solutions to deal with an emergency. Well, here we are, almost 70 years later, and we are still utilizing some emergency solutions, temporary solutions, to deal with a different time and a different era.

The reason why we should oppose this legislation is it does not embrace the modest reforms that the Secretary of Agriculture put in place that would move our dairy industry in a more market-oriented direction, a direction

that would ensure that dairy families, farming families, in an area that had a relative advantage, maybe because of climate, maybe because of feed cost, would be able to recognize that relative advantage.

It is a step away from an old program that put in place arbitrary differentials, which means that we have the Government dictating that some dairy farmers in a particular region of the country are going to be getting more income, not because they are more efficient producers, but only because they live a further distance away from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. That does not make any sense.

It might have made sense in the 1930's, when we did not have refrigeration. But it is remarkable, today every house in America has a refrigerator. We did not have refrigerated trucks back then that could transport milk products to make sure that we could have an adequate supply of fluid milk in every region of the country. But today we have refrigerated trucks. We even have an interstate system today that allows us to ship milk from Wisconsin to parts of the country that, unfortunately, because of climate conditions and feed costs cannot be competitive in the marketplace with producing milk.

Does this mean that we are attacking family farms? Nonsense. It means that we are ensuring that those family farmers that have an opportunity to be most cost effective, that have a relative advantage, will be able to recognize that.

Where else in this economy do we dictate that we are going to have a Government program that ensures that we are going to have something produced in a particular region? Where else do we dictate by the Government that we are going to ensure that we have the production of a particular product in an area which might not have the level of efficiencies? This is a wrong policy to embrace. We need to move forward. We are making these modest reforms that ensure that we are not prejudicing those family farmers that do have the advantage.

I would also like to state that there will be one amendment that I am going to offer that is going to do something that is very simple, that can make this bill much better, and that is to ensure that a dairy farmer can enter into a contract with a private processor, something that every businessperson in America can do today.

It is a reform that will ensure that a dairy farmer will have the ability to manage the volatility and prices, to manage the risk that is incumbered upon them by fluctuating milk prices, and is something that will make this bad bill a little better. I hope people will support my amendment to Stenholm-Pombo.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time, and, Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this fair rule, and I rise in strong support of 1402.

Over the past 3 years, the Department of Agriculture has undertaken a biased march toward implementing a new program which will slash upwards of \$300 million per year in on-farm revenue to dairy farmers nationally. It is \$30 million to the dairy farmers in New York State.

In 1996, during the farm bill debate, a battle was waged over dairy policy, and in that debate efforts to scale back and eliminate the federal milk marketing order program were convincingly defeated on this floor in favor of the preservation of the milk marketing order program. Yet today, here we are again listening to some of those same arguments, as if that debate never took place.

H.R. 1402 is an effort on the part of a bipartisan majority of this House to reaffirm the intent of Congress in the 1996 farm bill to preserve dairy farm income and to hold the Department of Agriculture accountable for ignoring the will of Congress and the best interest of nearly all of the many dairy producing regions in this country, 45 out of the 50 States, as my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), pointed out.

This debate is very simple. Do you support a balanced program that is responsive to all regions of the country, or do you seek to pull the rug out from under the farmers in those 45 States? Let me repeat, 45 States lose money under the USDA plan.

The federal dairy program is a reasonable industry-funded safety net that ensures fair treatment of farmers throughout the country, even in the upper Midwest. That is why farmers, by over 90 percent, voted in support of the system. We have an obligation to ensure that it is preserved.

The dairy program may be complex, and many Members will claim they do not understand it; but my colleagues should know that their farmers understand very well the impacts these policies have on their livelihoods. They know without passage of 1402 the dairy industry will become a monopolized disaster, unfair to consumers and farmers.

I urge strong support for this rule and support for 1402.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I understand where many of the Members of this chamber feel they have to stand up for their farmers. They feel this is a bill that is in the best interest of their farmers. But it reminds me a little bit of a holiday coming up in the next month, and that is Halloween. We have a situation at Halloween where little kids are going around trick or treating. Some of the little kids realize there are bigger kids

who are getting all the candy, and this is wrong. They feel they have to do something so that they get more candy. Now, they can do one of two things. They can go after the bigger kids to get the candy, or they can pick on other little kids.

Make no mistake about it, that is exactly what is going on in this bill. Little kids who feel that they have been picked on have decided to pick on other little kids. Does that make it right? Absolutely not. In fact, that is even worse than anything else that can be done.

The people that we are talking about here, these horrible people, are small dairy farmers in the Midwest and other parts of this country. They are not huge conglomerates. In fact, in many parts of this country farms are being destroyed on a daily basis.

