

that may be dismissed, some that may be won, some that may be lost but it is an American right, just like that second amendment is an American right that I will go to my grave believing in, but I will go with these police officers in believing that it is wrong to deny people an opportunity to take their matter to court and have it decided appropriately by a court of law and juries of their peers who are all 435 of our constituents.

In addition to what is wrong is this system is wrong. When you close out amendments that would allow people to have an opportunity to come down here on the floor of the House of Representatives and represent their constituents, this is a closed rule; and I urge my colleagues to vote against this closed rule.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would only point out that this bill, with the exception of one and maybe two changes, has already been debated by this House. I appreciate the fact that my friend from Florida would be concerned about it being a closed rule, but this is certainly not the first time that we have considered this bill. I think I have voted on it a number of times in the past.

The fact of the matter is all this bill does is the same thing the last version did that we voted on before and the one we voted on before that: it protects licensed and law abiding firearms and ammunition manufacturers and sellers from lawsuits that seek to hold them responsible for the crimes that third-party criminals commit. It does not hold harmless unlawful, non-law-abiding arms manufacturers and sellers; but it simply allows for some immunity from the frivolous lawsuits that gun manufacturers have faced now for many years. Thirty-three States, including my home State of New Hampshire, have passed similar legislation at the State level.

Indeed, the argument is brought up that this does set a precedent of providing special protection to a segment of the industry; and I say, you are right. You are absolutely right about that. And sad to say, I wish this bill was not necessary. I wish that there were not adventurous trial lawyers that see deep pockets as a new way to line theirs. I wish we had not reached the day that we have to protect, as we may later on this week, restaurants and public schools from frivolous lawsuits related to obesity claims; but the fact of the matter is we need to do that. We need to do that because there is no direct connection now between gun manufacturers and crimes that are committed with guns unless there is negligence of one sort or another.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill because it is a sad reality that le-

gitimate industries in this country need special protection against entities that are looking to make money, to provide new sources of revenue outside of the tax base, and other ways of looking for people that can afford to settle on cases that they would never ever settle on under any other circumstance.

This bill has been debated. This is a good bill, and I urge the Congress to adopt it when it comes up on the floor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, despite their best arguments against free enterprise, personal responsibility and the protection of lawful commerce, critics fail to provide an alternative solution to the problem without compromising our liberties and second amendment rights.

Just as a car is a tool for transportation, an ax is a tool for cutting trees and shrubs, prescription drugs are tools for better health, a firearm is a tool for hunting and self-defense and protection of our citizens. Any of these tools used in an irresponsible manner and used contrary to their attending purpose can hurt and, yes, even kill others. But a gun by itself, Mr. Speaker, cannot commit a crime. It takes an individual to use the product illegally and irresponsibly.

The protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act is a bill to curb our lawsuit-friendly and, yes, sometimes abusive society and to protect law-abiding citizens from individuals who avoid responsibility and undermine the good faith of our legal system.

Frivolous lawsuits against gun manufacturers threaten the survival of the gun industry, the jobs it creates, and our constitutional right to purchase, keep and bear arms. While many cases are dismissed, it only takes one bad ruling to sink a company and to send ripple effects across an entire industry. Although America's first gun manufacturer, Springfield Armory, went out of business in 1968, we still have to protect America's remaining law-abiding companies who conduct business in a responsible and in a lawful manner.

It would be a tragedy for a Nation with such a rich and innovative history in manufacturing to have our police and military carry over foreign-engineered firearms. We need to protect the American firearm industry. We need to restore responsibility and end these frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage passage of this rule and passage of the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 554, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY IN FOOD CONSUMPTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 494 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 494

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. 554) to prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain or obesity. 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 the Judiciary. 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 the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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, 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 such amendments are waived. 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), 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, H.R. 494 is a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary and now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. This resolution makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution, and it provides that the amendments printed in the report may be considered 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, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole. It waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, and it provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of House Resolution 494 and the underlying bill, H.R. 554, the Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act. First, I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and additionally I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, for authoring the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 554, the Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act, a common sense piece of legislation that passed this House in the last Congress by a substantial bipartisan vote of 276 to 139. I might further add that 55 Democrats joined with 221 Republicans supporting this bill in an effort to help rein in this mentality of jackpot justice that has plagued our judicial system and cluttered the dockets to a virtual standstill. This legislation would require courts to dismiss any lawsuits that seek damages for injury resulting from weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with obesity filed against manufacturers, distributors, sellers, marketers, or advertisers of any food product, in addition to trade associations that represent them.

