

doubly morally wrong to force millions of pro-life Americans to see their tax dollars used to support research that they find morally offensive.

Let the debate begin.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2419, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 291

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. 2419) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on 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 of rule XXI are waived except for section 104. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. 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. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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 (Mr. KLINE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1030

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 291 is an open rule that provides for the consid-

eration of H.R. 2419, the Fiscal Year 2006 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to reiterate that we bring forth this resolution under a fair and open rule.

Historically, appropriations bills have come to the floor of the House governed by open rules. We continue to do so in order to allow each and every Member of this House the opportunity to submit amendments for consideration, obviously as long as they are germane under the rules of the House.

This legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker, appropriates almost \$30 billion for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Departments of the Interior and Energy, and several independent agencies. This bill is truly fiscally sound, representing a reduction of \$131.7 million from the fiscal year 2005 legislation and the same spending level as was requested by the President in his budget request. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides the resources necessary to address the energy and water needs of the United States.

H.R. 2419 provides \$4.7 billion for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps is the world's premier public engineering organization, responding to the needs of the Nation in peace and in war. For over 200 years the Corps has been involved in such important missions as flood control, shoreline prevention, navigation and safety on the waterways of this great Nation. The vital work of the Corps will continue under this act, which includes a vigorous civil works program.

The bill also includes a number of significant changes to improve project execution and financial management, including more responsible use of reprogramming, continuing contracts and implementation of long-term financial planning.

I would like to highlight a Corps project of particular interest to my community, the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program. The restoration of the Everglades, that wonder of nature, is the largest and most significant environmental initiative that this country has ever undertaken. The legislation continues our commitment to the restoration of this environmental treasure with an appropriation of \$137 million. I am pleased to report that Everglades restoration is moving forward expeditiously and effectively. Congress, and the Committee on Appropriations especially, should be proud of this environmentally sound action.

The National Nuclear Security Administration, which includes the nuclear weapons program, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors and

the Office of the Administrator, is funded at \$3.8 billion, an increase of \$24 million over fiscal year 2005. I am glad to see that the appropriators increased this program. Nonproliferation is essential to the defense of the homeland. Our work across the globe, especially in Russia, makes it ever more difficult for rogue states and terrorists to obtain the weapons necessary to attack the United States or our Armed Forces abroad or our allies.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) for truly extraordinary work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to today's consideration of H.R. 2419, which reflects much thought and long-term planning on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations. This year's energy and water bill means a great deal to my constituents and to my home in Sacramento.

Sacramento's history has long been intertwined with flood control. When the city endured a near catastrophic flood in 1986, the community quickly realized they did not have nearly the level of flood protection necessary to fully safeguard the region. After the city again faced more floods in 1997, the community set off to achieve 200-year flood protection. However, until that day arrives, flooding remains a very constant and real threat, and continued Federal assistance plays an important role to attaining that goal.

In spite of years of efforts, Sacramento still remains one of the most flood-prone and threatened cities in the country, paling in comparison to the level of protection enjoyed by other river cities. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento's flood risk is among the highest of major urban areas in the country.

Located at the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers, Sacramento is the hub of a six-county regional economy that provides 800,000 jobs for 1.5 million people. A major flood along the American River would cripple this economy, cause between \$7 billion and \$16 billion in direct property damages and likely result in significant loss of life. The risk of serious flooding poses an unacceptable threat to the safety and economic well-being of Sacramento and to California's State Capitol.

With the steady support of Congress, Sacramento has already made good progress toward our initial goal of

achieving 100-year flood protection for the region and ultimately moving as quickly as possible towards 200-year flood protection. At the beginning of this year, FEMA revised its flood maps for the majority of Sacramento to reflect 100-year flood protection. But this level of flood protection is still a far cry from the protection afforded other large river cities and at least 100,000 people and 1,500 businesses continue to be at high risk in the south Sacramento area.

Fortunately, as a result of long, bipartisan negotiations, Congress has authorized a suite of projects that will achieve 200-year flood protection. Upon completion of the authorized projects to improve area levees, modify the outlets at Folsom Dam and raise Folsom Dam by 7 feet, Sacramento will attain its long-term flood control goal. I deeply appreciate the Committee on Appropriations's commitment to funding these projects to help give Sacramento the level of flood protection that it both needs and deserves.

