

earned both the Medal of Honor and the Nobel Peace Prize. I think that is a fitting tribute for a man who represented so much and did so much to shape the 20th century, the American century.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I reviewed this case, a list of words come to mind. I want to share them. They are words that come to mind with regard to Teddy Roosevelt and his gallantry. They are virtues and ideals and values that we can all admire. I think about valor, bravery, gallantry, courage. He was audacious. He was bold. He was dauntless, fearless, gutsy. He had intrepid character. He was valiant, stalwart, steadfast. Yes, venturesome and daring.

And then I add three more: Bold-hearted, brave-hearted and lionhearted.

Those words, yes, apply to Teddy Roosevelt and his conspicuous valor and gallantry on that day, and that is why I believe this House should overwhelmingly pass this resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award the Medal of Honor to one of our great presidents, Theodore Roosevelt.

Let me conclude and say to my very dear friend, as you go home to your family, this Congress will miss you, the country will miss you, but more importantly, I am going to miss you, my friend.

When I think about bold-hearted and brave-hearted and lion-hearted, I think of PAUL MCHALE, because your heart is in the right place, my friend. Godspeed to you, and that phone is two-way. Do you hear me?

Mr. MCHALE. I do.

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

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for concluding remarks.

Mr. Speaker, is it too late to announce my reelection campaign? Had all these nice things been said about me a year ago I might have run again.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roosevelt, Tweed Roosevelt, I am delighted and honored that you are here with us today. Throughout the entire presidency of Theodore Roosevelt our forces were never ordered into battle. Theodore Roosevelt understood that the ultimate purpose of military power is to deter conflict and he, in fact, achieved that goal during his presidency.

I have had the opportunity on a number of occasions to go to the Roosevelt Room at the White House, where the Nobel Prize awarded to Theodore Roosevelt for his efforts in negotiating a peace in the Russo-Japanese War remains on display.

I can think of nothing more fitting for Theodore Roosevelt and in fact I can think of nothing more emblematic of our Nation than one day, following this action, to have the Congressional Medal of Honor on that mantle for dis-

play immediately adjacent to the Nobel Peace Prize.

We are a nation that reveres peace. We do all that we can to achieve peace, and we are prepared to go to war only in those cases when necessary to defend the fundamental interests and liberty of the citizens of our Nation.

We abhor war. We strive for peace. Those two medals, side-by-side, on display in the Roosevelt Room, would capture much of Theodore Roosevelt and all that is good in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in a couple of moments, when it is procedurally proper, I am going to call for a recorded vote. We have little time remaining in this Congress. It is imperative that the other body act within the next 24 to 48 hours. In order to impress upon the other body the sincere, overwhelming support of the membership of this House, I will call for a recorded vote so that the transmittal of that voting tally may, on the other side of the Capitol, provide an incentive for prompt consideration in the other body.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Before putting the question, the Chair would remind all Members that pursuant to clause 8 of rule XIV it is not in order to recognize or call to the attention of the House any occupant in the gallery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2263.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUYER. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FURTHER PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4274, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-798) on the resolution (H. Res. 584) further providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4274) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 584 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 584

Resolved, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 4274) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union pursuant to House Resolution 564—

(1) general debate shall not exceed one hour; and

(2) amendments numbered 2 and 3 in House Report 105-762 shall be in order before consideration of any other amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Fairport, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded will be for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for further consideration of the bill H.R. 4274, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill for 1999, pursuant to H. Res. 564.

The bill will afford 60 minutes of general debate divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

This rule makes in order, before consideration of any other amendments, the amendments numbered 2 and 3 that were printed in the report of the Committee on Rules that accompanied H. Res. 564.

Mr. Speaker, the House last week passed a rule to provide for consideration of this appropriations bill, the single largest appropriations bill that comes before the Congress. The health care, medical research, education and job training programs provided for in the bill touch the lives of tens of millions of American families. For that reason alone, the bill deserves consideration on the floor of the People's House.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this bill is immersed in highly charged social issues and is very controversial. Some may be uncomfortable with those debates but they are a fact of life when Federal Government programs impose on areas of daily life which for so long were outside the purview of Washington, D.C.

When that happens, deep and often emotional questions about values will be raised. We can expect nothing less. I applaud the work of my friend from Wilmette, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), for tackling the challenges put before his committee in as commendable a fashion as possible. His bill deserves a fair hearing on the House floor.