Of course, support of this bill is not limited to Capitol Hill, Mr. Speaker. A recent Gallup poll found that approximately 9 in 10 Americans, a number of whom are themselves in the ranks of overweight or even obese, opposed holding the fast food industry legally responsible for diet-related health problems of people who eat that kind of food on a regular basis.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, obesity is a problem in our society. Having practiced medicine for nearly 30 years, I am well aware of the habit and complications that obesity can wreak on a person's health, especially over a long term. Like most other Americans, I am also well aware that obesity is on the rise in our country, and particularly among our children. However, the root of the problem is not the existence of fast food or the presence of a local fast food restaurant, but rather the root of the problem lies in the choices of consumers. I have never heard of anyone pulling up to the drive-through window with a hamburger sitting in the passenger seat forcing someone to buy just one more Big Mac.

Mr. Speaker, allowing an individual to sue a restaurant because the consumer chose to eat there often or chose to eat too much is simply ridiculous and, frankly, it is a dangerous waste of the court's time. For every frivolous case that takes up a spot on the docket, a legitimate case where an individual is truly harmed and truly needs expeditious judicial review gets pushed farther and farther down the line. And as we all know, justice delayed is justice denied.

The title of this bill emphasizes the type of solution needed to address the underlying problem. It is called personal responsibility. It is not just a catch phrase. Individuals have to take control of their own lives. They have to make wise decisions, especially when it comes to their health. And when an individual does make a poor decision, he or she should not be able to abuse the courts so as to shift responsibility to someone else in order to cash in.

Mr. Speaker, while H.R. 544 prohibits certain types of lawsuits, it does make various reasonable exceptions to ensure the protection of a consumer's legitimate claim for legitimate harm. An individual, for example, can still sue in those instances where a contract or a warranty is breached, as long as the basis for the lawsuit is not related to weight gain, obesity or a health condition associated with either. Additionally, a manufacturer or seller is still liable if they knowingly violate a Federal or State statute concerning the marketing, the advertising, or the labeling of a product.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would still allow individuals to bring obesity or weight gain related matters before the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission, or the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, for consideration and appropriate action. Obviously, individuals can still sue in accordance with applicable State laws protecting against deceptive trade practices and if a person becomes sick from a tainted food product.

In closing, I just want to emphasize that this legislation is common sense and it includes exemptions to ensure legitimate claims still make it to court while abusive lawsuits are stopped at the courthouse door.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the consideration of this rule, and I ask my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, this rule, House Resolution 494, will allow the House to take up a bill limiting civil liability for the food and restaurant industry from obesity lawsuits.

We have already debated this legislation once. We now have precious few legislative days left on the calendar and an ever-expanding list of legislative priorities, yet the majority leadership has decided to take up a bill that preempts a handful of obesity lawsuits that are already being effectively handled in the courts. Given that, is this really the most pressing issue facing the American people? The courts are working fine. This bill is simply unnecessary.

Here is just a short list of issues we might be addressing today: The debt, the trade deficit, Iraq, housing for Katrina victims, the bird flu, port security, border security, nuclear plant security, and energy independence. I am sure the American people would appreciate a debate on any of those issues over what we are doing today.

In touting the merits of H.R. 554, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have cited the need for American people to take responsibility for what they eat and how they live. I very much agree. However, I would respectfully submit that maybe it is also time that Congress starts taking some responsibility for the challenges facing the American people. The disconnect between the content of this legislation and the concerns of our constituents would be humorous if it were not so disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, obesity is one of the great health epidemics in the United States, and as today's debate will show, it continues to go ignored. If you talk to any health professional in the country, whether it be the Director of the National Institutes of Health or a nurse at a local clinic, they will tell you that our health care system is on an unsustainable path, especially when it comes to obesity.