I am also quite pleased with the work that the committee has done to ensure Corps projects are executed in an efficient manner with improved financial management. For example, the work necessary to achieve 200-year flood protection will take 15 to 20 years to complete. The committee is asking that the Corps develop a 5-year plan and a vision for water infrastructure in the country. The current year-by-year strategy would not be an efficient manner to plan for the significant financial demands. This would ultimately compromise the ability to implement the region's flood control projects. Efforts to comprehensively interrogate financial planning and project management in the Corps will greatly benefit not only the execution of the projects, but also the local and State partner's ability to plan their budget.

It is certainly understandable that no matter how extensive the planning and preparation for a project, that as it moves forward, it may get off schedule. With that in mind, it is certainly helpful for the Corps to be able to reprogram funding to projects that can keep progressing. But this should only happen if the Corps can return the funding back to the project the funds originally came from. To not do so is a complete disregard of congressional directive. In such tight financial times, the Corps must curb this practice.

I strongly support the committee directive that the Corps specifically identify all of the funding owed to projects as a result of reprogramming. I also believe integrating this funding into the Corps budget will help clear the books and assist the Corps in efficient project execution and financial management.

By working together, the Congress, the administration and the Corps of Engineers will be better prepared to ensure limited Federal resources are spent efficiently, commitments to local sponsors are honored and projects remain on schedule.

I would also like to take a moment to acknowledge the committee's work determining funding priorities for the Department of Energy. This year's Energy and Water Appropriations bill highlights the committee's focus on other long-range issues, noticeably their commitment to nuclear nonproliferation.

Sadly, this President's go-it-alone approach has been ineffective in reducing the threat by cooperating and working with our allies and others around the world to bring economic, social and political pressure to bear on any country trying to gain nuclear weapon capabilities.

It is illogical to expect any other nation to listen to Americans speak of nonproliferation when we are developing bunker-busting nuclear weapons. I stand with the committee's position to stop nuclear earth penetrator research. Considering the vast amount of nuclear material that is not secured in the former Soviet Union, I believe it is a much better investment to fund the Sustainable Stockpile Initiative. Through this program, we will be able to increase our Nation's security by keeping their Cold War-era nuclear weapons and materials from falling into the hands of terrorist organizations.

My one disappointment with this rule, Mr. Speaker, is that yesterday afternoon the Committee on Rules refused to make in order a good amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ). Her amendment would provide the Department of Energy an additional \$250 million to accelerate energy research, development, demonstration and deployment. This investment will help our Nation harness technology to secure greater independence from foreign sources of energy. As we face rapidly rising prices for crude oil and gasoline at the pump, I believe this issue is very timely and of great relevance to our debate today about the funding priorities for the Department of Energy.

This bill moves our country forward on many levels, from improving local water infrastructure, to bigger-picture Corps of Engineers financial management and efficiency issues, to global issues like nuclear nonproliferation. I strongly support the underlying bill and am pleased it was reported in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule under consideration.

Yesterday, I asked the Committee on Rules to provide a waiver so that the House could consider my amendment to create the energy technology to power the 21st century initiative which would provide \$250 million to accelerate the research, development, demonstration and deployment of new energy technologies and make our Nation less reliant on foreign energy. Unfortu-

nately, my request was denied along party lines.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question much of our energy supply is controlled by foreign nations. Just as we are trying to improve national security, we have failed to complement these efforts with the energy policies that would move us towards greater energy independence.

The recently passed Energy Policy Act failed to adequately invest in renewable energy and conservation, directing \$600 million to these efforts while allocating more than 40 percent of the bill's \$8.1 billion in tax cuts, that is, \$3.2 billion, toward the oil and gas industries, the same traditional resources that in large part we depend on foreign countries for.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not change our focus, our country's consumption of oil will only increase. By 2025, oil usage will increase to 28.3 million barrels per day, with imports accounting for 19.68 million of those barrels. Leaving our energy security in the hands of international oil barons is a foolish and dangerous approach.

