the District to operate as any other American jurisdiction would be allowed to do so: with its own local tax base. I think it is unconscionable, it is undemocratic, and it is unfair.

Madam Speaker, D.C. residents are taxpaying American citizens and are denied full representation here in the Congress. Some of the amendments that are allowed in order ought not be in an appropriations bill, they should go through the regular process. It is a bad rule, it is unfair, it is undemocratic, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I ask for a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and have an open and honest debate on the important issues that the Nation is watching us for.

Madam 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 (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. Madam 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 261

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. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XIII 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. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 7, line 1, through page 9, line 2; page 36, lines 21 through 25. During consideration of the bill for 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. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), 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.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 261 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2605, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule 13, which requires a 3-day layover of the committee report. The rule also waives clause 2 of Rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and it waives clause 5(a) of Rule XXI, which prohibits a tax or tariff provision in a bill reported by a committee with jurisdiction over revenue measures. These are waived against provisions in the bill, except as otherwise specified in the rule.

Madam Speaker, this rule accords priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This will simply encourage Members to take advantage of the option in order to facilitate consideration of amendments on the House floor and to inform Members of the details of pending amendments.

The rule also provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment, and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follow another recorded vote, and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes. This will provide a more definite voting schedule for all Members and hopefully will help guarantee the timely completion of the appropriations bills.

House Resolution 261 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority Members of the House.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 261 is a typical open rule to be considered for general appropriations bills. This rule does not restrict the normal open amending process in any way, and any amendments that comply with the standing Rules of the House may be offered for consideration. While a vast number of amendments is not expected, the rule permits those Members who have amendments every opportunity to offer them.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2605 appropriates a total of $20.2 billion in discretionary budget authority, which is $880 million below last year's level and $1.4 billion below the President's request. As we all know, the Committee on Appropriations has, once again, had to balance a wide array of interests and make tough choices with scarce resources. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member for their work on this legislation.

Specifically, the bill provides $4.19 billion for the Corps of Engineers for civil projects such as flood control, shoreline protection and navigation and environmental projects, which is an increase of $91 million over last year's level. The bill also provides $784.7 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to maintain, operate, and rehabilitate Bureau projects and western water infrastructure, which is $2.6 million over last year's level.

As we keep our fiscal House in order, we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is needed most. This bill achieves this goal. Notwithstanding the constraints we now face after decades of fiscal irresponsibility, H.R. 2605 effectively funds solar and renewable energy programs, nuclear energy programs, science programs, and atomic energy defense activities.

Madam Speaker, clearly the Department of Energy is a department that is plagued by mismanagement and abuse, and I want to comment on two specific provisions in this appropriations bill that the Committee on Appropriations has taken to reform and improve management and security.

First, the bill reduces contractor travel by 50 percent, a decrease of $125 million from last year's level. The General Accounting Office has reported widespread abuses of travel funds, excessive waste of taxpayers' money, and the overall use of contractors on Department of Energy programs. We cannot stand for this kind of mismanagement and waste, and I strongly support the significant reduction in funding for contractor travel in this bill.

I also wanted to comment on the bill's provisions that delays $1 billion in obligations for the Department of Energy until after June 30, 2000, and

until Congress has enacted legislation restructuring the national security program currently under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy.

The security of our nuclear secrets is vital to this Nation and the Department of Energy has shown itself to be inept in the safeguarding of these secrets. While reports have indicated problems with the Department of Energy for years, the Department's confusing structure and overlapping lines of responsibility have continued to undermine any effort to improve security from within the Department. By withholding these funds until Congress restructures the national security program, we send a strong message that this Congress demands improved management and accountability when it comes to protecting nuclear secrets.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2605 was favorably reported out of the Committee on Appropriations, as was this open rule by the Committee on Rules. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my colleague and friend, for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by congratulating my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of that subcommittee, for their very hard work. This is their first time steering the Energy and Water Development appropriations bills through committee and they have done an excellent job.