Obesity is the number one preventable cause of death in America. According to the RAND Corporation, obesity will account for 20 percent of all health care costs by 2020 if we do not change course. This challenge demands responsible, forward-looking leadership.

As Members of Congress, we need to take personal responsibility for the trajectory of the health care system in the United States. It would be cheaper to prevent this train wreck now than

to wait for obesity to overwhelm the capacity of our health care system. Our citizens are hungry for leadership, and they are not getting any.

The obesity epidemic in the United States should spur this Congress into action. Since 1980, childhood obesity rates have more than doubled among preschoolers and adolescents. Obesity among children ages 6 to 11 has more than tripled. Overweight children have a 70 percent chance of being overweight as adults, facing higher risks for many diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, stroke, and diabetes.

I recently visited a dialysis center in my hometown of Sacramento, California, earlier this year. Many patients there had diabetes. Mr. Speaker, diabetes is a terrible disease. In its late stages it limits terribly one's quality of life. We need to be doing more to prevent it. We just do not need another cheeseburger bill. What we need is a debate about health care, about prevention, and about our priorities.

Two-thirds of all Americans are obese. According to the Centers for Disease Control, health care costs related to obesity are costing us more than \$117 billion annually and much more in damage to our citizens' quality of life. We should not accept this fate for so many of our Nation's children. Dealing with obesity by talking about tort reform does just that, it says that Congress is more concerned about the industry than it is about the long-term health of our Nation and of our children.

No serious policymaker believes that we can turn this tide with a few half-hearted calls for Americans to exercise more. This is going to take real leadership, real investment. It will take a relentless campaign to educate our citizens, along with public pressure to recognize the importance of this issue. It will mean taking a hard look at whether our public schools are up to the test in terms of offering nutritious meals and physical education classes for everyone. It means asking whether industry advertisers are targeting children and, if so, setting strict marketing guidelines.

In the short-term, the easy path is to dodge this whole debate, to pass this tort reform measure and walk away from the discussion. The harder path and the more responsible one would be to deal with the crisis that is here today and the even bigger crisis we all know is coming. I for one am ready for that discussion. I hope my colleagues are.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, following which I will yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, the Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act, H.R. 554, is all about, again, personal responsibility and to point out how ludicrous it would be if we allowed personal injury lawsuits against the

food industry or any other company that makes a legitimate product.

We just talked earlier in the afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in regard to gun manufacturers.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, let me just give an example, if I might. This is a belt, an alligator belt. In fact, it is my belt. Size 36. I have a size 36 waist. This belt, I am proud to say, is hand-finished, American alligator, produced right here in the good old U.S.A. This alligator skin was obtained from a Louisiana hunt, it says on this belt, 1993, manufactured by the Trafalgar Limited Belt Company, a good company. And the belt has served me very well. Size 36 fits me well.

Mr. Speaker, let us suppose now that I decided, it is unlikely that I would do this, but let us suppose I decided I wanted to wear a size 42 and I punched a few extra holes in this belt, which is a size 36, so I could wear it and buckle it with a size 42 pair of trousers. These trousers fell right to my knees in a public place. I do not think I should have the right to sue the belt company because I used its product in a manner that it was not designed to use. I could go out and buy myself a size 42 belt.

Let me give another example, and this is more likely. Let us suppose I really felt like my waist was a size 34, and so I cinched this belt up really good so I could proudly say I am not a 36, I have a 34 inch waist at my age. I would feel pretty good about myself.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is a nerve at my waist called the lateral femoral cutaneous nerve. If someone puts too much pressure around their waist by wearing a belt inappropriately, by cinching it up too tightly, they put compression on that nerve, that lateral femoral cutaneous nerve, and I speak from knowledge on this from 30 years as a practicing physician. That condition, my colleagues can look it up, but I will share it with them, it is called meralgia paresthetica. If Members do not believe me, look it up. It creates tremendous numbness and loss of feeling in the anterior part of the thigh.

