The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the time limitation would include any amendments thereto.

Without objection, that is the order.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BAKER] assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Committee resumed its sitting.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to speak out of order.)

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1127, NATIONAL MONUMENT FAIRNESS ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next Monday, September 29, to grant a rule which may limit the amendments which may be offered to H.R. 1127, the National Monument Fairness Act; that is, the Monument Antiquities Act.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by noon on Monday, September 29, to the Committee on Rules, at room H–312 in the Capitol.

H.R. 1127 was ordered reported by the Committee on Resources on June 25, and the report was filed on July 21. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Resources.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to make sure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules also is planning to meet the same evening, on Monday, September 29 to grant a rule which may restrict amendments for consideration of H.R. 1370, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization bill.

Any Member contemplating any amendments should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Committee on Rules in H–312 of the Capitol no later than noon on Monday, September 29.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported, copies of which will be available in the document room.

I thank the membership for their consideration.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the Committee, it is in order to consider amendment No. 22 offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 38, line 22, after ''$21,700,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 54, line 11, after ''$28,490,000'' insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me at this point thank both the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and Members from both sides of the aisle for their commitment to fairness. I think that is the right thing to do, and I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a tripartisan amendment sponsored by progressives and conservatives, Democrats, Republicans, and an Independent.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, our current trade policy is a disaster. This year we are going to run up a $200 billion merchandise trade deficit, the largest in our history, and it is a deficit that is going to cost us millions of decent-paying jobs. But, Mr. Chairman, as serious as the economic implications of our trade policy are, this amendment deals with an issue that is even more important.

This amendment deals with democracy and national sovereignty and the right of the American people, through their local, State and nationally elected bodies, to make legislation which the American people believe is in their best interests.

The Members of Congress who are cosponsoring this legislation have different political points of view. We disagree on everything, but we agree that it is the people of the United States of America who should decide the important issues and not people in the World Trade Organization meeting behind closed doors in Switzerland who should make those decisions and who should override legislation that we pass, that State government passes, that local government passes.

□ 1800

Briefly stated, what is some of the legislation that is being threatened, that has been threatened? The WTO, through the urging of Venezuela, forced changes in our Clean Air Act. Mexico forced changes in the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

Southeast Asian countries have filed complaints against American restrictions on shrimp. A Massachusetts law promoting democracy in Burma, which has also been passed by many cities all over America, is now being brought before the WTO by the European Union and Japan. If Massachusetts loses that case, they must take their law off of the books or risk being punished by trade sanctions.

The bottom line here is that no matter what Members' political views are, and I disagree with Helms-Burton, voted against it, want to see it repealed, but I want to see that debate take place here in Congress, and not have somebody through the WTO overrule it. That is the issue.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. As chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, I object to the policy which motivates the original supporters of the amendment, who feel that additional resources should be provided to the U.S. Trade Representative to identify the effect of the multilateral agreement on investments [MAI] on State and local laws. I do not believe that the funds should be used for this purpose. I am concerned about the use of these funds for any purpose which might alter the progress of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment.

The MAI is the first comprehensive multilateral agreement on investments. However, it is not entirely new. The MAI builds on over 1,000, bilateral investment treaties already in force around the world. Most of those agreements include investor-to-state dispute settlement procedures. The agreement will not force the United States to lower standards, and it will not prevent Congress from regulating the behavior of companies, nor are we agreeing to a dispute settlement process that can force changes in U.S. law. There will be no loss of sovereignty under the MAI.

This amendment would deter progress on developing international rules for investment that mirror our international rules for trade by which U.S. companies and their workers have benefited from fairness, openness, and transparency.

I therefore strongly oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]. We have to be honest with the American people. These trade agreements have a profound effect on them, and they have a profound effect on local, State, and Federal laws. That is why the gentleman from Vermont has offered this amendment.

There is great concern that the United States laws, which lawmakers in Congress, State legislatures, and localities have worked hard to establish and pass, continue to be overturned by faceless bureaucrats during trade negotiations. These bureaucrats could be in the World Trade Organization or they could be anywhere.

What can we do, as elected representatives of this great Nation? We will stand up for the laws that are on the books. Many of us would obviously like to stop this constant disregard for U.S. laws, but we are limited in our ability to make such a stand during consideration of appropriations bills, and now we have an opportunity.

