

Mr. Speaker, the Court's opinion in *Brown v. Board of Education* has touched the lives of all of us. I urge all Members to support this legislation.

I just want to comment on the fact that my first teaching assignment in Maryland was during the early transitional years of integration in Poolesville, Maryland.

This year I delivered the high school commencement address at that same place, a caring community which has as its slogan, "Where everyone knows your name."

My thanks to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for handling the important resolution across the aisle. I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), Subcommittee on Civil Service chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the ranking members respectively of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and Subcommittee on Civil Service, for expediting the consideration of this measure.

Again, I encourage all Members to support this resolution.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for H.R. 2133, which establishes a commission to encourage and provide for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. This unanimous landmark decision marked the beginning of the end for de jure racial segregation in public facilities. On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court declared that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal and, as such, violate the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees all citizens equal protection of the laws.

The *Brown v. Board of Education* 50th Anniversary Commission will work with the U.S. Department of Education to plan and coordinate public education activities and coordinate observances of the anniversary.

It is important that we revisit our history to see how far our nation has evolved. I am sure that it is hard for young people today to believe that only 50 years ago children were prohibited from attending certain public schools simply because of their race. The blatant racism behind the disingenuous claim of providing "separate but equal" facilities for African American children was recognized and repudiated by the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court decision did not mean the end of segregation, however. Many states and localities continued to fight efforts to integrate the schools for many years. And today, economic inequalities mean that many of our schools remain effectively segregated. Nonetheless, *Brown v. Board of Education* was a major turning point in eliminating Jim Crow laws and practices that sought to marginalize and isolate minorities.

It is fitting that our nation begin preparations to commemorate this important anniversary in 2004. We need to look back at where we started, celebrate the progress we have made thus far, and rededicate ourselves to creating that more perfect union that will truly deliver on the promise of equal opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, On May 17, 1954, in the landmark case aimed at ending segregation in public schools—*Brown* versus the Board of Education—the United States Supreme Court issued a unanimous decision that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal", and as such, violate the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution, which guarantees all citizens, "equal protection of the laws." This decision effectively denied the legal basis for segregation in Kansas and other states with segregated classrooms and would forever change race relations in the United States.

The United States Constitution guarantees liberty and equal opportunity to the people of the United States. Historically, however, these fundamental rights have not always been provided. America's educational system is one such example.

In the early beginnings of U.S. history, education was withheld from people of Africa descent. In some states it was against the law for African Americans to even learn to read and write. Later, throughout America's history, the educational system mandated separate schools for children based solely on race. In many instances, the schools for African American children were substandard facilities with out-of-date textbooks and insufficient supplies.

In an effort to ensure equal opportunities for all children, African American community leaders and organizations across the country utilized the court system in order to change the educational system. The *Brown* decision initiated educational reform throughout the United States and brought all Americans one step closer to attaining equal educational opportunities.

As the great abolitionist and orator Frederick Douglass once said, some people know the value of an education because they have one, but I know the value of an education because I did not have one. Therefore, we must continue working to make sure that all of America's children receive the very best education imaginable.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me today in supporting the establishment of a commission to encourage and provide for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the *Brown* versus Board of Education Supreme Court decision.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2133, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1245

# PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 180

*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. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except section 308. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), our newest member of the Committee on Rules, and I would welcome him to the floor for what I think is his first rule that he will be managing, and I appreciate his being here and working with us on this; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 180 is an open rule and waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides for 1 hour of general debate divided equally and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

It also provides that the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the rule shall be considered as adopted.

The rule waives points of orders against provisions in the bill as amended for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, except as specified in the rule.

The bill shall be considered for amendment by paragraph, and the Chair is authorized to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is an open rule providing for the consideration of H. Res. 2311, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for 2002. This legislation provides for funding for a wide array of Federal Government programs which address matters such as national security, environmental cleanup, flood control, alternative energy sources, and advanced scientific research.