□ 1800

But the solution is not to come in and destroy more farmers. And when I hear people say, well, there are Members of this chamber from 43 different States or 45 different States supporting this, that does not make it right. Because you can have 45 bullies picking on five little kids and it does not make it right.

Notwithstanding that, what is amazing about this bill, as the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and others have pointed out, that we are in an economy right now where people are talking about let us have open trade around the world.

I may not agree with all of that, but it blows my mind that in our own country we have picked out one product, one product alone, and said we are not going to have open trade when it comes to dairy products.

Name another product in this country where we will penalize someone for doing a good job of producing that product. That is not the American way and all it does, all it does is pick on small farmers in the Midwest, California, and other parts of this country.

This bill may pass today, but it should not pass. It is bad for farmers, and it is bad for the American public.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York for yielding me the time.

Obviously, we have having a little disagreement here on the floor today. It is obviously not partisan because we have got Members from both sides of the aisle on different sides of this fight.

The fact is that, as much as I would rather not be here debating this bill tonight and tomorrow, the fact is a majority of the House wants to debate it, we have moved it through the committee, and we are going to debate it. And the fact is, I think the Committee on Rules did a nice job in putting the rule together, I think it is fair, it gives us an open debate, and then we can have at it with our differences fairly.

But when I hear Members up here talking about the USDA making a mistake and how they went about putting this rule together, let me remind the Members that in the 1996 farm bill we tried for almost a year to bring some reform to the dairy program. We were unable to come to an agreement except that we were able to get some language into the bill agreed to by all parties that there would be a consolidation of these marketing orders and that we would allow the Secretary to implement this most modest of reforms.

The Secretary went around the country and had hearings, listened to dairy farmers around the country, came up with two options, option 1(a)/option 1(b), had comments from around the country, a comment period; and then the Secretary made a decision to go with a modified option, somewhere between 1(a) and 1(b), that is supposed to go into effect next week. What is underway here is an effort to stop that.

The fact of the matter is, when we look at the numbers, whether it is 1(a) or 1(b), it does not make a dime's worth of difference to almost any farmer in America. Nobody here is against the dairy farmer. The question is how do we best help the dairy farmer. Many of us believe that if we allow the market to work, that we get rid of this antiquated system in effect since 1937, we can actually help the farmers.

Let us pass this rule and have the debate tomorrow.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I have no other requests for time on this rule, but I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

"Ms. LOFGREN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee of conference recommend a conference substitute that,

(1) includes a loophole-free system that assures that no criminals or other prohibited purchasers, (e.g. murderers, rapists, child molesters, fugitives from justice, undocumented aliens, stalkers and batterers) obtain firearms from non-licensed person and federally licensed firearm dealers at gun shows;

(2) does not include provisions that weaken current gun safety law; and

(3) includes provisions that aid in the enforcement of current laws against criminals who use guns (e.g. murderers, rapists, child molesters, fugitives from justice, stalkers and batterers)."

While I understand that House Rules do not allow Members to co-offer motions to instruct, I would like to say that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) supports this motion and intends to speak on its behalf tomorrow.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for generously yielding me additional time.

Madam Speaker, I want to make an important point here. We have heard a lot this evening about how dairy farms all across America are hurting. And that is true. I agree with the speakers who have made that point. But let me direct everyone's attention to our situation in the upper Midwest.

In the State of Wisconsin, by the time this bill comes up for a vote tomorrow, we will have lost five more dairy farms. We are losing five farms a day. In the last 10 years, we have lost more dairy farms than nearly every other State ever had.

So when we are talking about alleviating the pain and suffering of our dairy farmers, clearly 1402 is not the answer.

Understand that as each of us gets up here and talks about the pain that our farmers are facing, 1402 is the current system. We should not be here voting on 1402.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time and for the good work that he has done on this bill.

This is a good bill, and it is a good rule. I have been listening to the debate; and with several few exceptions, all of the opponents to this rule and this bill has been from Minnesota and Wisconsin, the home of some of the finest dairy farmers in America and some of the best legislators in America. They are so good, they are trying to convince the rest of the country that we should lose at what they say is to the benefit of their farmers.

Why would anyone pass a Federal dairy policy that hurts the rest of the country to try to prop up two States? As I understand it, this option 1(b) takes \$200 million out of the pockets of dairy farmers all across the country and does not really help Minnesota or Wisconsin. Whereas, the option 1(a) that I support holds everyone harmless.

Now, what is the sense of passing a reform that hurts 90 percent of the country when we could pass a reform that keeps everybody whole and in fact

helps stabilize prices and ensures that there is a fresh supply of milk all across the country? It does not make sense.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I had not intended to speak today on this rule because I think it is a good one, a fair one. But in the hopes of perhaps injecting some reality and facts into the debate tomorrow, I want to rise and just make a few points.