Make no mistake about it, this vote is a miniature GATT Fast Track II. What we are saying here today is if Members vote for this, they are saying we should transfer money out of the administration of the Commerce Department to the U.S. Trade Representative, and let this department look at the impact of the World Trade Organization on Members' local and State laws. Members cannot be against that. They have a fiduciary relationship with the people in their districts to say, is the World Trade Organization impacting my congressional district?

The President of the United States is talking up here on the Hill about pushing fast track. But many of us in this congressional House feel strongly that we need to have an early vote. I applaud the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for going ahead and putting this in place.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

We in the Congress have a serious responsibility to make sure that the principles of American Federalism are not trampled in the rush to approve new trade agreements under fast track. I support the Sanders amendment because we need to send U.S. trade negotiators a clear signal that Congress cares deeply about the fundamental precepts of American sovereignty.

We have worked hard to build a consensus around clean air, safe drinking water, and a pure safe food supply. We should not give it up. Vote ''yes'' on the Sanders amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY].

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say very quickly that we realize there is a give and take when we are dealing with the world and trade policies, but most of it has been a take from this country. What is going to happen in Switzerland is going to affect township trustees, county commissioners, Governors, and citizens of the United States.

This is a commonsense approach, it is a commonsense amendment. All it wants to do is to simply say we should inform people. People have a right to know in this country. We should support the Sanders amendment. It is the right thing to do for America, it is the right thing to do to inform people in our society.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH].

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, we need a national economic policy which protects our nation. We need a national economic policy which respects and reestablishes America as a sovereign Nation. We need a national economic policy which places the interests of the American people first among all international trade agreements.

But the World Trade Organization ruled against U.S. regulations on clean air, U.S. consumer protections. They ruled violated WTO rules. The WTO ruled against regulations on hormone-treated beef. Now is the time to take a stand on behalf of our rights as a people to self-determination.

The WTO does not care about the rights of the American people. The WTO does not care about the rights of our workers, about our environment. It is the American Congress which must stand up for the people. Outside of America, the international community does not care. We, the Congress, must protect we, the people.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask, as I read the amendment, this would add $1 million to the U.S. Trade Representative's office to continue the good work they are doing in terms of representing us and furthering the globalization of our economy, and the progress of our domestic production. I do not see, I am baffled by some of the things that are being said. But the amendment itself is only a $1 million increase to the U.S. Trade Representative's office. If that is what it does, I do not have a problem with it.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sanders amendment. There is an alarm bell going off all over the United States, and some people can hear it on the right, and some people can hear it on the left, and some people are ignoring the alarm bell. Other people are trying to set the fire.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is we are being rushed time and again into conceding the authority that was vested in us by the Constitution of the United States to multinational organizations in the name of creating some global trading system, in the name of facilitating global and international commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I may have my disagreements with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] on issues of labor and the environment, but the last thing I want to do is grant authority to some international organization, none of whom will be voted on by the American people, to make these decisions.

We will rue the day when we have granted authority to someone who has no obligation to the voters of the United States to make these decisions. Big business today may think they are getting something in the environmental area or the labor area, but all the American people will suffer a loss of freedom if we give it away to these international organizations.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, we need to unearth and understand any provisions of any pending trade agreements which might undermine the sovereignty of the United States or our many States or our local governments. According to Renato Ruggiero, Director General of the WTO, in referencing the pending MAI agreement, we are writing the Constitution of a single economy. That is the man in charge. He is saying, the Constitution of a single economy. That is not our Constitution. It is not compliant with our Constitution or our sovereignty.

They have so far challenged the Helms-Burton law, the Clean Air Act, a Massachusetts law that is promoting democracy in Burma, and restrictions on shrimp, and buy-America provisions and buy-Oregon provisions, or buy-California or buy-Arizona provisions will all be held to be non-compliant with this MAI.

We are asking for $1 million to the United States Trade Representative to have them fully investigate, unearth, and report to us in the Congress, the representatives of the people of this country, what the reality of these agreements and these threats are, so we may be more fully informed. Mr. Chairman, I have one agreement with the gentleman from Virginia, we should have this money and we should know what we are voting on.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I agreed with many things that have been said by the minority side concerning this amendment. I would like to clarify some matters, though. I think emotionally some people get carried away.