□ 1615

This rule, that was already approved by the House, along with this modification, will allow us to engage in what will certainly be a spirited debate that is worth having. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to recognize that fact and support this rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this rule is unprecedented. The House has already passed an open rule for the consideration of the Labor-HHS and Education bills. The second rule we are being asked to approve tonight is a rule that will block any real consideration of that bill.

Instead, this rule's extraordinary procedure is designed to give a single special interest group a vote that it wishes to use in a voter scorecard before the election. Once we take that vote, the appropriations bill will be pulled from the floor.

Subverting the House's legislative process for this cynical political ploy typifies the majority's actions this entire session. The do-nothing majority continues to put its own special interest politics before the public good. We have seen bill after bill manipulated for partisan purposes, forcing Members to take votes for purely partisan political reasons. We knew these bills would never be enacted into law, but each provided a sound bite for some special agenda.

In the meantime, this majority has failed in its most basic responsibility. For the first time since the Congressional Budget Act was passed 24 years ago, Congress has not passed a budget resolution. The law requires action on a concurrent budget resolution by April 15. That is many months ago. Six months later, the majority has still failed to pass a resolution.

Today, 8 days into the new fiscal year, only one of the thirteen appropriations bills has been signed into law, and only three other appropriations bills have even been sent to the President. On October 8, with nine appropriations bills still in the legislative process, and with only 2 remaining scheduled legislative days, the House is being asked to again ignore its statutory responsibilities.

Today, we are not taking up the Labor-HHS-Education bill in order to move the process to a conclusion. A rump "conference committee" has been working on this bill for several days and this version is no longer the basis for further action. This new rule is designed solely to force a House vote on two contentious legislative amendments that amend a portion of the bill

containing legislative language that does not even belong in the bill.

The rule would enable the House to proceed directly to a vote on a controversial provision in the second title of the bill, directly leaping over the Labor Department provisions and ignoring a number of important issues and amendments that deserve a full and fair debate in this chamber. Instead, the House would debate immediately an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and a substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) regarding parental consent for title X contraceptives distributed to minors.

Now, why is it so vital the House single out those two particular controversial amendments? There is only one reason. The majority has promised its far-right allies this vote to provide campaign fodder for the November election.

This is hardly a new issue. The House has voted on parental consent issues many times, most recently on last year's Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. Our positions are all clear on this matter. Yet the majority is kowtowing once again to another element, handing them a politically attractive vote a mere 25 days before the election.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to support Labor-HHS appropriations bills in the past, and I have enormous respect for its chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is one of the finest persons I have served with in the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, this rule will not provide for real consideration of this most important bill.

This rule represents the most egregious example yet of the majority using its powers for partisan gain. I urge my colleagues to reject this ruse. This institution should be better than this procedural farce. With the Nation's business to do, we should not be pandering to a single interest group. Please vote against this rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply respond to the words of my friend from Fairport, and what I would say is that we have already considered this rule. We had a vote that took place on the rule. This is simply making what is really a minor modification to ensure that amendments numbered 2 and 3 are going to be considered under the constraints that were included in the rule that did pass the House.

There are many Members who have indicated that they want to have a full and fair debate on those issues, which I admit are controversial. Frankly, we have the responsibility of dealing with tough public policy questions, and they are among them.

And so with that, I would say that we can continue to hear charges of the do-nothing Congress and all of this sort of

stuff that was used back in 1948; we can hear all sorts of name-calling, which we heard earlier during the debate, but I would just underscore again that this rule passed the House earlier this week. We have considered this issue. We have a couple of amendments that many of our Members want to have brought to the forefront, and I think that those Members have a right to be heard.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Mr. Speaker, today I am standing here on behalf of the thousands upon thousands of Americans who rely on the LIHEAP program to help heat their homes in the winter and cool them in the summer. As we celebrate an end to the budget deficit for the first time in years, these people are still wondering how they will keep their children warm this winter, and that, Mr. Speaker, is just plain wrong.

It is wrong to force people to choose between putting food on the table and heating their homes when the temperature outside is below zero. And it is not only limited to the cold climate, Mr. Speaker. During the heat wave that swept through the south this summer, over \$100 million in LIHEAP funds were released to help the most vulnerable people suffering from those high temperatures.

Given how important this program is, given that it saves so many lives, and given the benefits that stretch from Maine to Mississippi, I am very disappointed that the Committee on Appropriations has decided to eliminate this program entirely.

