

tell our consumers and our constituents is be prepared for more price spikes. Energy security is national security.

HONORING OTTO SCHNELLBACHER AND THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

(Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today because earlier this week the House passed H.R. 948 to recognize the University of Kansas football team on their astonishing accomplishments of the last season and their victory at the Orange Bowl.

I also rise this morning with great sadness because just this Monday KU lost one of its great all-time athletes. Otto Schnellbacher was an all-American who, in 1948, led KU to its very first Orange Bowl appearance. He was a wide receiver whose career 58 catches was a record for almost three decades. As a professional athlete, he played in both the NFL and the NBA.

This man was an American and an astonishing athlete. Otto was a giant of Kansas athletics. He was a very good friend. He leaves behind many admirers and a legacy that will last forever.

To the University of Kansas, congratulations again on a historic season. To Otto Schnellbacher, we will miss you. To his widow, Jane, God be with you.

THE BUDGET

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, we are voting later today on the Democrat budget.

I am not surprised that it represents larger government and higher taxes. That is the type of government our friends on the other side of the aisle generally prefer. I am surprised, however, that at a time when our economy is shaky and American families are making difficult budget decisions at their kitchen table, that our friends have chosen not to make the difficult decisions necessary to craft a responsible budget.

Their proposal represents what will be the largest tax increase in American history; \$683 billion in increased taxes. It is nothing short of irresponsible to simply ignore the coming fiscal crisis, a tsunami, represented by increased spending and entitlement programs.

Perhaps if our friends on the other side of the aisle would ask their constituents what they think, they would hear what I heard from a constituent named Debra in Pennsylvania who said she is working two jobs to pay taxes and oil bills. She said, "There is no way I can afford to pay more taxes. Enough is enough."

Well said, Debra.

□ 1100

SUPPORT DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express in the strongest terms possible my opposition to President Bush's proposed budget for 2009, a budget that simply does not reflect our traditional American values. The Republican budget would sink us deeper into debt and will destroy Medicare and Medicaid as we know them. Everything, everything the President says he is, he is not. And with the help of his party, the President is doing what Germany and Japan could not do in World War II, destroying our Nation.

The question America voters must ask is: Whose side are we on? Does anyone in this Chamber seriously intend to cut Community Service Block Grants, Community Oriented Policing, the Centers for Disease Control, NIH, the FAA, and Social Service Block Grants? These are essential people-oriented programs that serve as our Nation's social safety net, and we must invest in them.

Join me in supporting the Democratic budget. Let's invest our hard-earned tax dollars right here at home in America based upon our traditional American values.

FISA: FACT VERSUS FICTION

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, President Bush and the congressional Republicans refuse to face the facts on the expiration of the President's Protect America Act, and instead continue their false and misleading scare tactics that are not productive and will do nothing to protect our Nation.

Republicans continue to claim that the expiration of the Protect America Act has reduced our ability to conduct surveillance. That is false, and Republicans know it. They know that the Protect America Act gave the intelligence community authorization for one full year, meaning that they are all still in effect until August of this year.

If Republicans really believed that the expiration of the act would jeopardize our national security, why did every single Republican Member of this body vote against a 21-day extension of the act last month?

Washington Republicans can't have it both ways. Rather than resorting to political games, congressional Republicans should have joined bicameral negotiations that were conducted for several weeks to develop a strong compromise bill. It is time that the Republicans get off the sidelines and work with our Congress. Let's see this legislation come to the floor today.

DEMOCRATS' FISA BILL PROTECTS AMERICA

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, later today the House will have an opportunity to vote on a strong new FISA bill that has been negotiated over the last couple of weeks.

The new legislation will modernize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. First, it rejects the President's plan to provide blanket immunity to telecom companies who turned over information about their customers. Instead, it gives the Federal court the exclusive opportunity to hear clear classified evidence in order to make a determination whether telecom companies should be held liable for their actions.

Our legislation also requires a special bipartisan commission to investigate the Bush administration's use of wiretaps and other surveillance programs. The commission would be similar to the bipartisan 9/11 Commission that played a critical role in reviewing the events leading up to 9/11 and developing recommendations on how to best protect our Nation.

Madam Speaker, House Democrats are hopeful that Republicans will join us in supporting a FISA bill that protects our Nation and our civil liberties.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)1 of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas on December 11, 2007, a bipartisan group of 21 State attorneys general wrote to Senate Majority Leader Reid and Senate Minority Leader McConnell regarding the FISA Amendments Act of 2007 (S. 2248);

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated that protecting communications carriers from "unprecedented legal exposure is essential to domestic and national security. State, local and federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies rely heavily on timely and responsive assistance from communications providers and other private parties; indeed, this assistance is utterly essential to the agencies' functions. If carriers and other parties run the risk of facing massive litigation every time they assist the government or law enforcement, they will lack incentives to cooperate, with potentially devastating consequences for public safety";

Whereas on February 5, 2008, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified before the Senate Select Committee on

Intelligence that “in protecting the homeland . . . it’s absolutely essential we have the support, willing support of the communications carriers”;

Whereas in the same hearing, Director Mueller further stated “[m]y concern is that if we do not have this immunity, we will not have that willing support of the communications carriers”;

