

Graham	Markey	Sabo	Hoekstra	Johnson, E. B.	Lowey
Granger	Mascara	Sanchez	Hostettler	Larson (CT)	Meek (FL)
Graves	Matheson	Sanders			
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sandlin			
Green (WI)	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer			
Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton			
Grucci	McCollum	Scarborough			
Gutierrez	McCrary	Schaffer			
Gutknecht	McDermott	Schakowsky			
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Schiff			
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Schrock			
Hansen	McInnis	Scott			
Harman	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner			
Hart	McKeon	Serrano			
Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Sessions			
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Shadegg			
Hayes	Meehan	Shaw			
Hayworth	Meeks (NY)	Shays			
Hefley	Menendez	Sherman			
Herger	Mica	Sherwood			
Hillenary	Millender	Shimkus			
Hilliard	McDonald	Shows			
Hinchey	Miller (FL)	Shuster			
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Simmons			
Hobson	Miller, George	Simpson			
Hoeffel	Mink	Skeen			
Holden	Mollohan	Skelton			
Holt	Moore	Slaughter			
Honda	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)			
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)			
Horn	Morella	Smith (TX)			
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (WA)			
Hoyer	Myrick	Snyder			
Hulshof	Nadler	Solis			
Hunter	Napolitano	Souder			
Hutchinson	Neal	Spence			
Hyde	Nethercutt	Spratt			
Inslee	Ney	Stark			
Isackson	Northup	Stearns			
Israel	Norwood	Stenholm			
Issa	Nussle	Strickland			
Istook	Oberstar	Stump			
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Stupak			
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Olver	Sununu			
Jefferson	Ortiz	Sweeney			
Jenkins	Osborne	Tancredo			
John	Ose	Tanner			
Johnson (CT)	Otter	Tauscher			
Johnson (IL)	Owens	Tauzin			
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Taylor (MS)			
Jones (NC)	Pascarella	Taylor (NC)			
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Terry			
Kanjorski	Paul	Thomas			
Kaptur	Payne	Thompson (CA)			
Keller	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)			
Kelly	Pence	Thornberry			
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)	Thune			
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)	Thurman			
Kerns	Petri	Tiaht			
Kildee	Phelps	Tiberi			
Kilpatrick	Pickering	Tierney			
Kind (WI)	Pitts	Toomey			
King (NY)	Platts	Towns			
Kingston	Pombo	Traficant			
Kirk	Pomeroy	Turner			
Kleckza	Portman	Udall (CO)			
Knollenberg	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)			
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Upton			
Kucinich	Putnam	Velazquez			
LaFalce	Quinn	Visclosky			
LaHood	Radanovich	Vitter			
Lampson	Rahall	Walden			
Langevin	Ramstad	Walsh			
Lantos	Rangel	Wamp			
Largent	Regula	Waters			
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg	Watkins (OK)			
Latham	Reyes	Watson (CA)			
LaTourette	Reynolds	Watt (NC)			
Leach	Riley	Watts (OK)			
Lee	Rivers	Waxman			
Levin	Rodriguez	Weiner			
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Weldon (FL)			
Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (PA)			
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)	Weller			
Linder	Rohrabacher	Wexler			
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield			
LoBiondo	Ross	Wicker			
Lofgren	Rothman	Wilson			
Lucas (KY)	Roukema	Wolf			
Lucas (OK)	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey			
Luther	Royce	Wu			
Maloney (CT)	Rush	Wynn			
Maloney (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)			
Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—12

Allen	Ferguson	Fossella
Burr	Ford	Hill

Hoekstra
Hostettler
Johnson, E. B.
Larson (CT)
Lowey
Meek (FL)

□ 1622

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 145, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, the California delegation, 52 strong, including our two United States Senators, Republicans and Democrats, met with the Vice President. The subject of the meeting was energy.

Californians are reeling from the sticker shock in the bills that they are receiving. We know that the Federal Energy Commission has said that there is gouging. We know that there is gamping. Californians are hurt and hurting badly by this.

I will place into the RECORD as part of what I am saying this morning a report that has come out from CNN. It is entitled "Power of advertising fights electricity rate caps".

Well, together with the White House and the GOP majority in the House, those gouged prices from Californians are now going to be put into an advertising campaign. The dollars that we are paying are going to be placed into an advertising campaign to try to defeat price relief in California.