□ 1600

Even though this bill is very complicated, they managed to put together a bipartisan bill that was approved by the Committee on Appropriations on a voice vote. Madam Speaker, they deserve our gratitude and they deserve our congratulations.

Madam Speaker, like most appropriation bills, this bill is coming to the floor with an open rule that waives points of order against legislating on an appropriations bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it. In general, this is a very good bill which funds some very excellent energy and water infrastructure projects. Specifically, it provides $4.2 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers and $15.5 billion for the Department of Energy.

The Army Corps of Engineers will be able to continue their civil projects, like controlling floods, protecting our shorelines, and supporting navigational and environmental projects.

They will also receive $951 million in funding for the new Harbor Services Fund, which will make improvements, vast improvements, to our ports and help maintain our harbors. They also will receive $25 million for Challenge 21, which is a river restoration and flood mitigation program.

Madam Speaker, in addition to water projects, this bill also funds the Energy Department, which is responsible for atomic defense activities as well as conducting basic science and energy research activities, which are very, very important in today's high-tech world.

For instance, Madam Speaker, the Energy Department helps develop clean non-greenhouse gas power sources, but they might need more funding to do so. Otherwise our solar and renewable energy programs will take a back seat to those of other countries, and I believe the United States should be on the cutting edge.

Unfortunately, our Internet program was cut as well. This bill cuts funding for the next generation Internet program, also known as Internet 2. This program will help keep the United States on the cutting edge of information and communication technologies by making it easier for universities and government to conduct research using wider bandwidths.

Madam Speaker, now is not the time to be pulling away from the Internet, and I hope this funding can be restored. Furthermore, as it stands now, Madam Speaker, this bill contains some anti-environmental riders which will make it harder to protect wetlands and harder to protect communities against floods. Because of those anti-environmental riders, the administration is strongly opposed to this bill.

But under this open rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) will be able to offer an amendment which can get rid of those anti-wetland amendments and greatly improve the bill.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for their very hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding time to me. I deeply appreciate the comments of both the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Massachusetts on the rule.

Madam Speaker, this is an open rule. It is a fair rule, one that I totally support, and I want to encourage all the Members to support it, vote for it, and get on with the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, I would like to use my time on the debate on the rule to do three things. The first is to indicate my support, as well, for passage of the rule. It is a good rule.

Secondly, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and to thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on the committee, and to thank all of the staff for their hard work on this very good bill.

Given the allocations that the subcommittee faced, given the responsibilities that the subcommittee faced, and given the positioning we must place ourselves in to have a successful conference with the other body, I do believe that we have done a very good job.

Having said that, I want to use the remainder of my time to set the stage for the amendment I will offer to the bill. The issue deals with the question of the Clean Water Act, current permitting processes that are violative of the Clean Water Act, and the preservation of wetlands in this country.

Wetlands are key in the United States of America, and are vital as far as flood protection. Wetlands are essential as far as our water quality. They are valuable as far as the preservation of wildlife habitat, and they are critical for recreational opportunities. We are losing the benefit of these wetlands, and if the language contained in the bill today is not stripped out, we will lose additional wetlands in an unwarranted fashion.

When European settlers began to come to North America, there were 220 million acres of wetlands. As the chart indicates, in 1995, according to the Department of Agriculture, there are only 124 million acres left. According to the Army Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Environmental Protection Agency, we continue to lose 70,000 to 90,000 acres of precious wetlands every year, and this must stop.

Beginning under the Reagan administration in 1985, it became the policy of our national government to do something about this issue. The ante was upped, so to speak, in 1989 under President Bush.

I have a statement for my colleagues from President Bush dated June 8, 1989. Essentially, the President said that somewhere around 1989 he would hope that future generations begin to understand that things changed and we began to hold onto our parks and refuges, and we protected our species. In that year, under the Bush administration, the seeds of a new policy about our valuable wetlands were sown, a policy summed up in three simple word by President Bush: ''No net loss.''