Mr. Speaker, the people who this program helps are not the well-off people. Two-thirds of the people that this program is aimed at make less than \$8,000 a year. And during periods of extreme cold or extreme heat they have to choose between paying their utility bills and paying their grocery bills.

Let me give my colleagues an example. I have here a letter from a retired veteran who lives in South Boston. He is a veteran of the Korean War. And he explained in this letter that he gets by on about \$100 a week. I would just like to read part of this letter. It says:

Joe, why would anyone want to cut this heating program? It really helps us veterans in the winter. Sometimes you can't afford to heat your room and eat at the same time. What's the matter with the politicians when they want to destroy us veterans and the elderly?

Mr. Speaker, to tell the truth, I do not know how to answer this letter, and I suspect many of my colleagues feel the same way when they get similar letters.

Mr. Speaker, because the LIHEAP program has always received bipartisan

support, my Republican colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JACK QUINN), and I have sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asking for full funding of LIHEAP. This letter was signed by over 200 Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans alike, in a true bipartisan movement. And until this appropriations bill contains funding for the LIHEAP program, I urge those 200 Members to join me in opposing this rule.

With the budget finally in the black, with prosperity affecting millions upon millions of Americans, now is not the time to forget about the elderly. Now is not the time to forget about the poor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have the highest regard for my friend from South Boston, and I would say to him, as we consider debate on this rule, which again is simply a modification of the rule that already passed the House, I think it is important to note that the LIHEAP program is something that I understand has actually had an increase in funding in the manager's amendment; and the next thing would be in order under this rule, following consideration of amendments numbered 2 and 3, would, in fact, be the manager's amendment, which would include that increase.

I do not want to get into a big debate on the LIHEAP program itself, but I will say that if we look at the program that was put into place in the mid 1970s, at the height of the energy crisis, it was done so, in large part, to deal with that very serious need that was out there. Today, taking inflation into consideration, it is very clear that the cost of energy is substantially lower than it was even in those days in the 1970s. And the LIHEAP program was established, in large part, to provide reimbursement to the States, many of which had very, very serious deficit problems themselves at that point, and now most States are, in fact, running a surplus.

So I would say that I think my friend raises some very interesting questions about the LIHEAP program, and I would argue that those could, in fact, be considered following the consideration of this rule when they move ahead with the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. And, again, the manager's amendment would, in fact, be the next thing in order.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying that this matter is dealt with in the manager's amendment in this rule?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that it is my un-

derstanding that the manager's amendment, that would be next to be considered after passage of this rule, after we consider the amendments numbered 2 and 3, the manager's amendment would be in order. And it is my understanding there is, in fact, an increase in funding for the LIHEAP funding. Am I wrong?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, there is not an increase in the LIHEAP program in the manager's amendment. There is an increase from zero. But the program level last year was over a billion dollars. So it is an 85 percent reduction. Thanks for small favors.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will continue to yield. I was correct, then, an increase from zero. There is, in fact, an increase in that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would just tell the gentleman that that increase still represents about a half a billion dollar decrease.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this astonishing rule. The Labor-HHS bill has often been described by both Democrats and Republicans as the people's bill. It reflects our priorities as a Nation, the health, the education and employment of our children and our families.

What, then, does this rule reveal as Republican priorities? Will we debate full funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which helps poor seniors and families with children heat their homes without sacrificing prescriptions or food? No, we are not going to do that.

Will we debate the elimination of the summer jobs program, which provides summer employment for nearly half a million teens who would otherwise be employed in this country? No, we are not going to do that.

Will we debate the \$2 billion shortfall in education funding in this bill? The need for modern schools, so that our children can learn the skills that they need to get the good jobs of the 21st century? The need to reduce class size, train more teachers, ensure that every child gets the attention and the discipline that he or she needs in order to be able to learn? No, we are not going to do that.

Will we debate funding for child care, to ensure that children have safe places to learn while their parents are at work? Will we debate after-school care, to keep kids off our streets and out of trouble in the hours after school ends and before mom and dad get home? No, we are not going to debate that.

What, then, will we debate? What is the Republican right wing's highest priority? Legislation requiring parental consent for birth control, which will violate State laws, frighten teens away from receiving the counseling

and screening for sexually transmitted diseases that they need to stay healthy, and increase teenage pregnancy and abortions.

Certainly, this is an important issue. I believe teens should talk to their parents before making these decisions. But it is not more important than all of the priorities represented in this bill.