Let us suppose someone misused this belt and wore it as a size 34 and decided for that reason to sue this Trafalgar Company, this good, solid American company that makes this belt, for damages. That is totally ridiculous and ludicrous, and that is why this bill is so important. That is why it is called personal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to applaud him for maintaining a size 36 over the years; and I will decline to share my dress size with the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 554, also known as the Personal Responsi-

bility in Food Consumption Act, and sometimes fondly referred to, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) said, the Cheeseburger Bill.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is a Nation of freedom. Liberty, individuality, and personal choice are all critical ingredients. A recipe for self-reliance, individual responsibility, and choice has been handed down from generation to generation.

That is why it is so distasteful to see a handful of greedy people trying to strike it rich by attacking the American food industry. The blame-obsessed legal system has increasingly tried to poison the restaurant business with frivolous lawsuits.

Our food industry actually employs about 12 million people. It is the Nation's largest single private sector provider. It provides a legal product, and it provides it in a legal way. And now, because of the avarice of a few, it has become a huge target with a huge bull's-eye on its back.

Mr. Speaker, most restaurants are small businesses that contribute to their community in literally countless ways. What is more, many of them are too small to defend themselves against out-of-control, deep-pocketed trial attorneys who want to file lawsuits against them, who see them as just another target, perhaps see them as just another ATM machine.

I am proud to support this rule and proud to support H.R. 554, which prohibits profiteering from groundless claims about weight gain, to protect our vital food and restaurant industry, to help defend our economy and American jobs, and to support the fundamental tenets of our Nation: personal choice, liberty, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I am obviously a pretty good customer of the restaurant industry, but I also recognize that with democracy comes responsibility, the responsibility of citizens to make the right decisions for themselves and the responsibility of a government to stop those who seek to hurt fine American businesses for a drive-thru, fast windfall. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that today's legislation is not the answer. Certainly it is not about addressing the larger issue, obesity, and its impact on the American health care system.

This legislation demonstrates the blind eye the majority leadership is turning to the very real challenges Americans are facing today. Regardless of what happens with this legislation today, America's health care system will still be in dire need of responsible leadership. The American people deserve an honest discussion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking my colleagues for a productive discussion on the rule and the underlying bill. Today, this House has an

opportunity to again pass meaningful reform to not only promote personal accountability but also to strengthen the opportunities for legitimate claims to be heard and adjudicated. Let us take one more step to turn back the tide of so-called "jackpot justice."

While runaway juries and frivolous lawsuits might make a few individuals and certain ambulance-chasing lawyers rich, the American people ultimately pay the price both economically and socially.

Mr. Speaker, discouraging individuals from taking personal responsibility does not help anyone. In fact, it will only make matters worse. Encouraging healthy lifestyles and wise dietary choices should always trump rewarding poor decisions by shifting the blame to innocent bystanders.

The Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act of 2005 is a good bill, and I look forward to further discussing its merits on the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, a strong bipartisan majority passed this bill in the last Congress; and I have no reason to doubt that we should be able to pass it again by a similar, maybe even a stronger, margin; and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join many of my colleagues in strongly opposing the restrictive rule set forth on H.R. 554, the "The Personal Responsibility In Food Consumption Act of 2005." As you know, in light of the world we live and the importance of nutrition, this is a very important piece of legislation. Having such a restrictive rule truly goes too far and limits the protections of the American people. It goes without saying; this bill is drafted so broadly, it would immunize defendants for negligent and reckless behavior, including mislabeling of food products. I also object to the fact that the legislation applies retroactively, and is written for the benefit of a single special interest—the fast food industry. Third, I believe the legislation constitutes an unwarranted and hastily considered affront on our system of federalism. Finally, I oppose the bill because there are far preferable ways to respond to this issue than by rushing to judgment to pass a one-size-fits-all Federal law preempting all 50 states. Despite my concerns, I am pleased to see that a few very important amendments were ruled into order. If adopted, I believe these amendments will make major improvements to the bill.