This is an outrage, and it is an equivalent to what the tobacco companies did as they tried to wage their war on America and say that tobacco was good. This is an outrage, and we are going to fight this.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article that I referred to earlier as follows:

POWER OF ADVERTISING FIGHTS ELECTRICITY RATE CAPS

WORRIED GOP, WHITE HOUSE GIVE BLESSING TO UTILITIES' CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

(By Major Garrett)

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Major U.S. utility companies—at the behest of senior congressional Republicans and with White House approval—will launch a multimillion-dollar advertising campaign this week to fight federal

caps on electricity prices in California, several sources tell CNN.

No exact dollar figure has been set for the television campaign, but congressional and administration sources said the first phase will cost less than \$5 million and run only in California. Media buyers for the utilities will also purchase airtime on Spanish-language television.

"Every penny right now will be spent in the Golden State," said a source intimately involved in the ad campaign.

Over time, the utilities' ad campaign could easily cost more than \$10 million. Leading congressional Republicans have urged the entire energy industry to spend upwards of \$50 million on the ads—or about as much as the tobacco industry spent to defeat comprehensive tobacco legislation in 1998.

Congressional GOP leaders have issued dire, albeit private, warnings to the energy industry that they may not be able to block legislation imposing caps on prices or other measures designed to give the federal government a greater role in setting rates for wholesale electricity, oil or natural gas.

The ad campaign reflects a deepening sense of dread among congressional Republicans that the Bush energy policy, while long on specifics, has failed to address short-term political pressure on Republicans.

Republicans inside and outside of Congress tell CNN they are terrified about confronting a summer of Democratic attacks on energy prices as they gear up for re-election campaigns. The concerns are all the more acute because of the GOP's narrow, five-seat House majority and fear among Senate Republicans that they could lose more ground to the Democrats in next year's elections.

The final straw for many House and Senate Republicans was Mr. Bush's trip to California, which, in effect, put the issue of price caps in the spotlight.

"It was a total disaster," said an adviser to the House Republican leadership. "He came out there to let every Californian, including Republicans, know he was against price caps. Now everyone in California knows (Democratic Gov.) Gray Davis is for them and the president is not."

What's worse, several senior Congressional Republican sources told CNN, the White House returned from the trip thinking the president had the upper hand.

"It's ludicrous," said another House Republican. "Members have lost confidence in their ability to understand how this issue is affecting us."

Congressional Republicans will not play any role in the content or overall strategy of the campaign. Neither is the White House involved. But House and Senate GOP leaders have shared their concerns with top White House officials, among them Mr. Bush's senior political adviser, Karl Rove.

"The White House is aware and approving of the effort," said a senior Senate Republican aide.

House Republican leaders, beset by complaints from rank-and-file Republicans about the beating they're taking on the energy price issue, have been demanding action from energy companies to make the public case against price caps or other controls on energy markets. Chief among the advocates has been House Majority Leader Tom DeLay of Texas.

DeLay and his wife, Christine, dined with President Bush and the first lady on Wednesday. Sources close to the situation said the evening was mostly social, but they added that DeLay expressed concerns about the withering attacks the House GOP has been absorbing from Democrats on the energy issue.

From news conferences to special orders on the House floor, Democrats have blasted Republicans as allies of big energy conglomerates and as unwilling to question high energy prices.

The White House, sources inside and outside the administration tell CNN, has gotten the message. Senior advisers convened an emergency “California energy message” meeting Thursday to discuss future strategy. The meeting involved Rove, White House counselor Karen Hughes and senior advisers from the president’s economic team and the Energy Department.

The political danger for Republicans has become so pronounced that House GOP leaders pulled an energy bill sponsored by Republicans Rep. Joe Barton, R-Texas, because they could not be sure they could kill a Democratic attempt to add energy price caps in California to the legislation.

Similarly, senior Senate Republicans aides said a push for electricity price caps in California could prove unstoppable if the issue comes to the floor. With Senate Democrats eager to push other matters first—such as HMO reform—the price cap issue will probably not make it to the Senate floor until Congress returns from its Fourth of July recess.

At a recent gathering of Senate Republicans, one top senator said there “wasn’t five votes” among Republicans to block price caps on electricity in California.

Last week, House Majority Leader Dick Armey, R-Texas, and Conference Chairman J.C. Watts, R-Oklahoma, sparred publicly over whether to hold hearings into energy prices. Armey said the exercise was “nonsense.” Watts said he wanted energy companies to at least explain price fluctuations so the public would see that Republicans were at least willing to hold them accountable to consumers.

“We’re not fighting fire with fire,” said one exasperated senior House Republican aide. “This is a war and if the energy companies don’t step up to the plate, we can’t stop bad things from happening anymore. They have to be willing to fight and fight on the air.”