First of all, my friend from Minnesota, and he is my friend, spoke about the good faith of the Department of Agriculture's policy and development of 1(b). And frankly, that is the problem. It was a total lack of good faith by the Secretary that brings us to this point here today.

How do I know? Well, frankly, as they listened as we have heard today to so many farmers, the hearing record shows that in response to the 1(a)/1(b) proposal, 4,217 total comments were received. Of those, 3,579 supported 1(a). How many supported 1(b)? 436. Eighty-five percent of the hearing record supported 1(a). The lack of good faith is evident.

Not only that, Madam Speaker, we must remember that the Secretary's own dairy price structure committee, the internal organization, the experts in the Department of Agriculture assigned to make these kinds of decisions supported 1(a), as well.

The other thing I wanted to mention is we have heard about market orientation in Eau Claire, Wisconsin and such. It may not be nice to hear but the facts are H.R. 1402 as well as 1(b), in fact, change and make adjustments to the current system so that the Eau Claire pricing system is no longer applicable. And, in fact, under 1(b), 408 counties in 10 States will have class 1 differentials equal to or lower than Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

So it is not an issue of Eau Claire and it is not an issue of market orientation because, indeed, both of the plans operate in essentially the same way.

Lastly, modest reforms, \$200 million. The Congress spoke as to the wisdom of this policy when we debated the 1996 farm bill. As my colleague from Vermont so eloquently stated, we spoke when we wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture on this issue. We have to now take the matter back into our hands into this, the people's House, where the answers lie. We have to pass this rule and support H.R. 1402.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, we continue to hear how Wisconsin dairy farmers got a raw deal back in the 1985 farm bill and how

the dairy farmers in other parts of the country are doing better at their expense. But it is interesting, the Department of Agriculture records show dairy farmers' take-home pay is higher in Wisconsin than in the majority of farmers in the rest of the country.

I urge all of us to support this bill, to support fair play for dairy farmers in all 50 States by voting for the option 1(a) proposal in H.R. 1402.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I believe we have heard from everybody from Wisconsin on our side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule and the underlying bill, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

The votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2116, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 1431, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 468, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

VETERANS' MILLENNIUM HEALTH CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 2116, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2116, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 46, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—369