□ 1045

That is why I wanted to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Appropriations Act that would provide the Department of Energy with \$250 million to accelerate the research, development, demonstration, and deployment of new energy technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of controlling our own energy sources are enormous. A down payment of \$250 million would spur much-needed work in the emerging sector of energy technology. We could bring to bear reliable and successful methods of wind, solar, biomass, hydrogen, and other forms of energy. It could bring new ways to bring cleaner, safer, and more efficient energy with more traditional sources, including coal and oil. It would put the United States on a course to energy independence, something we all talk about.

It would also help maintain our standing as a world leader with regard to scientific discovery by establishing a 21st-century engine to discover new, more efficient, cleaner energy sources for the future. We would help to create new, high-paying jobs and keep the United States on the cutting edge of science and technology. With appropriate investments, consumers as well as businesses will have greater, rather than fewer, and less expensive options.

In the end, shifting our energy economy means improved national security, more American jobs, a stronger economy, and a cleaner environment. It is time to demand action on policy initiatives that will set the United States free from its reliance on imported oil.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With regard to an amendment that was allegedly not made in order, I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that we brought forth this legislation under an open rule. Obviously, an amendment has to be germane and not violate the rules of the House. We very much attempted to bring forth this appropriations bill under an open rule, and we are pleased that we were able to do so, and obviously that permits the amendment process to be wide open and obviously fair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), my distinguished friend and a great leader in this House.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for allowing me today to rise in support of the rule, but in opposition to the underlying bill. First, I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for allowing me time to speak on an issue that is very important to my home State of Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, since the proposal of Yucca Mountain over 2 decades ago, Nevadans have collectively fought against this ill-advised project. I hope that one day I can come to the House floor and tell the people of Nevada that they no longer need to worry about this disastrous proposal. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, today is not that day.

I agree with my colleagues that we must find a solution to the escalating energy problem in this country. However, digging a hole in the Nevada desert and burying the waste is simply not the answer. The Yucca Mountain project was based on 1980s science and technology and has no place in our country today. We need to focus on 21st-century solutions like reprocessing and transmutation processes to reduce our nuclear waste. Going forward with the Yucca Mountain project is like still using cassette tapes or even 8-track stereo tapes in an era of MP3 players and iPods.

In addition to this disregard of modern technology, it seems now the DOE does not even care about ensuring the science they are basing the project on, outdated or not, is even accurate. I met with Secretary Bodman, along with the rest of the Nevada delegation, and we discussed the recent scandal regarding the falsification of science from some employees directly involved in the project. Despite the manipulation of the data and the complete disregard for quality assurance that the employees have shown, the Secretary demonstrated absolutely no willingness to review the Yucca Mountain project.

I know most of my colleagues are not following this issue as closely as we are in Nevada; but for the sake of government accountability, we must halt this project until we have time to fully investigate these accusations.

As Members of Congress, we are entrusted with responsibly spending the taxpayers' dollars, and now is the time

for us to stand up and demand that the Department of Energy be accountable for its actions. We are only wasting our constituents' tax dollars by pumping money toward a project that continues to crumble from the inside.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the funding levels for Yucca Mountain in the underlying bill. However, I will support the rule so that we can move forward with debate on this very important issue.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will be asking Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that we can consider the Schwartz amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules last night, but rejected on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Schwartz amendment proposes an important new initiative to help the United States reduce our dependence on imported oil and strengthen our national security. It would provide the Department of Energy with an additional \$250 million next year to accelerate the research and deployment of energy technology that will reduce our country's consumption of fossil fuels.

I also want to point out that the cost of this amendment is fully paid for and will not increase the deficit by one penny. The funding for this amendment will come from a small, less than 1 percent reduction in a tax cut for people making over \$1 million this year.

A "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, but a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Schwartz amendment. However, a "yes" vote will prevent us from voting on this responsible and aggressive approach to help our Nation out of its dependency on foreign oil.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on the previous question so that we can have an opportunity to vote on the Schwartz amendment.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 291.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is an important appropriations bill, and it is one that we are pleased, obviously, to bring forward under the great tradition of open rules. So I very strongly support not only the underlying legislation but also the rule, and I would ask for an affirmative vote by all of our colleagues on the previous question as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, while I am not present for today's debate on this rule or on the underlying Fiscal Year 2006 Energy and Water Appropriations bill due to an illness in my family, I do urge my colleagues to support both measures.

