

down, there are good rates available out there, but programs like the one Congressman KANJORSKI's legislation will protect and nurture have been a huge reason why we've seen the growth in numbers that the U.S. Department of Commerce reported last week.

The 502 program in eastern Connecticut has been a lifeline throughout 2009 and early 2010 where, again, the spike in numbers that Mr. KANJORSKI described has been a reality and has allowed, again, the market to thrive, but also to provide people an avenue to obtain financing that otherwise they never would have been able to get in the regular market.

As was said by the Congresswoman from West Virginia, lenders are holding their breath, homeowners are holding their breath, and the first-time homebuyer tax credit is about to expire in a few days. Passing this legislation which will provide an avenue to protect this program will continue the upward momentum that we are finally starting to see in the housing market.

Again, I congratulate Mr. KANJORSKI for his creative solution to this problem, which will not cost the taxpayers additional funds, but will keep, again, a growing real estate market moving in the right direction.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would just, again, reiterate my support for this bill. I think it's timely. It's something that we want to do in an expeditious and responsible manner, and I believe that this bill addresses those concerns.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5017, the "Rural Housing Preservation and Stabilization Act of 2010."

This bill would preserve the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Housing Service (RHS) Section 502 Single Family Direct Homeownership Loans Program, which is set to expire at the end of this month.

Section 502 is USDA's main housing loan program and is designed to help low-income individuals purchase, build, repair, or renovate homes in rural areas.

Currently, Section 502 is the only federal program targeting safe and affordable homeownership opportunities to low- and very low-income rural households. The annual average income of a Section 502 direct borrower is 55 percent of area median income, or \$18,500 a year.

Since its inception, Section 502 has provided loans to approximately 2.5 million families at an extremely low cost to the federal government. Unfortunately, the amount appropriated for rural housing programs has been insufficient to meet the demand. The current backlog for Section 502 direct loans includes 27,000 rural households, totaling \$2.9 billion in loan applications.

H.R. 5017, will preserve the Section 502 program and establish a self-sustaining program at no cost to taxpayers. I believe Section 502 is vital for our rural communities throughout the nation and this bill is absolutely necessary to help preserve a critical program at no cost to taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5017, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. 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.

#### PROHIBITING A COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN 2011

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5146) to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5146

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. NO COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while there are positive signs of economic recovery around the country, the budget deficit is still an important issue. Therefore, it is appropriate that we continue to forego a cost-of-living adjustment at this time as we did for 2010. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation, providing Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011, sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MITCHELL), actually mirroring language that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has had before our body for some period of time. Both gentlemen have worked on this together, it is my understanding.

Across the country, we know that there are serious issues plaguing Americans, mainly a deteriorating economy and very high unemployment rates. In my home State, the underemployment rate is over 20 percent. In my district, Sacramento County has an unemployment rate of 12.9 percent, which is actually lower than some of the cities in my district. The city of Galt, for example, has an unemployment rate of 15 percent. So it goes without saying that things are not well in our economy and people are suffering.

As Americans around the country are struggling and sacrificing to make ends meet, it appears that we in Congress should not be immune. Other institutions are doing likewise. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court recently announced in his Year-End Report for the Judiciary that he would not be requesting the usual salary increase for Federal judges given that "so many of our fellow citizens have been touched by hardship." The President has also announced a pay freeze for top White House officials and other appointees in the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, recently in this House we passed H. Res. 1257, supporting the goals and ideals of National Financial Literacy Month, 2010. This legislation sought to raise public awareness about financial education through highlighting the importance of maintaining and managing personal finances, increasing personal savings, and reducing indebtedness in the United States. Some would ask whether we in Congress ought to undertake that same examination with respect to our spending in this House and our spending overall on the Federal budget.

□ 1530

At a time when we are passing resolutions telling Americans to be more cognizant of their financial situation, their debt, their savings, we do need to do the same in the House.

Millions of Americans are not getting a pay raise this year. Many, unfortunately, are not even getting paychecks. Under these circumstances, Congress must forgo a pay raise to save the hardworking taxpayers and hard-looking job seekers in this country a little of their money. Relative to the overall Federal budget, this single act doesn't have that great an impact. But any dollar, any Federal dollar, is something that we should treat with utmost responsibility because it comes to us in a sense involuntarily from our constituents. It comes through taxes or future taxes to pay for current debts.