The legislative riders that again I believe are violative of the Clean Water Act and will lead to the loss of additional wetlands are strongly opposed by the Army Corps of Engineers. They are strongly opposed by the Federal

Emergency Management Administration. They are strongly opposed by the Environmental Protection Agency.

It is my understanding that the President has indicated the bill would be vetoed if these anti-environmental riders were not stripped from the bill. This is a serious and fundamental issue. I would remind all of my colleagues that this is only the second time in 21 years that an administration has issued a veto threat on this bill. We are talking about a major and substantive change.

I would remind my colleagues as well that in the last three Congresses, over 225 bills have been introduced on wetlands and the Clean Water Act. We have not been able to solve some of the conflicting positions and opinions through the authorization process. This is not the time, this is not the vehicle, to do this.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to listen to the debate and to support my amendment during consideration of the bill to strip this rider out. That is my one fundamental objection. It is a serious difference of opinion. It is the only one, I would point out, that I have with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 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. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of the rule and in general support of this bill. This is an important bill for our country. It is especially important for Colorado, as well, because it provides the funding for continuing work on the critical task of cleaning up Rocky Flats, the former atomic weapons facility.

The flats sits near the heart of the Denver-Boulder metropolitan area, which is home to more than 2 million people. It has extensive amounts of hazardous materials. For all Coloradans it is a matter of highest priority to have Rocky Flats cleaned up efficiently, safely, and promptly.

In 1997, the DOE designated the Rocky Flats site as a pilot for accelerated clean-up and closure, and is working to finish cleaning it up in time for closure in the year 2006. I strongly support this effort, as does the entire Colorado delegation here in the House and the other body as well. So I am very glad the bill includes the amount requested in the President's budget for the Rocky Flats closure fund.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), and the ranking members, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for their leadership and for recognizing the importance of this undertaking for Colorado and our Nation.

I also appreciate the inclusion in this bill of funds for the work of the DOE's Office of Worker and Community Transition. The activities of this office, which implements the so-called 3161 program, are essential if we are truly to keep faith with the Cold War warriors who worked at Rocky Flats and at the other sites in the DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

In addition, funding through this office is very important to assist the local communities as they work to adjust to ongoing changes now underway at Rocky Flats, and those that will come after clean-up and closure are achieved.

For example, a number of these communities have joined together to form the Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments. This organization, working with other communities and groups, can play a vital role in building consensus about the future uses of both the open space buffer zone and the more intensively developed industrial zone, as well.

So I regret that the bill does not provide all the funds requested by the President for worker and community transition purposes. However, I do understand the tighter constraints under which the Committee on Appropriations has had to work, and I hope that as we proceed with the legislative process, it will be possible to increase that amount to a level more adequate to the program's important purposes.

However, I am very concerned about the language in the committee report suggesting that the DOE ''should prepare for significantly decreased or no funding in fiscal year 2001 for implementing these 3161 programs.'' Terminating or even deeply reducing this fund next year would not be wise or appropriate. It would be a serious breach of faith with our Cold War veterans, and would make it that much harder for local communities to adequately respond to the changed circumstances at Rocky Flats and elsewhere throughout the complex of DOE sites. So I urge the committee to rethink this point, and to refrain from such an approach when it develops next year's bill.

In addition, there are a couple of areas where I think the bill needs improvement. For example, there are provisions related to wetlands that I think should not be included. I think the bill would be better if it did not include language that could make it harder for us to take action to deal with problems associated with climate change and global warming.

I also have some concerns about the bill's provisions as they could affect the Western Power Administration and related entities. In my view, though, the most troublesome aspect of the bill is the inadequate funding it would provide for the DOE's very important programs related to solar and renewable energy, both here at home and internationally, as well.

Working with others on both sides of the aisle, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and I have been working hard to improve this part of the bill to make it even more balanced and a better measure.