The bill provides for a total of \$23.7 billion in new discretionary spending authority for civil works projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, and several other independent agencies. The bill is \$147.7 million above the fiscal year 2001 funding levels and an increase of \$1.18 billion above the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to highlight some provisions in this bill. Included in this legislation is approximately \$4.47 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers, which has been involved in such vital missions as flood control, shoreline prevention, and navigation.

In addition, the Bureau of Reclamation, under the Department of the Interior, is funded at \$842.9 million, an increase of \$26.3 million over last year. Most of the large dams and water diversions in the West were built or with the assistance of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau is the largest supplier of water in the 17 western States and the second largest hydroelectric power producer in the Nation.

Also, this bill provides \$18.7 billion for the Department of Energy, an increase of \$444.2 million above the fiscal year 2001 level. Funding for the Department of Energy was increased over the President's request primarily in the areas of renewable energy technologies, environmental cleanup, and nuclear nonproliferation.

In March of 2001 this year, the Bush administration issued an outline for this budget. In this it states that solar and renewable energy cannot replace fossil fuels in the near term but will be an important part of this Nation's long-term energy supply. I am pleased that this bill includes \$376.8 million for renewable energy programs, an increase of \$1 million from last year.

Additionally, biological and environmental research is funded at \$445.9 mil-

lion. I am particularly pleased that the funding in this bill continues the strong record of conservation and preservation by the Republican Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from the First District of Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the Democrat ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor. Their staffs have done a great job in the crafting of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is considered noncontroversial. This rule, like the underlying legislation, deserves strong bipartisan support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time. It is a pleasure to serve on the Committee on Rules with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and I thank him for welcoming me as the newest member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 and in support of the rule. I also would associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas about the many particulars that are set forth in the bill that are meritorious, in my view, for the entire body.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), for their work on this bill and for their recognition of the importance to the entire country of the necessary public works projects it funds.

I am especially pleased, from a parochial point of view, that this bill contains nearly \$20 million for the continued restoration of the Florida Everglades. Congress and the State of Florida made a historic agreement last year to save this international treasure, and I am thrilled that Congress continues its commitment through this bill.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of significant projects important to my south Florida district, as well as those that are my colleagues that are in that area; and I would like to highlight a few of them for just a moment.

In my home of Broward County this bill funds beach erosion and renourishment projects to the tune of \$2.5 million. These funds are critical to protecting and enhancing Florida's pristine beaches and the businesses that thrive because of them.

In northeast Dade County this bill contains funding for a study of flood

patterns in the county and remediation of flooding that continually occurs in some of the poorest neighborhoods of this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this bill contains projects that would greatly benefit the constituents of myself and those of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), in Ft. Pierce, in St. Lucie County, and a number of projects that greatly improve conditions in Palm Beach County that are relevant to my other colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), as well as myself.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill; and the rule is fine as far as it goes. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) noted, the rule does allow for amendments to the dollar amounts contained in the committee-reported bill. The committee Republicans chose not to allow the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) the right to offer an amendment relating to transportation of high-level nuclear waste. This is most unfortunate, in my view, as I believe the Berkley amendment would have made the bill better.

Also, Mr. Speaker, let me add my support for the amendment which will be offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), which will allow construction of the Gulf Stream pipeline to continue unabated.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing an excellent bill to the House. This is a bipartisan bill that helps millions of Americans from coast to coast, and I urge passage of the bill and adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for yielding me this time; and I want to congratulate my friend, the newest member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), on his first rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and this underlying legislation. I would like to begin by commending the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), as well as the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), on their leadership in

bringing this excellent piece of legislation to the floor. This is the first bill of the gentleman from Alabama as chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and I commend him on his openness and his support. They have carefully balanced the priorities in a very tight budget year to ensure that the cleanup of former nuclear sites stays on schedule.