I know the gentleman from Ohio stated that it was the WTO that put

the embargo against the growth hormone on beef. That is not true. Mr. Chairman, that was a unilateral decision by the European Union after the GATT negotiations. Our own USTR did push for a penalty on the unfair trade barrier being placed against growth hormones. I have been fighting the battle to lift the growth hormone ban for 7 months. I have been fighting, pounding the table, becoming obnoxious about this unfair trade barrier. We must have stronger people to negotiate and fight for the United States position.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, if it had not been for the WTO finally recognizing and ruling against this unfair trade practice placed upon our beef producers by the European Union we would not have a world decision in our favor. It took several years by the USTR and 7 months of my own effort and we have to go through a 90-day appeal. Mr. Chairman, I am thankful under that circumstance the WTO was there to help, or rule against the European Union—125 million unfair trade balance against our beef producers. I think our beef people are going to reap a lot of benefit from it.

□ 1815

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, this amendment is very different than the debate that we have been having here tonight. Let us understand what it is and what it is not. The amendment would shift $1 million from the Department of Commerce to the U.S. Trade Representative's Office, period. That is all it does. The rhetoric is about a lot of other stuff, but the rhetoric has nothing to do with the actual amendment.

Since we have just gotten an amended budget request from the President on the USTR to add money to USTR, it may be not a bad idea. If this amendment passes, we will certainly use it for that purpose, since the USTR needs the money to hire some attorneys to carry out their activities, but certainly not anything dealing with this.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. No, I do not have the time to yield. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has his own time. He got 5 extra minutes on the earlier motion.

Let me just clarify a few other things about what is being proposed. The earlier ''Dear Colleague'' letter that Members received from some of the sponsors, talked about this is dealing with the multilateral agreement on investment. In fact, it talked about the role that the multilateral agreement, or MIA as we will call it, has with the World Trade Organization, or WTO. But there is not any link between the MIA and the WTO. To say there is a link between those two is simply incorrect.

The fact is, however, that the new multilateral agreement on investments builds upon 1,000 bilateral investment agreements that are already in force around the world. All of those agreements have some kind of investor dispute settlement mechanism in them. Most of them are done through the World Bank's International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes. The center has been in existence since 1966. It is one of the primary forces for settling these kinds of disputes.

We have to have something to settle disputes when investors get into some kind a dispute. This is the first comprehensive multilateral investment agreement that we have had, and in that sense it is new, but it is certainly high time. We have an increasingly complex world of trade out there, an increasing complex economic situation, and we have to have agreements and we have to have institutions that can deal with settling disputes. That is why we have this multilateral agreement on investments, and that is why we need to have some kind of mechanism for dealing with these.

Let us talk a little bit about what the WTO has done and what the WTO has not done. There is a lot of confusion about that. People say that we are giving up our sovereignty to this organization. But we don't. The WTO is like a lot of other institutions; we have them in a whole range of other areas for settling disputes when disputes arise.

We have an increasing amount of trade in the world, so we have an increasing amount of disputes in the world. The first five cases that we have taken to the WTO we have won. We won against Japan on their liquor taxes. We won against Canada on their restrictions on magazines. We won against the European Union on their banana imports. We won against the European Union on their hormone ban. And we won against India on their patent law.

As a result of having been able to threaten actions in the WTO, we have gotten significant settlements in other disputes with Korea, with the European Union, with Japan, with Portugal, with Pakistan, with Turkey, with Hungary, a whole variety of them.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying this: This issue does not have anything to do with the WTO at all. The rhetoric may, but certainly the amendment does not. This amendment is about policy. It suggests a major policy change. Thus is the reason why we should not debate this kind of thing on appropriation bills. It is the kind of thing that needs to be considered very carefully, in a very complex proposal in the authorizing committee, and I would urge us to not be misled by the rhetoric we have heard here today.

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE FOR TONIGHT

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, a lot of Members are asking about the schedule for the evening. We have been discussing that with leadership on both sides. Here is the intention at the moment as to how to proceed: We would intend that the vote on this matter be rolled and combined with the vote on the next amendment, which I understand is the EDA amendment.

If that is so, then Members would have roughly an hour between now and when the votes would be taken. At that time, there would be the two votes, presumably, unless there is a motion to rise or some other procedural motion that takes place. That is the intent of leadership at this point in time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] anticipate that the EDA vote would be taken first and be a 15-minute vote and that the vote on this amendment would be taken second?

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, either way. I have no real preference. I have no preference. If anyone has a preference, I am open.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do. I would prefer if we could vote this after the debate. We will be finished in a few minutes. Let us vote it, Members are here, and then go off to dinner.

Mr. ROGERS. I have no problem with that.