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Barrett (WI) | Blagojevich |
| Aderholt | Bartlett | Bliley |
| Allen | Barton | Blumauer |
| Archer | Bateman | Blunt |
| Armey | Becerra | Boehlert |
| Bachus | Bentsen | Boehner |
| Baird | Bereuter | Bonilla |
| Baker | Berkley | Bonior |
| Baldacci | Berman | Bono |
| Baldwin | Berry | Borski |
| Ballenger | Biggert | Boswell |
| Barcia | Bilbray | Boucher |
| Barr | Bilirakis | Boyd |
| Barrett (NE) | Bishop | Brady (PA) |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Brady (TX) | Hastings (FL) | Napolitano | Thune | Vitter | Whitfield |
| Brown (FL) | Hastings (WA) | Neal | Thurman | Walden | Wicker |
| Brown (OH) | Hayes | Nethercutt | Tiahrt | Walsh | Wilson |
| Bryant | Hayworth | Ney | Toomey | Watkins | Wise |
| Burr | Hefley | Northup | Traficant | Watt (NC) | Wolf |
| Burton | Herger | Norwood | Turner | Watts (OK) | Woolsey |
| Callahan | Hill (IN) | Nussle | Udall (CO) | Waxman | Wu |
| Calvert | Hill (MT) | Oberstar | Udall (NM) | Weldon (FL) | Wynn |
| Camp | Hildeary | Obey | Upton | Weldon (PA) | Young (AK) |
| Campbell | Hilliard | Ortiz | Vento | Weller | Young (FL) |
| Canady | Hinojosa | Ose | Viscosky | Wexler | |
| Cannon | Hobson | Owens | | | |
| Capps | Hoefel | Oxley | | | |
| Capuano | Hoekstra | Packard | | | |
| Cardin | Holden | Pastor | | | |
| Carson | Hooley | Pease | | | |
| Castle | Horn | Pelosi | | | |
| Chabot | Hostettler | Peterson (MN) | | | |
| Chambliss | Hulshof | Peterson (PA) | | | |
| Chenoweth | Hutchinson | Petri | | | |
| Clyburn | Hyde | Phelps | | | |
| Coble | Inslee | Pickering | | | |
| Coburn | Isakson | Pickett | | | |
| Collins | Istook | Pitts | | | |
| Combest | Jackson (IL) | Pombo | | | |
| Condit | Jackson-Lee | Pomeroy | | | |
| Cook | (TX) | Porter | | | |
| Cooksey | Jenkins | Portman | | | |
| Costello | John | Price (NC) | | | |
| Cox | Johnson (CT) | Pryce (OH) | | | |
| Coyne | Johnson, E. B. | Quinn | | | |
| Cramer | Johnson, Sam | Radanovich | | | |
| Crane | Jones (NC) | Rahall | | | |
| Cubin | Jones (OH) | Ramstad | | | |
| Cummings | Kanjorski | Rangel | | | |
| Cunningham | Kaptur | Regula | | | |
| Danner | Kasich | Reyes | | | |
| Davis (FL) | Kildee | Reynolds | | | |
| Davis (IL) | Kilpatrick | Riley | | | |
| Davis (VA) | Kind (WI) | Rivers | | | |
| Deal | Kingston | Rodriguez | | | |
| DeFazio | Kleczka | Roemer | | | |
| DeGette | Klink | Rogan | | | |
| DeLauro | Knollenberg | Rohrabacher | | | |
| DeLay | Kolbe | Ros-Lehtinen | | | |
| DeMint | Kuykendall | Royal-Allard | | | |
| Deutsch | LaFalce | Royce | | | |
| Diaz-Balart | LaHood | Ryan (WI) | | | |
| Dickey | Lampson | Ryun (KS) | | | |
| Dicks | Lantos | Sabo | | | |
| Dixon | Largent | Salmon | | | |
| Doggett | Larson | Sanchez | | | |
| Dooley | Latham | Sandlin | | | |
| Doolittle | LaTourette | Sawyer | | | |
| Doyle | Leach | Schaffer | | | |
| Dreier | Lee | Schakowsky | | | |
| Duncan | Levin | Scott | | | |
| Dunn | Lewis (CA) | Sensenbrenner | | | |
| Edwards | Lewis (GA) | Sessions | | | |
| Ehlers | Lewis (KY) | Linder | | | |
| Ehrlich | Lipinski | Shadegg | | | |
| Emerson | Lofgren | Shaw | | | |
| English | Lucas (KY) | Shays | | | |
| Eshoo | Lucas (OK) | Sherman | | | |
| Etheridge | Luther | Sherwood | | | |
| Evans | Maloney (CT) | Shimkus | | | |
| Everett | Manizullo | Shows | | | |
| Ewing | Markey | Shuster | | | |
| Farr | Martinez | Simpson | | | |
| Fattah | Mascara | Sisisky | | | |
| Filner | Matsui | Skeen | | | |
| Fletcher | McCarthy (MO) | Skelton | | | |
| Foley | McIntosh | Smith (MI) | | | |
| Ford | McIntyre | Smith (NJ) | | | |
| Frank (MA) | McKeeon | Smith (TX) | | | |
| Frost | Gibbons | Smith (WA) | | | |
| Gallegly | Gilcrest | Snyder | | | |
| Ganske | Gillmor | Smith (MI) | | | |
| Gejdenson | Gonzalez | Spence | | | |
| Gekas | Goode | Stabenow | | | |
| Gephhardt | Goodlatte | Stark | | | |
| Gibbons | Goodling | Stearns | | | |
| Gilcrest | Gordon | Stenholm | | | |
| Gillmor | Goss | Strickland | | | |
| Gonzalez | Graham | Millender-Leyva | | | |
| | Granger | McDonald | | | |
| | Green (TX) | Miller (FL) | | | |
| | Green (WI) | Miller, Gary | | | |
| | Moran (KS) | Miller, George | | | |
| | Moran (VA) | Minge | | | |
| | Murtha | Mink | | | |
| | Hansen | Mollahan | | | |
| | | Moore | | | |
| | | Taylor (MS) | | | |
| | | Taylor (NC) | | | |
| | | Terry | | | |
| | | Thomas | | | |
| | | Thompson (CA) | | | |
| | | Thornberry | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | | Napolitano | Thune | Vitter | Whitfield |
| | | Neal | Thurman | Walden | Wicker |
| | | Nethercutt | Tiahrt | Walsh | Wilson |
| | | Ney | Toomey | Watkins | Wise |
| | | Northup | Traficant | Watt (NC) | Wolf |
| | | Norwood | Turner | Watts (OK) | Woolsey |
| | | Nussle | Udall (CO) | Waxman | Wu |
| | | Oberstar | Udall (NM) | Weldon (FL) | Wynn |
| | | Obey | Upton | Weldon (PA) | Young (AK) |
| | | Ortiz | Vento | Weller | Young (FL) |
| | | Ose | Viscosky | Wexler | |

NAYS—46

Vitter

Whitfield

Walden

Wicker

Walsh

Wilson

Watkins

Wise

Watt (NC)

Wolf

Woolsey

Wu

Wynn

Young (AK)

Young (FL)