As chairman of the Nuclear Cleanup Caucus here in the House, I have been privileged to work closely with the committee this year to ensure that cleanup sites throughout the Nation continue their significant progress, ensuring that the legacy of World War II and the Cold War is cleaned up. While I have been supportive of the President's goal to cap the overall spending increase at 4 percent, I have to admit that I was deeply troubled by the administration's initial request on cleaning up the Nation's former nuclear weapons sites.

Earlier this year, the Committee on the Budget responded to that by including in the congressional budget resolution language directing up to an additional \$1 billion in the Environmental Management Account. I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has, in the past 2 weeks, included an additional \$880 million for cleanup in the supplemental and the legislation we will consider today. This will allow for the Federal Government to keep its legal and moral commitments to the communities that surround these sites.

The Department of Energy has negotiated innovative contracts that mirror commercial practices to transform the cleanup program and ensure that more dollars are spent on cleanup. These negotiated contracts ensure that the American taxpayer receives more cleanup dollars for less by requiring efficiencies to do more with less. Without this additional funding for the Environmental Management program, these aggressive contracts would have had to be re-negotiated, thus eliminating the benefits to the taxpayer.

This legislation will increase funding by nearly \$700 million over the administration's request. This will reverse the proposed reductions at the major sites throughout the country. Specifically at Hanford the additional dollars provided in this legislation will provide full funding for the construction of the Waste Treatment Project. This is the home of over 60 percent of the radioactive waste of this country; and yet it is the only facility, Hanford, that lacks a treatment capability. It is essential that this project be fully funded in fiscal year 2002 in order to ensure maximum benefit to the taxpayer and the safety of the Pacific Northwest.

Further, the legislation allows for the River Corridor Initiative to begin at the Richland Operations Office. This innovative approach will allow for the acceleration of cleanup along the River Corridor and will shrink the Hanford site from 560 square miles to 75 square miles by the year 2012.

□ 1300

This is an aggressive schedule which will save American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars over this time period.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides the first step to what I hope will be the full transformation of this project to a closure contract in fiscal year 2003. Further, the legislation will allow for continued efforts to remove spent nuclear fuel which has been standing 100 yards from the Columbia River for 25 years, and to move it away from the river into safe storage.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for their excellent work. I would also like to thank my colleagues on the Nuclear Cleanup Caucus, the contractors and the stakeholders that came together in a unified manner to ensure that these increases became a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), having been appointed to the prestigious and important Committee on Rules. Florida is proud of his service in the Congress, and we are proud that 3 of 13 Members who serve on the Committee on Rules are from Florida, two Republicans, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). And now the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) joins the Committee on Rules, and my great State is going to benefit by the gentleman's leadership.

Let me also commend this bill of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) clearly laid out some of the very important projects that are occurring in our mutual districts, such as Port St. Lucie, the inlet maintenance project, some shoreline protection that will occur throughout our counties; but I also want to call attention to an amendment that will be offered by one of our colleagues that will seek to reduce the Federal allocations towards beach renourishment. I believe that has been made in order. What that basically says is that we will reduce the Federal share of beach renourishment projects in places like Florida.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and I clearly want to underscore the need for Federal involvement, and we also want to give a little education here, because some people assume that these beach renourishment projects are folly, that they are a waste of tax dollars, that they are something that the local jurisdictions should do, and we need not concern ourselves with these issues in Congress.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and I know, many of the

areas where the most severe beach erosion is occurring are just south of inlets that were designed and constructed by the Corps of Engineers for some commerce at times, and some were national security issues. So in Palm Beach County, for instance, at the south end of our inlet, we are constantly vigilant because of shoreline that is eroding because of that unnatural cut that occurred.

Mr. Speaker, therein lies the nexus by which we ask and continue to urge Congress to fund these shoreline protection agreements. They are vital to tourism. We are parochial in our approach, and we are concerned about tourism; but it has more to do with ecological factors, such as nesting turtles, reef renourishments. All of these are impacted by a degradation of our beaches.

Mr. Speaker, we stand opposing an amendment that will be offered later, although supporting the fine work in this bill. There are some phenomenal projects that I will call Members' attention to again, whether it is the Department of Energy or other related accounts, the President's initiative on energy conservation, or on strategically positioning ourselves to be more self-reliant on energy needs.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done a masterful job of meeting not only the needs of 50 States, but also the concerns of Members.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member from the Florida delegation, I want to apologize to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) because we were unaware during debate last week on a very contentious issue that the gentleman was out of the Capitol with the President attending some business with the President of the United States in Alabama. We would not have excluded him from debate, so we apologize for that slight. We meant no disrespect. As a delegation, we are absolutely opposed to the drilling question, but never would we have done it as an attempted embarrassment of the fine chairman and the fine job he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the rule. I urge Members to support its adoption, the underlying bill; and again, I would ask my colleagues to pay special attention to an amendment that would cut the government's responsibility on shoreline protection and urge the defeat of that same amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) for his kind comments regarding my ascension to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in general support of the bill. I want to in particular touch on three issues briefly. I want to thank the committee, thank this House for continuing to fund the nuclear facilities closure projects across the country, but in particular the one in my district at Rocky Flats. Rocky Flats is close to the center of my congressional district. It is just a few miles from population centers that exceed 2 million people. This is a very important project to clean up and close this facility.

I also thank the committee for the inclusion in the bill of initial funding for a small flood control project in Arvada, Colorado. There has been an important partnership there along Van Bibber Creek, and these are important moneys that will begin to put this capital project in place.

Finally, I want to emphasize my support for the committee's work in increasing the levels of funding for DOE's renewable energy programs. Initially the administration slashed these important budget items by \$138 million, almost 36 percent, and I think this was shortsighted; but we have worked hard over the last 2 years to boost funding for these programs, and I want to acknowledge the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) on the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus for the good work the gentleman has done.

In general, Mr. Speaker, although no bill is perfect, this one is awful close, and I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak today in support of it.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just as it is the first rule for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to manage in the Committee on Rules, we also like to thank staff who it is their last rule to be with us.

I would like to thank Gena Bernhardt for her 6 years on the Committee on Rules, and 9 years serving on the Hill, who will be leaving the Hill for opportunities down at the Department of Justice. She served as professional staff and legal counsel, and is a good friend of all of ours. It is a time to say hello; and a time to say good-bye.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and open rule supported by my colleagues, and I would ask my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the

ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, following this 15-minute vote on House Resolution 180, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the two motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair postponed further proceedings earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

YEAS—425

Abercrombie	Costello	Green (TX)
Ackerman	Cox	Green (WI)
Aderholt	Coyne	Greenwood
Akin	Cramer	Grucci
Allen	Crane	Gutierrez
Andrews	Crenshaw	Gutknecht
Armey	Crowley	Hall (OH)
Baca	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Bachus	Culberson	Hansen
Baird	Cummings	Harman
Baker	Cunningham	Hart
Balducci	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Hastings (WA)
Ballenger	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Barcia	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth
Barr	Davis, Tom	Hefley
Barrett	Deal	Herger
Bartlett	DeFazio	Hill
Barton	DeGette	Hilleary
Bass	Delahunt	Hillhard
Becerra	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Bentsen	DeLay	Hobson
Bereuter	DeMint	Hoeffel
Berkley	Deutsch	Hoekstra
Berman	Diaz-Balart	Holden
Berry	Dicks	Holt
Biggert	Dingell	Honda
Bilirakis	Doggett	Hooley
Bishop	Dooley	Horn
Blagojevich	Doolittle	Hostettler
Blumenauer	Doyle	Houghton
Blunt	Dreier	Hoyer
Boehlert	Duncan	Hulshof
Boehner	Dunn	Hunter
Bonilla	Edwards	Hutchinson
Bonior	Ehlers	Hyde
Bono	Ehrlich	Inlee
Borski	Emerson	Isakson
Boswell	Engel	Israel
Boucher	English	Issa
Boyd	Eshoo	Istook
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Jackson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Brown (FL)	Everett	(TX)
Brown (OH)	Farr	Jefferson
Brown (SC)	Fattah	Jenkins
Bryant	Ferguson	John
Burr	Filner	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Callahan	Fletcher	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Forbes	Jones (NC)
Cannon	Ford	Jones (OH)
Cantor	Fossella	Kanjorski
Capito	Frank	Kaptur
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Keller
Capuano	Frost	Kelly
Cardin	Gallegly	Kennedy (MN)
Carson (IN)	Ganske	Kennedy (RI)
Carson (OK)	Gekas	Kerns
Castle	Gephardt	Kildee
Chabot	Gibbons	Kilpatrick
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Kind (WI)
Clay	Gillmor	King (NY)
Clayton	Gilman	Kingston
Clement	Gonzalez	Kirk
Clyburn	Goode	Kleczka
Coble	Goodlatte	Knollenberg
Collins	Gordon	Kolbe
Combest	Goss	Kucinich
Condit	Graham	LaFalce
Conyers	Granger	LaHood
Cooksey	Graves	Lampson