Do I understand the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] to say that he would prefer not to roll his vote until the EDA vote?

Mr. SANDERS. I prefer to vote it right after the debate, which will end in a few minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. I would hope that the gentleman could accommodate Members and perhaps combine the two votes so that we would have some time off between votes.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of instructing Members who are here and those who are not, I would remind the chairman and those Members that there may be procedural votes called in between the substantive amendments that may be voted on as well.

So I doubt very seriously that there will be an hour's worth of time that people would be able to be gone.

Mr. ROGERS. I would regret that. I would hope that we could proceed with the business of the House and cease the endless motions to rise and the like. I would hope that we can accommodate the Members and let everyone have a few minutes of time perhaps for other duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Who yields time under the Sanders amendment?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has 1

minute and 45 seconds, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, we have just one speaker and we have the right to close. So I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] just gave us a preview of his speech on Fast Track. I do not know what he knows about the WTO.

I have just spent the last year dealing with the WTO on one of those issues that he just alluded to, the one that had to do with the European Union. In our country, we have the opportunity to go to the meetings, we can go to committee meetings, we can come to this Congress, we can go to school boards and our state legislatures.

We do not know who is making the decisions at the WTO. We do not know who is on the panel. Nobody is going to send us a notice. Nobody is going to give us a telephone call. We do not have the opportunity to give our point of view.

I want to tell my colleagues, they just made a decision that is going to cause the drug lords in the Caribbean to take over where the banana trade has been knocked out by the WTO, and we are going to see dope and those drugs in the districts that we represent in America.

Support this. At least we can get a report on what they are doing, what they are supposed to do. And perhaps we can all get educated about the WTO so that we will not go down the line that we apparently are going down to allow them to make decisions about this country and our laws.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me in fact talk about the intent of this amendment. Because I am the author of the amendment, I know something about its intent. If we had the ability, we would have brought forth limitation amendments to stop the USTR from doing what they are doing. But we could not do that. So the intent here is to transfer $1 million from Commerce to the USTR only for two purposes:

First, to do a much better job of informing all Members of Congress when a formal trade complaint is filed or threatened at the WTO or other international bodies or when entering into new trade agreements which would compel the repeal or changes in our current national, State, local, tribal, territorial, or D.C. laws.

Second, to do a much better job of defending and arguing in support of our existing trade and trade-related laws that are in dispute between the WTO and other international bodies. This is as far as we can go.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask support for the amendment. The public has the right to know this information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has expired.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] may wish his amendment did that, but it does not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I think that many of the arguments that have been made by a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are very well-intentioned. But frankly, they are in large part based on fear.

If one looks at the World Trade Organization, we know what a horrible acronym that is out there. There are many people who believe that the World Trade Organization is going to take over the United States of America. But the fact is, I ask people to name one single instance of where U.S. sovereignty or the sovereignty of any State has been jeopardized, and the fact is it has not.

We also, Mr. Chairman, need to look at the fact that there is no tie whatsoever between the multilateral agreement on investment, the MAI and the WTO. It seems to me that as we look at where we are going, I want as much information out as possible. But the United States of America is the world's only complete superpower of the military, economically and geopolitically.

I happen to have a great deal of confidence. My colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] just talked about how closed this is. The fact is, the United States of America is represented there as the world's preeminent leader.

I believe that we need to do everything that we possibly can to break down barriers. I think that Members on both sides of this aisle want us to embark on agreements which will reduce the burden of taxes on our working Americans and on the people.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. DREIER. I have very limited time, and I am in the midst of my closing remarks. Did the gentleman from Oregon have a chance to speak?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I did. I would love to rebut.

Mr. DREIER. That is why I have been given the opportunity to close here, and I appreciate having the chance to do that.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that as we look at where we are headed, this is well-intentioned, but the fact is I think that it would undermine our attempt to proceed with our attempts in those 1,000 agreements that are in the process of moving ahead so that we can cut that burden.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this and hope my colleagues will join in doing that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. Every time the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative commits this Nation to the provisions of an international trade agreement, they potentially bind American citizens to changes in dozens of Federal, State, or local laws. What makes matters worse is that, if the agreement has been negotiated under fast-track authority, the elected representatives of those people have no opportunity to amend the legislation implementing the agreement.