Before the emergency White House meeting California, top White House communications aides sent a memo to all congressional Republicans last week advising that they should no longer use the phrase “price caps” but “price controls.”

The theory behind the semantics, Republicans say, is that price caps sound consumer-friendly and nonthreatening, while price controls sound bureaucratic and meddlesome. The White House has long argued that price caps in California—or anywhere else—would distort markets.

This distortion, the White House has argued, would artificially lower prices, encourage consumption and diminish the supply of energy that can be profitably brought to market.

Republican sources said several utilities will participate in the advertising and that the thrust of the pitch would be that government interference in energy markets would, in the case of California, bring more blackouts.

The campaign may, in later stages, remind viewers of the gas lines in the 1970s, which many energy economists say were brought on by price controls that drastically reduced the supply of gasoline and by consumers hoarding gasoline, frightened of never having enough.

“We’ve been carrying their water for a long time,” one Republican said of the energy industry. “And now they’re going to have to provide some air cover.”

The one irony is that energy economists have of late forecast that gasoline prices—

which were feared to be headed well above \$2 per gallon—will likely drop later this summer and that the energy crisis in California may not be as acute as anticipated.

The main reason, these economists say, is that high prices for gasoline and electricity sparked widespread conservation that has boosted supplies of gasoline and taken pressure off California’s electricity needs.

But that doesn’t mean the political equation has changed.

“Members are scared to death,” said another senior House Republican aide. “They are going to be redistricted this year and they will have to sell themselves to some new voters next year. They need to be able to tell them what they did about energy.”

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SPEAKING OUT FOR RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tonight we would like to pay tribute to rural America and to particularly highlight the efforts of the 140-member Congressional Rural Caucus. We have pledged ourselves to having attempts to preserve rural America, and I commend my cochairman of this caucus, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for their leadership and dedication to the rural caucus on issues that matter to rural residents across this country.

Our job as members of the Congressional Rural Caucus is to promote economic and social policies that support the continued viability of our rural communities. In many instances throughout my State of Kansas our rural communities continue to struggle. We continue to see populations in once-thriving communities decline across the Great Plains. Of 105 Kansas counties, 61 have smaller populations today than in 1900; 82 Kansas counties have lost population since just 10 years ago; and 65 counties are predicted to lose population in the next 10 years.

Kansas communities are confronted with serious challenges of prosperity and survival. While working on the farm bill, Mr. Speaker, we hope there will be a strong component for rural development in that farm bill. And as parts of the rural caucus, I chair the task force on telecommunications. Seems awfully important for us to make certain that the provisions that are often available in more urban areas of our country are made available in rural communities as well. Our communities’ survival depend upon access to increasing technology.

Mr. Speaker, by providing one voice for rural America, the Congressional

Rural Caucus will ensure that rural communities will remain viable and competitive. Our job in Congress is to raise the awareness of rural issues and to preserve that way of life. As Congress debates important issues like rural development in the farm bill, and access to telecommunication technologies, we must address the opportunities and challenges that we face in rural America.

Rural Americans across the country need us to demonstrate our commitment for a better quality of life, and I urge my colleagues to join us in this fight and to speak out for rural America.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the number one industry in the State of Montana. That is why the two pieces of legislation I introduced, along with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) are so important to me and to rural America.

The heart of America is her rural communities. The Montana farmers and ranchers who work the soil understand that our State’s motto, *Oro Y Plato*, gold and silver, is truly the gold of ripe wheat fields and the silver of water resources. The harvest of the farmer and rancher translate into the gold and silver of economic health in rural communities.

Families spanning generations have sustained themselves in agriculture, but it is no longer feasible. The past few years have brought disasters and record low prices to the ag economy. While safety nets are important to producers, especially in lean years, America’s farmers and ranchers do not want to be dependent upon the government. So we must develop a long-term market-oriented approach to Federal farm policy to give producers the tools to help themselves and at the same time to bring much-needed economic growth to their communities. Short-term financial aid is helpful; but long-term planning, along with creative, innovative opportunities, are vital lest America’s rural families lose their farms and small towns die with them.

We need to encourage producers to add value to their product. Value-added ventures will enable producers to reach up the marketing chain and capture profits generated from processing their raw commodities. Two barriers prevent producers from pooling together and adding value to their products: first, though farmers are experts in their own fields, often they do not have the technical expertise needed to launch complex value-added business ventures; second, producers are strapped for cash. Even if they had enough capital to initiate development of value-added processing, many of the combined players in the market could squeeze producer-owned entities out before they