Langevin	Ose	Simpson
Lantos	Otter	Skeen
Largent	Owens	Skelton
Larsen (WA)	Oxley	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (MI)
Latham	Pascarell	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Pastor	Smith (TX)
Leach	Paul	Smith (WA)
Lee	Payne	Snyder
Levin	Pelosi	Solis
Lewis (CA)	Pence	Souder
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Spence
Lewis (KY)	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Linder	Petri	Stark
Lipinski	Phelps	Stearns
LoBiondo	Pickering	Stenholm
Lofgren	Pitts	Strickland
Lowey	Pomeroy	Stump
Lucas (KY)	Portman	Stupak
Lucas (OK)	Price (NC)	Sununu
Luther	Pryce (OH)	Sweeney
Maloney (CT)	Quinn	Tancred
Maloney (NY)	Radanovich	Tanner
Manzullo	Rahall	Tauscher
Markey	Ramstad	Tauzin
Mascara	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
Matheson	Regula	Taylor (NC)
Matsui	Rehberg	Terry
McCarthy (MO)	Reyes	Thomas
McCarthy (NY)	Reynolds	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Riley	Thompson (MS)
McCrery	Rivers	Thornberry
McDermott	Rodriguez	Thurman
McGovern	Roemer	Tiahrt
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Tierney
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Toomey
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
McKinney	Ross	Traffant
McNulty	Rothman	Turner
Meehan	Roukema	Udall (CO)
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Menendez	Royce	Upton
Mica	Rush	Velazquez
Millender-	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
McDonald	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Miller (FL)	Sabo	Walden
Miller, Gary	Sanchez	Walsh
Miller, George	Sanders	Wamp
Mink	Sandlin	Waters
Mollohan	Sawyer	Watkins (OK)
Moore	Saxton	Watson (CA)
Moran (KS)	Scarborough	Watt (NC)
Moran (VA)	Schaffer	Watts (OK)
Morella	Schakowsky	Waxman
Murtha	Schiff	Weiner
Myrick	Schrock	Weldon (FL)
Nadler	Scott	Weldon (PA)
Napolitano	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Neal	Serrano	Wexler
Nethercutt	Sessions	Whitfield
Ney	Shadegg	Wicker
Northup	Shaw	Wilson
Norwood	Shays	Wolf
Nussle	Sherman	Woolsey
Oberstar	Sherwood	Wynn
Obey	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Olver	Shows	Young (FL)
Ortiz	Shuster	
Osborne	Simmons	

NAYS—1

Thune  
NOT VOTING—7

Burton	Platts	Wu
Hinchey	Pombo	
Meek (FL)	Putnam	

□ 1334

Mr. THUNE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the