Let me give you some examples of why this amendment is so important. In 1991, the fishing industry in Mexico decided it did not approve of the United States law protecting the thousands of dolphins slaughtered each year in the Pacific tuna fishery. Mexico challenged that law under the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and a panel of unselected trade bureaucrats, meeting behind closed doors in Geneva, decided our popular law, enacted by an open democratic process, was a barrier to free trade. They told us to change it—and this year, amid massive controversy and in spite of tremendous opposition from the American people, we did. Mexico and the GATT got their way, and more dolphins will die this year as a result.

In 1993, right after the administration assured us that our entry into the newly created World Trade Organization would not require any weakening of United States environmental protection laws, Venezuela challenged EPA regulations issued under the Clean Air Act, claiming that the regulations discriminated against foreign refiners. Even though Venezuela's gasoline produces more smog-emitting chemicals than American refiners are permitted to sell, in 1996 the WTO ordered the United States to change its regulations because they were a barrier to free trade, and EPA is now rewriting the regulations.

Today, the United States is fighting similar challenges behind closed doors in Geneva. Several Asian countries have challenged a provision of our Endangered Species Act that protects sea turtles. On the human rights front, the United States is currently defending a Massachusetts law prohibiting companies that do business with the State government from also doing business with the oppressive regime in Burma. Clearly, even State laws are subject to challenge by other nations under WTO rules.

Now let me point to the latest, and perhaps most egregious, example of how our laws can be held hostage by foreign-owned corporations. Included in the fast-track request sent to Congress last week by the President is a little-known item called the Multilateral Agreement on Investment. The MAI has been under negotiation by the developed nations of the world for the past 2 years, but these negotiations have been kept so secret that no one could confirm their existence until this past April. According to the director of the World Trade Organization, the MAI is ''the constitution of a single global economy.''

Here in my hand is a list of the State laws that could be challenged under the MAI as inconsistent with the agreement. They range from California laws promoting investment in facilities for processing recycled materials to Alaska laws limiting permits for mineral extraction on public lands. Federal statutes affected

would include laws providing special incentives for minority-owned businesses or for companies that employ local workers.

Trade agreements are no longer about lowering tariffs or eliminating quotas. They cover everything from the contents of the milk our children drink to the way we manage our fisheries. It's time to update the way we approve of these agreements as well.

The democratically elected members of the Congress and State legislatures have a right to know whether the trade agreements that this or any other administration commits us to have an impact on our laws, and for that very important reason I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] will be postponed.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DE FAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If they give us the vote, I withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we be allowed to vote the amendment up or down right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont to renew his request for a recorded vote on his amendment at this time?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the proceedings on the motion to rise are vacated.

There was no objection.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 356, noes 64, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—356

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (FL)

NOES—64

Archer
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Callahan
Campbell
Cannon
Christensen
Crane
Cubin
Davis (VA)
DeLay
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Everett
Fawell
Frelinghuysen
Gekas
Gilchrest
Goss
Granger
Hamilton
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Levin
Livingston
Manzullo
Matsui
McCrery
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nethercutt
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pickett
Porter
Rogers
Roukema
Sanford
Shaw
Skeen
Snyder
Thomas
White

NOT VOTING—13

Bonilla
Collins
Flake
Foglietta
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Lazio
Rogan
Schiff
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 1849

Messrs. PACKARD, SNYDER, DICKS, CANNON, WHITE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BUNNING, EHLERS, TALENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. GREENWOOD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BECERRA moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 294, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—107

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berry
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (OH)
Capps
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Doggett
Doolittle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Harman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez
Sawyer
Serrano
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Waxman
Woolsey

NOES—294

Aderholt
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Coble
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—32

Armey
Ballenger
Bonilla
Christensen
Coburn
Collins
Doyle
Ewing
Fawell
Flake
Foglietta
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Largent
Lazio
Ortiz
Oxley
Roemer
Rogan
Schiff
Smith (OR)
Wamp
Whitfield
Wicker
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 1909

Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the open portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91–304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, and for trade adjustment assistance, $340,000,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may provide financial assistance for projects to be located on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment to grantees eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, without it being required that the grantee have title or ability to obtain a lease for the property, for the useful life of the project, when in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, such financial assistance is necessary for the economic development of the area: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, consult with the Secretary of Defense regarding the title to land on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

Page 42, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $90,000,000)''.

□ 1915

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, and that the time be equally divided.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thought we were proceeding under a time agreement, are we not?