□ 1630

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself such time as I may consume, I would just again tell my colleagues that this is fascinating to continue the debate that we had earlier on a virtually identical rule. We look forward to addressing all of these questions, if we can proceed. I would reserve the balance of my time in hopes that we could move ahead, have a vote on the rule and then move ahead with the work on the appropriations bill so that LIHEAP and everything else can be debated.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this rule. Members heard the arguments on LIHEAP and they have heard the arguments on the elimination of summer jobs. But I also want to point out one other area, and that is the President's education initiatives that have been eliminated by \$2 billion. We sit here and talk about tax breaks and we have passed a bill to remove the cap to increase persons coming in, immigrants, for jobs because we do not have them prepared, but yet we are gutting the part of this budget that would prepare our young people for the future. We have gutted Goals 2000 which brings our parents much more involved into the education planning for our students. The technology literacy challenge fund has been eliminated, the Eisenhower professional development grants being eliminated, title I grants and safe and drug-free schools.

We have heard arguments all year long about the increase of drug usage of our students. Yet we are eliminating those dollars that can help eliminate the drug use to educate and treat young people who have gotten involved in drugs.

I do not understand the logic of why we are making tax breaks and immigration more of a priority than preparing our own young people for the future. It does not make sense. I ask my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a simple question. What in God's name are we doing bringing up this bill

at this point? The authority for the government to remain open expires in one day. We still have seven major appropriation bills, funding more than half the government, that have still not been acted upon. And if they are not, a whole lot of government will not be operating two days from now. Yet we are about to debate a bill which is going nowhere.

Now, we have been trying to get together to resolve the remaining differences on the seven major appropriation bills that have still to be disposed of so that we can finish our work, keep the government open and go home. We have some rather major problems. If anybody has noticed what has been happening today and yesterday with the stock market and NASDAQ, you have a huge collapse on your hands. And it is probably going to get a lot worse. We are trying to figure out how to reach agreement on things as controversial as the IMF. We have been trying to get to a meeting since 10 o'clock this morning between the principal conferees on the labor-health-education budget, and we have a wide variety of other disputes that are preventing us from finishing our work.

I would point out that while the press seems to be under the impression that there are only five or six items that still are in dispute, we have over 300 open issues that are still highly controversial that must be resolved before tomorrow night. Yet we are being asked now to begin debate on a bill which we know is going nowhere.

This bill is so extreme that the Republican majority in the Senate has shoved it aside and produced an entirely different bill. We have yet to finish action on the Labor-Health bill, the Transportation bill, the State-Justice-Commerce bill, the Foreign Operations bill, the District of Columbia bill, the Ag bill is being vetoed so we have to deal with that one again. We have the Interior bill that still is not passed. Yet what is happening? This Congress is being tied up on bill after bill on one issue, sex. On the Treasury-Post Office bill, that bill has been hung up and still remains at issue because of resistance to insurance coverage on contraception on the part of some members of the majority party. The Agriculture bill was held up for many weeks because of a strong feeling on the part of some members of the majority party that the FDA ought to impose a ban on another birth control device. The State-Justice-Commerce bill is being held up on an issue relating to abortions in prison. The Foreign Operations bill, which is our basic foreign policy document in the appropriations area, is being held up because you have a small group of persons in the majority party who insist that if they do not get their way on the international family planning issue, the entire bill will be held hostage. And now we are asked to bring this bill up and debate the issue of family planning services once again. That issue is being brought up not to resolve

anything on the House floor but to resolve a difference within the Republican Caucus between a group that calls themselves moderates and a group that calls themselves conservatives.

I just want to say, sometime, sometime it would be nice if this Congress stops being bogged down on this issue, if we could quit debating bills that are not going anywhere so that we can get in the rooms and work out the differences on bills that are going somewhere and must go somewhere so that we can finish our work on time. This debate does nothing but satisfy political problems within the majority party caucus on a bill that is going nowhere.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBEY. I think that is a terribly destructive waste of time, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Does the gentleman yield back the time to the gentleman from New York before making his motion?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 58, nays 349, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—58

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Becerra
Brown (CA)
Clayton
Conyers
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)

Hefner
Hinchev
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
LaFalce
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lowe
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)

Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Pelosi
Rodriguez
Sabo
Scott
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Towns
Waters
Woolsey
Yates

NAYS—349

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss

Chenoweth
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth

Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn

Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traffant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)