So under these circumstances I think most of my colleagues, if not all of my colleagues, would agree that this is the time for us to forgo a pay raise. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I would like to yield 3 minutes to the bill's sponsor, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5146, the Cancel the Pay Raise for Members of Congress in Fiscal Year 2011 Act, a bill to stop Members of Congress from receiving an automatic pay raise in fiscal year 2011. Last week the Senate approved this same legislation, and I am pleased that today the House is finally following suit.

With unemployment high and so many families under stress, it would be simply unconscionable for Congress to raise its own pay. But that is precisely what will happen in fiscal year 2011 unless Congress takes action to stop it. This bill is simply the right thing to do. Earlier this year, Chief Justice Roberts announced that, in a major break from tradition, he will not seek a salary increase this year for Federal judges in light of the fact that, quote, "so many of our fellow citizens have been touched by hardship." Likewise, President Obama has announced a pay freeze for senior White House officials as well as top appointees across the Federal Government. And as I mentioned, last week the Senate approved legislation to block the next automatic pay raise for Members of Congress.

It is time—past time—for the House to act. The American people are not getting a raise this year. Neither should Congress.

I want to thank Representative RON PAUL for his steadfast leadership on this issue. He and I have worked closely with each other for several years now to block the annual pay raise, and today's vote would not have been possible without him. Dr. PAUL, thank you.

I also want to thank the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste for their support of our efforts to block the pay raise. And of course I want to thank Representative JIM MATHESON for his work on this legislation, as well as House leadership for allowing this important bill to come to the floor today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the indomitable distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), who has worked on this issue for some time.

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I want to compliment Mr. MITCHELL from Arizona for getting this bill to the floor. We have worked

on this for several years. I am pleased that this is going to be passed today.

Much has been said about the unemployment rate in this country. And I saw one other take on unemployment today, where it said that for low-income people below \$20,000, the unemployment rate is actually 31 percent, which shows how devastating this recession is, and for some it is an actual depression.

I would like this bill to be passed, but not just as symbolism. It is good symbolism and important symbolism. As was mentioned by the gentleman from California, it is not a tremendous amount of money, but it is important for us to recognize that we have a serious problem in this country and that we shouldn't be careless about the way we think about this problem. It shouldn't make us feel necessarily good because we passed this. This is just necessary.

It does remind me of a piece of legislation I introduced many years ago, in the 1970s, when we had rampant inflation, which I anticipate will probably come back to this country. Back then we had a 15 percent inflation rate. My suggestion then in the form of legislation, to get the Members' attention to understand what inflation was all about, I said we should take a pay cut at the rate of inflation. Even today we might suggest that. There is a lot more inflation out there than we admit to. So maybe not only should we freeze our salaries, maybe we should be taking a pay cut so that we can do a better job, because we really can't brag about the job that we have done for the country because of the condition the country is in.

But I would like to extend this motivation to freeze the pay of Congressmen to freezing a few other things. I would like to see our budget at least frozen where it is. That would go a long way to solving some of our budgetary problems. And how about freezing the debt level. Let's not raise the debt level. Instead, this next year our national debt is going to go up about \$2 trillion when you add up all that we borrow from our trust funds.

Also, I would like to see a freeze on regulations because regulations usually backfire. There are unintended consequences, they cost a lot of money, they act as a tax, and they don't improve the economy overall.

I would be in support of freezing the wealth transfer system, the system that most people think is going to help all the poor people. The trouble is the wealth transfer system helps the rich people, and they are the ones who get the bailouts and the poor people don't. So a freeze on wealth transfer would go a long way toward restoring a free society and a constitutional government.

Also, I think the consensus of the American people today is we ought to freeze the bailouts. Let's not bail out anybody anymore. But it looks like it will be a long time before that happens because we have a monetary system

where we have somebody over there called the Federal Reserve that says we can print money at will, and our job is to be the lender of last resort. That means to bail anybody and everybody out that needs money. And it looks like that will be domestic as well as international.

I would like to freeze the ability of the Federal Reserve to print money out of thin air. That in moral terms is counterfeit, and yet that is the encouragement for us to run up our deficits because the Fed can come in and increase the money supply. A sound monetary system would have frozen anybody's ability to just create money out of thin air.

I would also like to freeze the income tax at the 1912 level. And that indeed would be a real boost to the people of this country. All of a sudden there would be great wealth in the hands of the consumer. Just think if all the money that we spent on the bailouts that just tided things over, if just a portion of that had been used to get rid of the income tax, I think the money would have been better spent because the people would have been spending the money instead of the bureaucrats and the politicians and the regulators that bailed out the people who were making all the money in the first place.

But I would also extend this freeze onto some other things, too. I would like to freeze some of our militarism. I think we have enough fighting going on. I don't think we should expand the war. I don't think we should be looking for another enemy. I would like to freeze the sanctions on countries. I would like to see a lot more free trade. I would like to see that the bombing is not extended, that we quit allowing our CIA to extend the bombing of countries that have not attacked us. I would also like to put a freeze on this concept of preventive war. This whole idea of the concept of preventive war means that we can literally start the war.

So, yes, it's good that we are freezing the salaries of us here in the Congress. But if we really want to restore the Republic, we will freeze a lot of these other issues as well.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I would like to yield 2 minutes to the bill's cosponsor, the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, as so many people in this country continue to struggle to find work, let alone receive a pay raise, I am glad Congress has chosen to highlight this issue. Now, last year Congress recognized how inappropriate it would be to accept the stealth salary increase and passed a measure to block a congressional pay raise for the current fiscal year. This past week the Senate continued the freeze on congressional pay without a single dissenting vote. And now I urge my fellow House Members to follow suit and pass this commonsense measure.

The need for this bill also underlines another significant problem with the

congressional pay raise system because every year, unless both the House and the Senate actually vote against a pay raise, like we are talking about doing right now, we automatically receive a pay raise. In almost every profession, salary increases are dependent on performance, experience, tenure, or any number of factors other than really showing up to work every day.

This system which shrouds the congressional pay increase in arcane procedures deters a healthy, open debate of the issue. This legislation is a straightforward measure to stop the pay increase for fiscal year '11 and has been widely supported in a bipartisan manner.

I commend Congressman MITCHELL and Congressman PAUL for their work on this issue over the past 2 years. Now, beyond this one-time issue we are talking about today, I would be remiss if I didn't mention I have introduced a separate piece of legislation which would permanently repeal the provision of the law granting automatic pay raises and bring this issue to an open, up or down vote to let the public know where we stand on this issue every year. The Senate has also passed this legislation. I look forward to discussing this issue as we move forward to address our budgetary priorities.

As I have said for the past many years, spending priorities in a time of war and economic turmoil should not include an automatic salary increase for Members of Congress. I urge my fellow Members of the House to prevent a pay raise for 2011 and vote in favor of the legislation on the floor today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

After listening to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), I am reminded of some freezes I would like to see. In addition to this freeze on our pay for a year, I would like to see us put a freeze on regulations on small business.

The previous speaker just mentioned that he believes we have somewhat of an arcane procedure for providing for pay raises to Members of Congress. That may be true. But there is certainly no more arcane activity that we engaged in than when we passed the health care bill in that having a new burden on business, particularly small business. And I speak of section 9006 of the health care bill, which has nothing to do with health, but has everything to do with regulation in that now, as opposed to the law which has existed for many years in which you had to file a 1099 on someone who provided a service for you, the purpose of which was to make sure that there was some paper trail to see if you were paying payroll taxes, we now have decided under this bill, the health care bill, section 9006, to require anybody involved in a trade or a service, that is any type of business who makes a purchase from some other corporate entity of any type that amounts to more than \$600 cumulatively over a single year, that requires

a 1099 to be filed with the person that you purchase the product from and the Federal Government.

What this means is that now if you purchase plane tickets and it amounts to more than \$600 and you are engaged in a business, you will have to file a 1099 with United Airlines or American Airlines and the Federal Government. If you purchase food for your company and it amounts to more than \$600, you will have to file a 1099. If you happen to be a rancher and you purchase bales of hay, you are going to have to keep a running tab all year long, and when you go over \$600 you are going to have to file a 1099. If you in fact utilize FedEx or UPS, if during the course of the year it is more than \$600, you will have to file a 1099 with FedEx or UPS and the Federal Government.

So this is a new burden that will require accounting procedures for anybody involved in business, particularly imposed on small business. But more than that, there is a double-edged sword to this. And that is this is a dagger at the heart of small business. Because if you have this obligation, it is easier to deal with one single big vendor than to have a number of them. Instead of going to your local hardware store if you are a small company and you need some hardware, you ought to go to one of the big guys because their universe of products is greater. And so if you have everything you purchased from them, knowing it is going to be over \$600, you only have a single 1099 to file.

So what we have done in one fell swoop is make it more difficult to actually operate with this new regulatory scheme, and on the other hand, create disincentives for small business.

Now, when we contacted the Internal Revenue Service to see how they are going to interpret it, they said we haven't interpreted it yet because we are waiting for HHS to give us guidance. So now we have tax policy going to be determined by HHS.

□ 1545

All I'm saying is, if people think that we've had arcane procedures for means of pay raises for Members of Congress, it is nothing compared to what we've done in this health care bill with regulation on small business. I actually call that provision of the health care bill the "universal snitch act" because, when you file this 1099, it has nothing to do with your obligation to pay taxes. It has got to be premised on the idea that every vendor you deal with cheats and that the only way to catch cheaters is to have this new paper trail.

So I don't know. It just seems repugnant to me that we would do that, and I happen to have a bill that I introduced yesterday that would repeal that.

I just bring this up because the gentleman from Texas prompted this thought in my mind about freezes that would be appropriate. Then when the

previous speaker mentioned arcane procedures, there was nothing more arcane than the health care bill we passed.

In fact, when we called the IRS, they weren't sure that this was in the bill. When we talked to the Congressional Research Service, they said, Oh, it couldn't be. Then when we pointed out that the new language in the bill is property and not just services—and that includes anything that you purchase—it has an unbelievable obligation on small business.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as a small business man in the oil and gas industry for over 30 years, I know that, when times are tough, we have to tighten our belts. That is why the very first bill that I sponsored in Congress was a bill to stop the automatic pay raise for Members of Congress.

Last year, we were able to get enough signers to stop this pay raise for this year, and I was proud to work to get that done. I am proud that our work has again paid off and that I am standing here today in support of a bill that will again stop the automatic pay raise that Members have taken advantage of for too long.

While many working New Mexicans are struggling to make ends meet, it is insulting that anyone would accept an automatic pay raise, which is something most of the constituents in my district will have to do without—if they are earning salaries at all. Our constituents expect honest and responsible leadership from their Congress. That's why I encourage my colleagues to just say "no" to the dough.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take this a step further. I call on my fellow Members of Congress to cosponsor legislation I have sponsored with my colleague from Arizona, Representative KIRKPATRICK. Our bill would cut pay for all Senators and Representatives by 5 percent beginning January 1, 2011. This would be the first congressional pay reduction since 1933.

I think it's about time that Congress has their pay cut just like the rest of the country, so I ask you to join me in this fight today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the pride of the Coast Guard, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of this bill.

Some would say, Well, it's just a symbolic gesture. Well, it may be symbolic, but it is symbolically significant. What better time to impose a freeze against ourselves than now during these harsh economic times of people being beneficiaries of pink slips, of being told their jobs are gone. Then

they see that Congress gets an automatic COLA. I think this is a good bill, and I urge its passage.

I thank the gentleman from California for having elevated me to the "distinguished" category as well.

Folks, we are on the right track here. This bill needs to be passed. We need to impose a freeze upon ourselves for the next fiscal year. I think it would send a message which would be well received by our constituencies across this land.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I would just urge my colleagues to support this resolution. This is appropriate at this particular time. I think all Members of Congress recognize the difficult economic straits we are in. It is a simple resolution. It forgoes the pay raise for the year 2011, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to comment very briefly because my colleagues were asking for basically a freeze on a status quo of the health care that we know today.

They spoke of repugnant policies. I want to talk just for a minute about the repugnant policies that we know of today, which don't allow people to get insurance if they have preexisting conditions that have ratings which discriminate, particularly against women, and which make it almost impossible for small business to be able to take care of and to help their employees when it comes to health insurance. So, yes, we have some policies that we have been trying to change. Unfortunately, my colleagues are asking for a freeze.

Yet I do want to applaud the fact that we are here on a singular effort today, and that is to forgo the cost-of-living adjustment for Congress. I think that's a good idea. It is a very timely idea, and it is very important that we move forward with it today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Kansans continue to suffer from the effects of the recession. Times remain tough for many. Small business owners are struggling to keep the doors of their businesses open. Families are struggling to pay their bills. When faced with difficult times, Kansans make sacrifices. They cut back where they can and stretch every dollar to make ends meet.

Times are also tough for the Federal Government. The national debt is more than \$12 trillion and it continues to grow every day.

When times are tough, Kansans expect their government to act like they do—to make sacrifices and cut spending. Yet, the Federal Government is spending more than ever before.

One of the first places Congress should look to cut spending is the annual cost-of-living increase for Members of Congress. Representatives and Senators do not deserve a raise, especially when many Kansans will not receive a raise this year and the unemployment rate remains high.

I have long been opposed to the hidden process by which Members of Congress get

an increase in their pay. The lack of transparency in the yearly raise only serves to increase skepticism, disillusion and distrust of government. Last year, I sponsored H.R. 1597, which eliminates the automatic pay increase for Members of Congress. If Members of Congress believe they have earned a raise, they should vote on it in full view of the public.

I am pleased today, that the House of Representatives is considering a bill in clear view of the public that would do away with the cost-of-living increase for next year. While this legislation, H.R. 5146, is only a one-year fix to the problem, it is an important first step and I am proud to be one of the sponsors of this legislation. I oppose the yearly automatic increase in pay and strongly support today's legislation to make sure Members of Congress do not get a raise next year.

Our employers, the voters, are right to be unhappy with Washington's spending spree. There should be no increase in congressional pay until Congress listens to the public and cuts spending.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. 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 California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5146.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. 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.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 1131, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5017, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5146, 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.

#### NATIONAL ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1131, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1131, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—411

Ackerman	Dahlkemper	Johnson (GA)
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)
Adler (NJ)	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
Akin	Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam
Alexander	Davis (TN)	Jones
Altmire	DeFazio	Jordan (OH)
Andrews	DeGette	Kagen
Arcuri	Delahunt	Kanjorski
Austria	DeLauro	Kaptur
Baca	Dent	Kennedy
Bachmann	Deutch	Kildee
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baird	Diaz-Balart, M.	Killroy
Baldwin	Dicks	Kind
Barrow	Dingell	King (IA)
Bartlett	Doggett	King (NY)
Barton (TX)	Donnelly (IN)	Kingston
Bean	Doyle	Kirk
Berkley	Dreier	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Berman	Driehaus	Kissell
Biggert	Duncan	Klein (FL)
Bilbray	Edwards (MD)	Kline (MN)
Bilirakis	Edwards (TX)	Kosmas
Bishop (GA)	Ehlers	Kratovil
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kucinich
Bishop (UT)	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Blackburn	Emerson	Lance
Blumenauer	Engel	Langevin
Blunt	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Boccheri	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Boehner	Farr	Latham
Bonner	Fattah	LaTourette
Bono Mack	Filner	Latta
Boozman	Flake	Lee (CA)
Boren	Fleming	Lee (NY)
Boswell	Forbes	Levin
Boucher	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Foster	Lewis (GA)
Boyd	Fox	Linder
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Braley (IA)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Bright	Frelinghuysen	Loeb
Brown (GA)	Fudge	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown (SC)	Gallegly	Lowe
Brown, Corrine	Garamendi	Lucas
Brown-Waite,	Garrett (NJ)	Luetkemeyer
Ginny	Gerlach	Lujan
Buchanan	Giffords	Lummis
Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Burton (IN)	Goodlatte	E.
Butterfield	Gordon (TN)	Lynch
Buyer	Granger	Mack
Calvert	Graves	Maffei
Camp	Grayson	Maloney
Campbell	Green, Al	Manzullo
Cantor	Green, Gene	Marchant
Cao	Griffith	Markey (CO)
Capito	Grijalva	Markey (MA)
Capps	Guthrie	Marshall
Capuano	Gutierrez	Matheson
Cardoza	Hall (NY)	Matsui
Carnahan	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)
Carney	Halvorson	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN)	Hare	McCauley
Carter	Harper	McClintock
Cassidy	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Castor (FL)	Heinrich	McDermott
Chaffetz	Heller	McGovern
Chandler	Hensarling	McHenry
Childers	Hergert	McIntyre
Chu	Herseth Sandlin	McKeon
Clarke	Higgins	McMahon
Clay	Hill	McMorris
Cleaver	Himes	Rodgers
Clyburn	Hinchey	McNerney
Coble	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Hirono	Meeks (NY)
Cohen	Hodes	Melancon
Cole	Holden	Mica
Conaway	Holt	Michaud
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hoyer	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Hunter	Miller (NC)
Costa	Inglis	Miller, Gary
Costello	Inslee	Miller, George
Courtney	Israel	Minnick
Crenshaw	Issa	Mitchell
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Moore (KS)
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Moran (KS)
Culberson	(TX)	Moran (VA)
Cummings	Jenkins	Murphy (CT)