This is an open rule and allows for full debate on funding for the Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and all programs and activities of the Department of Energy in the next fiscal year.

Writing this bill was a challenging task, as Subcommittee Chairman HOBSON had over \$130 million less to spend in Fiscal Year 2006 than was spent in Fiscal Year 2005. I commend Chairman HOBSON for the tremendous leadership he has shown in constructing this bill and for garnering bipartisan support for it in both his Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee. I fully expect it will pass this House with strong bipartisan support as well.

I particularly want to thank Chairman HOBSON for the continued commitment he has shown to the Department of Energy's Environmental Management program and cleanup of the Hanford site in Washington state. The Administration's proposed budget reductions at Hanford would have jeopardized the progress and cleanup momentum that has been achieved through accelerated cleanup over the past 3 years and put cleanup deadlines in jeopardy of being missed. The restoration of over \$200 million for Hanford in this bill will ensure that cleanup momentum continues, the Department has the ability to meet its legal timelines, and that skilled workers remain on the job.

The Federal government has a legal and moral obligation to cleanup Hanford and the Nation's other nuclear waste sites, and this bill ensures that these promises are kept.

In addition to significantly restoring funds to Hanford's budget, this bill provides funding for preservation of the B Reactor, for operation of the Volpentest HAMMER training facility, and for the critical effort to develop replacement lab space for Pacific Northwest National Lab scientists who will soon be required to vacate their current workspaces for cleanup work. PNNL is home to world-class researchers and ensuring they are able to continue their work is important for our Nation and for the economic future of the TriCities community in Washington state.

While water project funding is much tighter this year due to overall spending constraints, I am pleased that several important Washington state initiatives were included in this bill. Scarce funds will be used to continue the progress on the Bureau of Reclamation study of additional water storage in the Yakima River Basin that I began in 2003. Additional funding is also provided for work to address depletion of the Odessa Subaquifer, the Port of Sunnyside's wastewater treatment and wetland restoration project, and the deepening of the Columbia River channel.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support passage of the underlying Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MATSUI is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION H. RES. 291—RULE FOR H.R. 2419, FY06 ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Schwartz of Pennsylvania or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2419, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MS. SCHWARTZ OF PENNSYLVANIA
Page 19, line 5, insert “(increased by \$250,000,000)” after “\$1,762,888,000”.

Page 45, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 503. In the case of any taxpayer with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000 for the taxable year ending in calendar year 2006, the amount of tax reduction for the taxpayer for such year resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Pub. L. 107-16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-27) shall be reduced by 0.78 percent.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 190, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Boehner	Cantor
Akin	Bonilla	Capito
Alexander	Bonner	Carter
Bachus	Bono	Castle
Baker	Boozman	Chabot
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Chocola
Bartlett (MD)	Bradley (NH)	Coble
Barton (TX)	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)
Bass	Brown-Waite,	Conaway
Beauprez	Ginny	Cox
Biggart	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Buyer	Cubin
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Culberson
Blackburn	Camp	Cunningham
Blunt	Cannon	Davis (KY)

Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Porter	McGovern	Pelosi	Solis
Davis, Tom	Keller	Price (GA)	McIntyre	Pomeroy	Spratt
Deal (GA)	Kelly	Putnam	McKinney	Price (NC)	Stark
DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Radanovich	McNulty	Rahall	Strickland
Dent	King (IA)	Ramstad	Meehan	Rangel	Stupak
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Regula	Melancon	Reyes	Tanner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Rehberg	Menendez	Ross	Tauscher
Doolittle	Kirk	Reichert	Michaud	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
Drake	Kline	Renzi	Miller (NC)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Dreier	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)	Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Duncan	Kolbe	Rogers (KY)	Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Ehlers	LaHood	Rogers (MI)	Moore (KS)	Sabo	Towns
Emerson	Latham	Rohrabacher	Moore (WI)	Salazar	Udall (CO)
English (PA)	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen	Moran (VA)	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (NM)
Everett	Leach	Royce	Murtha	T.	Van Hollen
Feeeny	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)	Nadler	Sanders	Velázquez
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)	Napolitano	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Linder	Saxton	Neal (MA)	Schiff	Wasserman
Flake	LoBiondo	Schwarz (MI)	Oberstar	Schwartz (PA)	Schultz
Foley	Lucas	Sensenbrenner	Obey	Scott (GA)	Waters
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions	Olver	Scott (VA)	Watson
Fortenberry	E.	Shadegg	Ortiz	Serrano	Waxman
Fossella	Mack	Shaw	Owens	Sherman	Weiner
Fox	Manzullo	Shays	Pallone	Skelton	Woolsey
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Sherwood	Pascrell	Slaughter	Wynn
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)	Shimkus	Pastor	Smith (WA)	
Galleghy	McCotter	Shuster	Payne	Snyder	
Garrett (NJ)	McCrery	Simmons			
Gerlach	McHenry	Simpson			
Gibbons	McHugh	Smith (NJ)			
Gilchrest	McKeon	Smith (TX)			
Gillmor	McMorris	Sodrel			
Gingrey	Mica	Souder			
Good	Miller (FL)	Stearns			
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Sullivan			
Granger	Miller, Gary	Sweeney			
Graves	Moran (KS)	Tancredo			
Green (WI)	Murphy	Taylor (NC)			
Gutknecht	Musgrave	Terry			
Hall	Myrick	Thomas			
Harris	Neugebauer	Thornberry			
Hart	Ney	Tiahrt			
Hayes	Northup	Tiberi			
Hayworth	Norwood	Turner			
Hefley	Nunes	Upton			
Hensarling	Nussle	Walden (OR)			
Herger	Osborne	Wamp			
Hobson	Otter	Weldon (FL)			
Hoekstra	Oxley	Weldon (PA)			
Hostettler	Oxley	Weller			
Hulshof	Paul	Westmoreland			
Hunter	Pearce	Whitfield			
Hyde	Pence	Wicker			
Inglis (SC)	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (NM)			
Issa	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (SC)			
Jenkins	Petri	Wolf			
Jindal	Pickering	Young (AK)			
Johnson (CT)	Pitts	Young (FL)			
Johnson (IL)	Platts				
	Pombo				

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Cramer	Holden
Ackerman	Crowley	Holt
Allen	Cuellar	Honda
Andrews	Cummings	Hooley
Baca	Davis (AL)	Hoyer
Baird	Davis (CA)	Inslie
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Israel
Barrow	Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)
Bean	Davis (TN)	Jackson-Lee
Becerra	DeFazio	(TX)
Berkley	DeGette	Jefferson
Berman	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kennedy (RI)
Boren	Emanuel	Kildee
Boswell	Engel	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boucher	Eshoo	Kind
Boyd	Etheridge	Kucinich
Brady (PA)	Evans	Langevin
Brown (OH)	Farr	Lantos
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Filner	Larson (CT)
Capps	Ford	Lee
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Levin
Cardin	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Gordon	Lipinski
Case	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lowey
Clay	Grijalva	Lynch
Cleaver	Gutierrez	Maloney
Clyburn	Harman	Markey
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Cooper	Herseth	Matheson
Costa	Higgins	Matsui
Costello	Hinchee	McCarthy
	Hinojosa	McCollum (MN)

Boehlert	Jones (NC)	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Kuhl (NY)	Rush
Burton (IN)	McDermott	Sánchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Meek (FL)	Walsh
Delahunt	Meeks (NY)	Watt
Dingell	Millender-	Wexler
Gohmert	McDonald	Wu
Hastings (WA)	Poe	
Istook	Pryce (OH)	

NOT VOTING—24

Boehlert	Jones (NC)	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Kuhl (NY)	Rush
Burton (IN)	McDermott	Sánchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Meek (FL)	Walsh
Delahunt	Meeks (NY)	Watt
Dingell	Millender-	Wexler
Gohmert	McDonald	Wu
Hastings (WA)	Poe	
Istook	Pryce (OH)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1115

Messrs. BISHOP of New York, ORTIZ, RUPPERSBERGER, BERMAN, GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. SOLIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, due to other obligations, I unfortunately missed the following vote on the House floor today, Tuesday, May 24, 2005.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall vote No. 203 (On Ordering the Previous Question—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2419) making appropriations for energy and water development for FY 2006).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2419 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?