Whereas on March 4, 2008, a bipartisan group of 25 State attorneys general wrote to the Speaker of the FISA Amendments Act of 2007;

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated they “are our states’ chief law enforcement officials and therefore responsible for taking whatever action is necessary to keep our citizens safe”;

Whereas the State attorneys general also stated “[a] bipartisan majority of the United States Senate recently approved S. 2248. But until it is also passed by the House of Representatives, intelligence officials must obtain FISA warrants every time they attempt to monitor suspected terrorists in overseas countries. Passing S. 2248 would ensure our intelligence experts are once again able to conduct real-time surveillance. As you know, prompt access to intelligence data is critical to the ongoing safety and security of our nation.”;

Whereas on February 12, 2008, after passage of S. 2248, the Senate amended the bill H.R. 3773 with the text of S. 2248 and sent the amended bill back to the House for its consideration;

Whereas the State attorneys general concluded that with “S. 2248 still pending in the House of Representatives, our national security is in jeopardy.”;

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to provide the intelligence community and Federal law enforcement with all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to ensure they are not impeding the efforts of State and local law enforcement to use all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas according to the calendar distributed to Members by the House majority, the House of Representatives is scheduled to be in recess during the two-week period beginning on March 17, 2008; and

Whereas it would bring discredit to the House of Representatives to adjourn for two weeks without considering the amendments to H.R. 3773 now pending before the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) should immediately consider a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773; and

(2) should not adjourn for the Easter District Work Period prior to consideration of a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution just noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas on December 11, 2007, a bipartisan group of 21 State attorneys general wrote to Senate Majority Leader Reid and Senate Minority Leader McConnell regarding the FISA Amendments Act of 2007 (S. 2248);

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated that protecting communications carriers from “unprecedented legal exposure is essential to domestic and national security. State, local and federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies rely heavily on timely and responsive assistance from communications providers and other private parties; indeed, this assistance is utterly essential to the agencies’ functions. If carriers and other parties run the risk of facing massive litigation every time they assist the government or law enforcement, they will lack incentives to cooperate, with potentially devastating consequences for public safety”;

Whereas on February 5, 2008, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that “in protecting the homeland . . . it’s absolutely essential we have the support, willing support of the communications carriers”;

Whereas in the same hearing, Director Mueller further stated “[m]y concern is that if we do not have this immunity, we will not have that willing support of the communications carriers”;

Whereas on March 4, 2008, a bipartisan group of 25 State attorneys general wrote to the Speaker of the FISA Amendments Act of 2007;

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated they “are our states’ chief law enforcement officials and therefore responsible for taking whatever action is necessary to keep our citizens safe”;

Whereas the State attorneys general also stated “[a] bipartisan majority of the United States Senate recently approved S. 2248. But until it is also passed by the House of Representatives, intelligence officials must obtain FISA warrants every time they attempt to monitor suspected terrorists in overseas countries. Passing S. 2248 would ensure our intelligence experts are once again able to conduct real-time surveillance. As you know, prompt access to intelligence data is critical to the ongoing safety and security of our nation.”;

Whereas on February 12, 2008, after passage of S. 2248, the Senate amended the bill H.R. 3773 with the text of S. 2248 and sent the amended bill back to the House for its consideration;

Whereas the State attorneys general concluded that with “S. 2248 still pending in the House of Representatives, our national security is in jeopardy.”;

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to provide the intelligence community and Federal law enforcement with all the necessary and ap-

propriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to ensure they are not impeding the efforts of State and local law enforcement to use all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas according to the calendar distributed to Members by the House majority, the House of Representatives is scheduled to be in recess during the two-week period beginning on March 17, 2008; and

Whereas it would bring discredit to the House of Representatives to adjourn for two weeks without considering the amendments to H.R. 3773 now pending before the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) should immediately consider a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773; and

(2) should not adjourn for the Easter District Work Period prior to consideration of a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to be heard on whether the resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I do, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we are now 27 days, 27 days into a unilateral disarmament. We are not doing our job in the House of Representatives. We are not fulfilling our oath, and we are not protecting the American people. This brings discredit on the House of Representatives.

□ 1115

The underlying bill simply allows the American intelligence community to make certain that they are able to listen or surveil on terrorists in a foreign land speaking to another terrorist or suspected terrorist in a foreign land.

My constituents don’t understand why the House isn’t acting on this. They believe the House is bringing discredit on the Nation. Americans don’t understand.

The Senate has acted responsibly. It is imperative that the majority of the House be given an opportunity to vote on this issue. The majority of the House has said that they would pass this bill. Not bringing this bill to the floor for a vote brings discredit and abrogates our responsibility as Representatives of the United States of America.