In closing, let me note that while this issue may be important, there are far more urgent issues we need to be focusing on at this time. The aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita, where thousands lost their homes and hundreds lost their lives. Unfortunately, those who were impacted the most were children. For example, many children lost 1 or both parents or a guardian as a result of Hurricane Katrina and Rita. This is where our thoughts and legislative actions need to be. In addition, the earthquake registering 7.6 in magnitude that struck Pakistan has caused major devastation in the region. While the numbers are still coming in, it has been estimated that 23,000 have died and at least 47,000 have been injured. There have also been a historical number of

children impacted by this massive earthquake. Those impacted have no access to clean drinking water, making them more vulnerable to disease and other infections.

Mr. GINGREY. 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. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. GINGREY. 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 question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on H. Res. 494 and on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 494, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1409, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 492, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3549, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3853, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 554, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY IN FOOD CONSUMPTION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 494 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 114, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—310

Aderholt	Fortenberry	Melancon
Akin	Fossella	Menendez
Alexander	Foxa	Mica
Baca	Frank (MA)	Michaud
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Barrett (SC)	Gallely	Miller, Gary
Barrow	Garrett (NJ)	Moore (KS)
Bartlett (MD)	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Barton (TX)	Gibbons	Moran (VA)
Bass	Gilchrest	Murphy
Bean	Gillmor	Musgrave
Beauprez	Gingrey	Myrick
Berkley	Gohmert	Neal (MA)
Berry	Gonzalez	Neugebauer
Biggert	Goode	Ney
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Northup
Bishop (GA)	Gordon	Norwood
Bishop (NY)	Granger	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Nussle
Blackburn	Green (WI)	Ortiz
Blunt	Green, Gene	Osborne
Boehlert	Gutierrez	Otter
Boehner	Gutknecht	Oxley
Bonilla	Hall	Paul
Bonner	Harman	Pearce
Bono	Harris	Pelosi
Boozman	Hart	Pence
Boren	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Boustany	Hayworth	Petri
Boyd	Hefley	Pickering
Bradley (NH)	Hensarling	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Herger	Platts
Brown (SC)	Herseth	Poe
Brown-Waite,	Higgins	Pombo
Ginny	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Burgess	Hobson	Porter
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Buyer	Hoolley	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Hostettler	Putnam
Camp	Hoyer	Radanovich
Cannon	Hulshof	Ramstad
Cantor	Hunter	Rangel
Capito	Hyde	Regula
Carson	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Carter	Israel	Reichert
Case	Issa	Renzi
Castle	Istook	Reyes
Chabot	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds
Chandler	(TX)	Rogers (AL)
Chocola	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Coble	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Cole (OK)	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Cooper	Jones (NC)	Royce
Costa	Kelly	Ruppersberger
Cramer	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Kennedy (RI)	Ryun (KS)
Cubin	Kildee	Salazar
Cuellar	Kind	Sanchez, Linda
Culberson	King (IA)	T.
Cunningham	King (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Sanders
Davis (CA)	Kline	Saxton
Davis (KY)	Knollenberg	Schmidt
Davis (TN)	Kolbe	Schwartz (PA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kuhl (NY)	Schwarz (MI)
Davis, Tom	LaHood	Scott (GA)
Deal (GA)	Langevin	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
DeGette	Latham	Serrano
DeLay	LaTourette	Sessions
Dent	Leach	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Dicks	Linder	Sherwood
Dingell	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Doolittle	Lucas	Shuster
Doyle	Lungren, Daniel	Simmons
Drake	E.	Simpson
Dreier	Lynch	Skelton
Duncan	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Marchant	Smith (WA)
Emanuel	Marshall	Snyder
Emerson	Matheson	Soderl
English (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Souder
Everett	McCotter	Stearns
Feeney	McCrery	Sullivan
Ferguson	McHenry	Sweeney
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McHugh	Tancredo
Flake	McIntyre	Tanner
Foley	McKeon	Taylor (MS)
Forbes	McMorris	Taylor (NC)