The CHAIRMAN. There was an objection heard on the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. But previous to that, we had an agreement on time, did we not?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman, it had not come to the floor yet. I am perfectly agreeable to the time agreement.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thought that was already in agreement. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has become an annual ritual, like the swallows returning to Capistrano, that we in the bill increase the amount of money to be designated for the Economic Development Administration, and every year I come down here with some of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and try to do away with the Economic Development Administration.

I am not trying to do that this year, but I am trying to bring the amount of money back to some kind of a reasonable figure, if we think we even need it. This is a wasteful agency and an agency that we will get rid of eventually; whether it is this year or next year, we will eventually, but at this point I am just trying to cut back to some kind of reason.

This is an amendment that is sometimes hard on friendships. The agency has been on the chopping block for years, but it has survived not on the merits of the program, because the program has few merits, but it survives because it makes Representatives and Senators look good.

Mr. Chairman, the Heritage Foundation calls the EDA the No. 1 Federal boondoggle which could be eliminated tomorrow without hurting anyone at all, and they are right. The EDA duplicates the activities of 62 other community development programs and 340 Federal economic development-related programs administered by 13 separate agencies. We simply do not need it, first of all; and second, it does not work.

Now, when we have a problem around here and we do not want to make a decision, what do we do? We say, well, let us get the GAO to do a study of it to get the facts so we will know what to do. Well, the GAO has done a study of the EDA, and it says that it has had a very small effect on income growth rates during the period that the aid was received and no significant effects in the 3 years after the aid ceased. This does not compute to the good-paying, long-term jobs the EDA is said to create.

Mr. Chairman, the value of this program that will be argued here tonight is fiction. The Senate received testimony to this effect in June of this year, and consequently had decided to appropriate only $250 million, I say only, but it is a lot of money, more than I would want, but it said, they have said $250 million to the EDA. We have gone far above that. I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment and bring the EDA's funding in line with the Senate bill.

This has been a target of Presidents, this has been a target of almost every think tank that has looked at it and tried to evaluate it. It has been a target of the GAO. Instead of getting rid of it, let us at least bring it down to the Senate level.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. This is an amendment to drastically cut the Economic Development Administration, and I strongly urge a ''no'' vote.

We debated the issue of EDA on this bill last year and the year before and the year before, and on and on. Last year 328 Members of this body, a majority of Republicans and Democrats, voted resoundingly to support the work of the EDA and to reject this cut. I urge the House again to defeat the Hefley amendment.

If we do not vote this amendment down, we will be depriving hard-hit communities in every State in this country of the vital assistance these programs provide. EDA gives our poorest urban and rural areas the tools to raise themselves up by their own bootstraps, to create new jobs, expand their local tax base, and leverage private investment. It gives them a hand, not a handout.

If one's town is hard hit by sudden and severe job losses when a plant shuts down, EDA is the place to go. If one's community has been devastated by a natural disaster, like the recent floods this year in the Midwest, EDA is the place one can turn to. If one's district has suffered from cutbacks in the defense industry, EDA is the only Federal program dedicated to helping your community retool its economy. If my colleagues do not believe me, ask California.

Critics of the program fail to recognize that the EDA has been reformed, reduced, and streamlined over the last 3 years. This bill cuts EDA funding by 15 percent below the current level. Due to the congressional oversight by both the authorizing committee of this body and the Committee on Appropriations, EDA's grants are truly targeted to the most distressed areas. The development and selection of projects has been moved out of Washington and back toward the local and State levels, and EDA's bureaucracy has been cut by over one-third in the last 2 years.

In addition, since the vote last year, the House has continued to demonstrate its support for EDA programs. Our colleagues in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will soon approve an EDA reauthorization bill that reforms the programs and responds to the past criticisms of this program.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, there are communities that do not need help. They have infrastructure, they have industry, they have access to education, and all the requirements for a healthy regional economy. Other areas, that must rely on us and EDA to help them cope with job loss and defense cuts and other economic disasters, need us. They are the ones that need our help. They are the ones who are turning to us for our vote.

So I urge Members to do as they did last year and the year before and the year before by an overwhelming margin. Vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE] assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2266) ''An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.''

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 871) ''An Act to establish the Oklahoma City National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System; to designate the Oklahoma City Memorial Trust, and for other purposes.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Committee resumed its sitting.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BECERRA moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the privileged motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 281, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—103

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berry
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (OH)
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Doggett
Doolittle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Harman
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez
Sawyer
Serrano
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Waxman
Woolsey

NOES—281

Aderholt
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clement
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Fawell
Foley