I urge the Speaker and I urge my colleagues to allow this to come to the floor for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair ruled on March 11, 2008, under the precedents recorded in section 702 of the House Rules and Manual, the resolution addresses a legislative sentiment and not a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the

Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe
Ackerman	Ellsworth	Lowey
Allen	Emanuel	Lynch
Altmire	Engel	Mahoney (FL)
Andrews	Eshoo	Maloney (NY)
Arcuri	Etheridge	Markey
Baca	Farr	Marshall
Baird	Fattah	Matheson
Baldwin	Filner	Matsui
Bean	Foster	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)
Berkley	Giffords	McDermott
Berman	Gillibrand	McGovern
Berry	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Bishop (GA)	Gordon	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	McNulty
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Meek (FL)
Boren	Grijalva	Meeks (NY)
Boswell	Gutierrez	Melancon
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Michaud
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Miller (NC)
Boyd (KS)	Harman	Miller, George
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Mitchell
Braley (IA)	Herseht Sandlin	Mollohan
Brown, Corrine	Higgins	Moore (KS)
Butterfield	Hill	Moore (WI)
Capps	Hinchey	Moran (VA)
Capuano	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)
Cardoza	Hirono	Murphy, Patrick
Carney	Hodes	Murtha
Castor	Holden	Nadler
Chandler	Holt	Napolitano
Clarke	Honda	Neal (MA)
Clay	Hoyer	Obey
Cleaver	Inslee	Olver
Clyburn	Israel	Ortiz
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Cooper	(TX)	Pastor
Costa	Jefferson	Paul
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Crowley	Kagen	Pomeroy
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kaptur	Rahall
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Reyes
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Richardson
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Davis, Lincoln	Kind	Ross
DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Rothman
DeGette	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Delahunt	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Salazar
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Linda
Dingell	Lee	T.
Doggett	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Donnelly	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Doyle	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Edwards	Loeb sack	Schiff

Schwartz	Spratt
Scott (GA)	Stark
Scott (VA)	Stupak
Serrano	Sutton
Sestak	Tanner
Shea-Porter	Tauscher
Sherman	Taylor
Shuler	Thompson (CA)
Sires	Thompson (MS)
Skelton	Tierney
Slaughter	Towns
Smith (WA)	Tsongas
Snyder	Udall (NM)
Solis	Van Hollen
Space	Velázquez

NAYS—192

Aderholt	Fox	Musgrave
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gallagher	Nunes
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Pence
Barrow	Gilchrest	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Petri
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pickering
Biggert	Goode	Pitts
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Platts
Bilirakis	Granger	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Porter
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hayes	Putnam
Bonner	Heller	Radanovich
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Ramstad
Boozman	Herger	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Rehberg
Broun (GA)	Hoekstra	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Keller	Roskam
Calvert	King (IA)	Royce
Camp (MI)	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sali
Cannon	Kirk	Saxton
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Capito	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Carnahan	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Carter	Lamborn	Shadegg
Castle	Lampson	Shays
Chabot	Latham	Shimkus
Coble	LaTourrette	Shuster
Cole (OK)	Latta	Simpson
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Culshaw	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Linder	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Souder
Davis, David	Lucas	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	E.	Terry
Dent	Mack	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Tiberi
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Dreier	McCotter	Walberg
Duncan	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Ehlers	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris	Weller
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Feeney	Mica	Whitfield (KY)
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Wittman (VA)
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Wolf
Fossella	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Boustany	LaHood	Rush
Cubin	Oberstar	Tancredo
Hooley	Rangel	Udall (CO)
Hunter	Renzi	Woolsey
Issa	Ruppersberger	Young (AK)

□ 1141

Messrs. COSTELLO and ALTMIRE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 183, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Foster	Miller, George
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Mollohan
Allen	Gillibrand	Moore (KS)
Andrews	Gonzalez	Moore (WI)
Arcuri	Goodlatte	Moran (VA)
Baca	Green, Al	Murphy (CT)
Bachus	Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick
Baird	Grijalva	Murtha
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Nadler
Barrow	Hall (NY)	Napolitano
Bean	Hare	Neal (MA)
Becerra	Harman	Obey
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Berman	Herseht Sandlin	Ortiz
Berry	Higgins	Pallone
Biggert	Hinchey	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Paul
Blumenauer	Hodes	Payne
Boren	Holden	Pomeroy
Boswell	Holt	Price (NC)
Boucher	Honda	Rahall
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Reyes
Boyd (KS)	Inslee	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Brown-Waite,	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Ginny	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Buchanan	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Butterfield	Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Linda
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Kagen	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Castle	Kaptur	Schiff
Castor	Kennedy	Schwartz
Chandler	Kildee	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Serrano
Cleaver	Kirk	Sestak
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Kucinich	Sherman
Conyers	Kuhl (NY)	Sires
Cooper	Lampson	Skelton
Costa	Langevin	Slaughter
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Smith (TX)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Latham	Snyder
Crowley	Lee	Solis
Cuellar	Levin	Space
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Stark
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	Lowey	Tauscher
DeFazio	Lynch	Taylor
Delahunt	Mahoney (FL)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Tierney
Dent	Markey	Towns
Dicks	Matheson	Tsongas
Dingell	Matsui	Udall (NM)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (NM)
Doyle	McDermott	Velázquez
Edwards	McGovern	Visclosky
Ellison	McIntyre	Walberg
Emanuel	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Engel	McNulty	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Schultz
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Fattah	Melancon	Watson
Filner	Michaud	Watt
	Miller (NC)	Waxman