I will have more to say regarding the solar and renewable energy programs, but for now let me reiterate my appreciation for the hard work of the Members and staff of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and the entire Committee on Appropriations.

I urge support for the rule.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and H.R. 2065, the fiscal year 2000 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, and also in support of the rule.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and also our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for their continued support for the Houston-Galveston navigation project. I also want to thank all the Members of that committee, and particularly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for his leadership.

For two consecutive years, the Congress has appropriated sufficient funds to complete the widening and deepening of the Houston Ship Channel project in 4 years. This fiscal year, the $60 million appropriation in this bill ensures we will maintain the optimum construction schedule.

Maintaining this schedule is important because it will add an additional $281 million to the project's rate of investment, return on investment, and save taxpayers $63.5 million in increased escalation and investment costs.

The expansion of the Houston Ship Channel is important on many levels. The port of Houston, connected to the Gulf of Mexico by the 50-mile ship channel, is ranked first in foreign tonnage and second in total tonnage among U.S. ports and eighth in total tonnage among world ports.

With more than 7,000 vessels navigating the channel annually and an anticipated increase over the next few years, the widening and deepening is a necessary step in safeguarding the safety and economic viability of the port and the city of Houston.

The port of Houston provides $5.5 billion in annual business revenues, and creates 196,000 direct and indirect jobs. By generating $300 million annually in customs fees and $213 million annually in State and local taxes, the Houston-Galveston navigation project will more than pay for itself.

I appreciate the subcommittee's support, and ask my colleagues to support both this rule and the bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, there is legislation contained in this bill before us that is protected by the rule, legislating on an appropriations bill. This legislation that pertains to the Bonneville Power Administration is very, very problematic, and in fact, is contradicted by language in the manager's report. But, of course, we know the language in the manager's report does not hold sway over legislative provisions contained within the bill protected by the rule, riders on the bill.

There are two provisions that are aimed at Bonneville Power Administration and other Federal power marketing agencies that are damaging and very ill-informed. One is incredibly broad, and it would repeal legislation Congress passed by a large majority in the 1992 Energy Policy Act.

□ 1615

It allowed the Bonneville Power Administration to directly fund operations and maintenance at hydroelectric facilities operated by the Army Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Pacific Northwest.

For years, we had a horrendous backlog and horrendous inefficiency. But then this amendment passed. In fact, now unlike other Federal power marketing agencies and systems around the country, we are pretty much up to date, and it is working very efficiently and effectively, both for the Federal taxpayers and for the region.

Why would this bill repeal that? It is some sort of strange flat-earth view of competition that does not exist and cannot effectively deal with the problem and did not before we had a change in the statute.

Secondly, the bill would prevent Bonneville Power Administration and other PMAs from cooperating with the utility customers to properly maintain the regional transmission grades.

Here we are worried about system reliability across the country which carries both public and private power, and we are going to undermine that in this bill. That is not a good move for the West or even the Southeast in terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority and other PMAs. It is very damaging. In fact, it is so damaging that I will have to vote against the entire bill, and I would urge other western Members to do the same.

Finally, there is a provision that forces BPA to discontinue an important infrastructure development. BPA is installing a fiberoptic network on its transmission towers to improve its communication and its dispatch of power. It is good business. They need to do it.

At virtually no incremental cost, they could provide excess capacity to remote rural communities who will never see in this century or even in the next century for 20 or 30 years a private provider stringing fiberoptics to their communities.

BPA owns 80 percent of the transmission. It does not, by policy, allow other people to access or hang things on its transmission. They are the only alternative out there. In some, again, misguided attempt to bring about competition that does not exist, and if it did exist, I would not be up here on that particular issue and prohibit them from using their excess capacity at no incremental cost to provide services to those communities.

These are ill-intentioned. They are not overcome by the manager's language. I urge colleagues to vote against the entire bill unless these are fixed.

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this open rule. 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. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 260, 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 227, nays 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders