

year. For the last fiscal year, \$144 billion was provided to support the Federal Government's role in labor, health and education programs, but for the upcoming fiscal year, the underlying bill provides for \$151 billion, an increase of \$7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, while I support some of the increases in the bill, such as an increased funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, I do have concerns with the overall increased spending level in this difficult budget year. I believe that Congress must always stop and remember that we are spending the American taxpayers' money when considering appropriations bills. Each time a decision is made to spend more money, taxpayers face a higher tax bill or the deficit faces an increase in leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill. Therefore, we must take a balanced approach that provides for the general welfare of our Nation while reducing the deficit.

It's important that taxpayers are aware that under the Democrat majority's budget plan, each taxpayer faces an average \$3,000 increase in their Federal tax bill in order to pay for the Democrats' spending spree over the next 5 years, as reflected in their budget.

Throwing money at all of our Nation's problems will not make them go away. The American people expect more of Congress. They expect us to tackle the difficult issues, make tough decisions and lower the deficit through fiscal restraint.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments before I yield to the next speaker.

I'd like to say that the President's budget would have cut education programs, health care programs, energy assistance for seniors, avian flu by some \$7.6 billion below last year after adjusted for inflation. This bill rejects most of those arbitrary cuts. As a result, some Members have criticized it.

But the bill only increases these funds by a modest 3 percent after adjusting for inflation and population growth. This increase puts the bill a full \$2.9 billion below its funding level in 2005. It is interesting logic that when you're spending less than you did 2 years ago, it's out-of-control spending.

The subcommittee's ranking member testified to the Rules Committee last night that he would have written a very similar bill as Mr. OBEY did had he been in the chairman's seat. And most of the amendments offered in committee were by the minority seeking to increase various funding levels in the bill.

This bill funds our Nation's health care, education and worker protection programs in a responsible, sustainable manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces the challenge of acting on the direction of the American people, as expressed in the vote of November 2006, and that is to change the direction of this country and to restore a domestic agenda that serves all Americans.

We began, and again on a bipartisan basis, with 100 hours, raising the minimum wage, reversing wasteful subsidies to the big oil companies, and instead funding renewable energy, requiring price negotiations so our taxpayers didn't get ripped off in prescription drug prices, making college more affordable.

□ 1130

These measures are a down payment, but just a beginning. Today, the House takes up the eighth of 12 appropriation bills. This bill, under the leadership of Mr. OBEY, more than anything else, is going to put a stamp on a new direction that this Congress is moving in.

It's a direction that says all Americans have to be included, not just the wealthy, not just those who can afford corporate lobbyists. All Americans have a right to affordable education, to quality health care, to safe working conditions and to a financially secure retirement. Getting from here to there is a challenge, but this is the road that this bill takes us on.

Let me mention just four different areas. First, the legislation restores \$7.6 billion in funding to vital programs that have been cut by the administration. At the same time, it saves \$1.1 billion from lower priority programs. There is a commitment here to fiscal responsibility.

We must invest in America's future generations, and the bill does that.

Second, again, I will just mention a few things that are important to us in Vermont. We have had unfunded mandates. Special Ed, No Child Left Behind are the poster children of that. This bill increases funding for No Child Left Behind by \$8.6 billion over fiscal year 2007.

This bill invests in vital rural health care programs, something that we in Vermont are very familiar with, by increasing funding by \$307 million. That provides real services to real people with real health care problems. This bill increases funding for the vital Low Income Heating Assistance Program. That was cut in the administration proposal by \$379 million, or 17.5 percent, below last year's level. That's simply not sustainable. That's going to inflict real harm on people who have no ability to control the price of home heating oil.

This bill is taking us further on the road of having a Congress who is committed to the needs of all Americans.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 is an open rule providing for consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill.

The underlying legislation puts many of this Nation's most critical agencies on a responsible and sustainable funding path. Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH should be commended. As the Rules Committee heard in their testimony yesterday, they worked in a cooperative manner without partisan rancor to balance many competing needs funded through this bill.

This bill strengthens our families and prepares our workforce for the challenges that lay ahead. For instance, in just 7 years, nearly half of all the Nation's job growth will be concentrated in occupations requiring a college degree. This bill helps prepare our young people for this new world by increasing funding for students at K-12 or college level. In particular, it rejects an administration proposal to freeze Pell Grants. Instead, this legislation increases Pell Grants by \$390 to \$4,700 on top of a \$260 increase provided in 2007 continuing appropriations resolution. These efforts will make great strides in making college more affordable.

The legislation also maintains our Nation's leadership in health care research by lifting a 2-year freeze on the average cost of new research grants to NIH, and it provides a responsible increase in employment, training and worker protection programs. These are just some of the ways in which the underlying legislation provides millions of Americans with access to affordable health care, a decent education, and strong worker protection.

I urge all my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Homeland Security, I move to take from the Speaker's table the

bill (H.R. 1) to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MRS.

BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Blackburn moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1 be instructed to agree to section 1455 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

The motion to instruct would require the Secretary to deny a Transportation Worker Identification Credential, a TWIC, to any applicant who has been convicted of certain crimes.

This card is the access card to our Nation's critical and sensitive port and maritime facilities. We have over 750,000 workers who access our ports daily. TWIC was created to ensure that they are all screened and that they pose no threat of terrorism.

Now, our motion would specify that individuals convicted of certain crimes, such as treason, espionage, sedition or murder, would be permanently disqualified from receiving a TWIC card. This would further specify interim disqualifying crimes, such as smuggling, arson, kidnapping or robbery, that would disqualify an individual within a certain timeframe of conviction.

This provision provides the right balance between ensuring that our ports are safe while ensuring that we have the workers we need to get the job done in a timely manner.

We all agree that protecting our ports is one of the most critical duties that we have. All the guns, all the gates, all the guards in the world, every bit of that is useless if we give an individual a TWIC card to walk right past them.

This would ensure that the screening of these individuals is thorough, and that it is complete. While some may argue that this will unnecessarily disqualify too many individuals, we have already provided for an appeal and waiver process elsewhere to ensure that individuals can apply for a TWIC despite their past history.

This section that we are offering today in this motion to instruct passed the Senate 94-2. Our motion to instruct would accede to the language in the Senate provision.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House has passed its own language as it relates to the issuance of the TWIC cards. We have negotiated for the last 2 months with our Senate colleagues and, for the most part, we have a bipartisan agreement on the issuance of the transportation security cards to convicted felons.

That agreement talks about many of the things my colleague referenced in the report. It talks about treason, it talks about sedition, it talks about espionage, all those things.

Therefore, I think carrying it to the level that my colleague would want to carry it is not in the spirit of the conference report that we are negotiating with our colleagues in the Senate.

It is bipartisan. We have been meeting for 2 months to craft a language. It's good language.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the body's attention, we had last week on July 10, a front page article in The Hill talking about this.

The concerns with this clause, I know that this program, TSA is going to roll this TWIC card program out on September 1. I would hope that our security is of such importance to us that we would not weaken this program.

We know that the security of our ports is important. We want to make certain that the workers that we are sending in to these ports have gone through the appropriate clearances. We know that these are critical and sensitive areas. Why would we want to give a card to someone who has been convicted of crimes such as treason, espionage, sedition or murder?

I do not think that the American people want to see those individuals inspecting the cargo that's coming into these ports. We hear so much about security and food security, the issues that surround that. We are hearing about the security of human trafficking that is going through our ports. For goodness sakes, we want to be certain that the people that are walking into those ports to work every day are not convicted of these serious crimes.

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

□ 1145

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I now yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee, and to the Speaker, my good friend from Tennessee, we are here on this floor for a very serious deliberation.

Over the last 10 days we have heard a number of responses from the administration; and I have often said that if and when, if and when there was a turn

of events that would generate a horrific and terrorist act against this Nation, it is the Members of the United States Congress and committees with names like Homeland Security and Defense that would have to be called to the carpet.

None of us, none of us, Mr. Speaker, have any desire to be on the list of those who are derelict in their duties. In fact, Chairman THOMPSON has been enormously zealous in constant oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, constant briefings, and I am reminded of one that occurred in the last 10 days where the term "gut feeling" was introduced to us. Out of that particular briefing, many of us tightened our belts and began to reflect on the oversight hearings and the legislative initiatives that will respond and have responded to that gut reaction. So the dilemma, or the discussion today, as we bring up the 9/11 bill, may I remind my colleagues, is about terrorism. It is about the thought and the fear that Americans have of who lives amongst us.

The TWIC card, as Transportation Security Administration is about to issue forward with regulations, is one of the elements to define who is in this country that would want to do us harm. Let me say this again, Mr. Speaker. It is a card to define who wants to harm us.

As the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, Critical Infrastructure, we live every day with those individuals who are receiving identification, those at airports. We have done oversight about employees' ingress and egress, about the back side of the airport. We are well aware, my colleague Representative SANCHEZ, LORETTA SANCHEZ and her committee, well aware of the massiveness of the Nation's ports. We could give you a list of times that we have been to look at the intimacies of the port. But what my good friend is speaking about clearly has no direct relationship to ensuring America's security and releasing or eliminating the fear that Americans have about the next-door terrorist cell. This amendment, this motion to instruct is not constructive. For what it says is that age-long workers, union workers who through an early lifetime had the ups and downs of a criminal record, have now been cast as terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in opening the doors to criminal elements. I don't disrespect the fact that we are concerned about murderers and others who have done dastardly deeds. But what you are talking about is taking an age-old seasoned port worker, union member, and eliminate their livelihood by projecting onto them the question of whether or not they are in line to perpetrate a terrorist act.

The TWIC card is an identification document to ensure that those who are in possession of that card have no connection to any elements of terrorism. It is to safeguard the American public.

It is not, it is not, if you will, the sledgehammer on hardworking, tax-paying Americans. And let me be very clear: The TWIC card is no wimp. There is a serious review process that goes forward that takes into account everyone's record and includes any elements that would lead us to believe that this person might perpetrate a terrorist act.

I respect the gentlelady from Tennessee because I know that she is, as we all are, warriors against terrorism, and this Congress has to be united on this factor. I would raise the question, however, as to whether or not these modifications of a TWIC card that has already been vetted directed only at eliminating, firing, and terminating lifelong employees with strong records that have shown no inclination and no past history to terrorist acts is the appropriate direction to take.

I hope that we can join in this body, as Chairman THOMPSON has encouraged us as members of his committee, to focus in a bipartisan way on solutions to major problems: Critical infrastructure, nuclear and biological possibilities, the reconstruction of FEMA, the interests in protecting our ports and borders north and south. This is how, an intelligence response that shows who is here as it relates to terrorist cells and who is here to do damage. These are the key elements, along with the 9/11 bill, that lay down the underpinnings, the framework of the survival of this Nation. Let us not fall upon divisiveness in the redesign of a card that has been fully vetted in its structure, that will do what it is intended to do, which is to weed out the terrorists and to allow hardworking Americans to continue to work and provide for their families. They, too, are patriots. And we as patriots and lovers of this country must stand united together in doing the right thing to secure America.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi spoke of the compromise language, and the compromise language does not give our TSA the tool in its toolbox that it needs. Indeed, the compromise language would weaken that tool that they need in that toolbox to be certain that they are giving Americans the certainty that they want to view our Nation's ports security with. They want to know that certainly the people that are coming into those ports have our Nation's best interests at heart. And I fully believe that they do not want individuals who are convicted of these crimes of treason, espionage, sedition, murder and, further, interim disqualifying crimes such as smuggling, arson, kidnapping or robbery to be in there watching the cargo and the transportation that comes into our ports and maritime facilities. Certainly, this is a regulation that TSA uses now with our truck drivers who are moving hazardous material. So the compromise language would take a tool out of that toolbox that TSA uses

to give Americans the certainty that they are doing their best.

Now, with respect to the question from the gentlelady from Texas, and I appreciate the hard work that she does at the Homeland Security Committee, but this would provide only a 7-year lookback, and I think that that is important to note in that screening process. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we want to be certain that screening is thorough, that it is complete, and that there is certainty given to the American public.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for the record, I would like to say to my colleague from Tennessee, this bipartisan agreement was worked out in the spirit of making sure that those individuals who work in various capacities in high-risk areas, that they are, in fact, not security risks. So what we have done, we have taken espionage, we have taken sedition, we have taken treason, any felony crime of terrorism, crime involving a transportation security incident, improper transportation of hazardous material, unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of or dealing with an explosive device, we have gone into great detail in defining those disqualifying areas.

In addition to that, we have laid out interim disqualifying criminal offenses that go toward unlawful possession, sale, manufacture, purchase, distribution of firearms; extortion, bribery, smuggling, immigration violations; distribution, possession with intent to distribute or importation of controlled substance; arson, kidnapping, rape, assault with intent to kill; robbery, conspiracy, fraudulent entry into a seaport, a violation of the Racketeering Influence and Corrupt Organization Act. Mr. Speaker, we have gone in great detail to list as many offenses as we could.

Now, from what I understand from the gentlelady's motion that we are debating, the only issue is that you don't want the Secretary of Homeland Security to have the ability to look at these things and say whether or not they should be modified. Now, if we are wrong in our interpretation, that is fine, but as we look upon what you have before us today, that is the only thing.

If we can't trust the people who run the Department to make certain administrative decisions, then who can we trust? And it is in this spirit that we left that particular modification language there for the Secretary to look at any unforeseen crime that may or may not have been excluded in this disqualifying criminal offense.

So clearly, Mr. Speaker, it was a bipartisan effort, and we wish to offer it.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was just making his point,

and in part of that he is right, but the important part of this is that what we have to do is be certain that a Secretary doesn't delete these provisions. And if you are going to give them that flexibility and if they delete it, then you have that hole that is there. So, because of that, we need it in statute to be sure that it is not altered.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Our Secretary of Homeland Security is appointed by the President. I would think that he would appoint the best qualified person, someone who would have the interests of this country at heart every second that he or she may be in that position. So to take the ability of an individual who is running a department from making certain decisions is not in our best interests.

We should not micromanage the Department of Homeland Security. We should let the Secretary of Homeland Security run the Department. He should have the administrative authority to do it. This would not be in the best interests of us. We do not do this in other secretarial departments.

And so, again, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of identifying crimes that are disqualifying, but notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary should have some discretion over running his or her Department regardless of what that Department may be, this is the bipartisan spirit in the conference that we reached.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

□ 1200

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I speak on this motion with the greatest respect for the gentlelady from Tennessee. But I would say that in my prior life, before coming to the Congress I was a prosecuting attorney, and I was responsible for sending a lot of people to prison.

I also had a responsibility to go down and visit people that I'd sent to prison. And I remember the first visit that I made down to one of the prisons in Ohio, and there's these trustees outside the prison gates with white stripes on the side, and they were given trusted positions within the prison.

And I said, who are the trustees? How do you get to be qualified to be a trustee? And they said, well, they're murderers. And I said, what do you mean, they're murderers? They said, they're murderers.

What we find is that in the crime of murder, most murders in this country are committed in crimes of passion, a husband murders a wife, a wife murders a husband, a boyfriend and so forth and so on. But they are also the least likely people to ever commit crime again.

And what concerns me about the requirement of receding to the Senate provision in this is that it ignores the opportunity for rehabilitation. It ignores the opportunity that people

make mistakes, and they're not a threat to national security, and they can be good productive people. They can work in our ports.

And I am concerned that murder is one of the automatic disqualifiers. I am also concerned that the other list of crimes that have waiting periods of 5 to 7 years, they have nothing to do, in my mind, with terrorism or port security.

And I am all for a system where the Secretary or even in law the Congress of the United States says, you know what, if you committed a crime of violence we're going to take an extra look at you; but to be automatically disqualified, either forever or for a considerable period of time, I think disturbs me.

I intend to vote against the motion. I respect the gentlelady's opinion and why she's brought this motion, but sadly, I can't agree with it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the appeals and waivers process was put in place for a reason, and that is why it is there, and that's why you've got the look-back provision and why it is stated as such.

Again, I will reemphasize the point. We don't want to do something that is going to weaken a tool that is in the TSA toolbox for being certain that we have the necessary security at our ports; that we know who is there and we know the reasons they are there, that we know that they have the appropriate clearances for being there.

And with all due respect to the chairman and the chairwoman who have worked on this legislation, our wording here, acceding to the language that passed over in the Senate, 94-2, would be certain that we have in statute something that is going to give our citizens the security that we have done our job.

It is the responsibility of this body to be certain that we have this national security interest at heart for the people of this good Nation, and certainly this language is one step in so doing.

And at this time, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi has no further speakers and is ready to yield back, then I will do so. But I want to be certain I have the right to close on this.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve at this point.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman. To my good friend from Tennessee, let us be very clear that homeland security is a bipartisan issue.

What the chairman has indicated is that we are yielding to the Secretary of Homeland Security for a slight opportunity to be able to modify, if you will, in his reasoned judgment, that deals with securing America. We are not ignoring sedition and treason. I want my colleagues to know that.

But the individuals that will now be subjected to the TWIC card, which costs 137 dollars and 700,000 people will be processed the first year, and 1.5 million persons the second year, these are our neighbors, individuals who have been working in this capacity who have nothing in their background that would suggest that they are terrorists.

The gentlelady's motion would literally shut down America's ports. Commerce would come to a standstill. As my good friend from Ohio has said, people rehabilitate. Give the Secretary the opportunity to use his judgment and to use his discretion to be able to secure America on the real causes of sedition and treason.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspension of the rules on H.R. 980, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of House Resolution 547, de novo;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 1, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 97, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—314

Abercrombie	Eshoo	McCrery
Ackerman	Etheridge	McDermott
Allen	Farr	McGovern
Altmire	Fattah	McHugh
Andrews	Ferguson	McIntyre
Arcuri	Filner	McKeon
Baca	Fortenberry	McNerney
Bachmann	Fossella	McNulty
Baird	Frank (MA)	Meek (FL)
Baldwin	Frelinghuysen	Meeks (NY)
Barrow	Galleghy	Michaud
Bean	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Becerra	Giffords	Miller (NC)
Berkley	Gilchrest	Miller, George
Berman	Gillibrand	Mitchell
Berry	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Biggert	Gordon	Moore (KS)
Blibray	Graves	Moore (WI)
Bilirakis	Grijalva	Moran (VA)
Bishop (GA)	Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Hall (NY)	Murphy, Patrick
Bishop (UT)	Hare	Murphy, Tim
Blumenauer	Harman	Murtha
Bonner	Hastert	Nadler
Bono	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Boren	Heller	Neal (MA)
Boswell	Herseht Sandlin	Oberstar
Boucher	Higgins	Obey
Boustany	Hill	Olver
Boyd (FL)	Hinchesy	Pallone
Boyda (KS)	Hirono	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Hobson	Pastor
Braley (IA)	Hodes	Pearce
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Perlmutter
Ginny	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Buchanan	Holt	Petri
Burton (IN)	Honda	Platts
Butterfield	Hoolley	Poe
Buyer	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Camp (MI)	Hulshof	Porter
Capito	Hunter	Price (NC)
Capps	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Capuano	Israel	Rahall
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Carnahan	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Carney	(TX)	Regula
Castle	Jefferson	Rehberg
Castor	Johnson (GA)	Reichert
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Renzi
Clarke	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Clay	Jones (OH)	Reynolds
Cleaver	Kagen	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rogers (KY)
Cohen	Kaptur	Rogers (MI)
Cole (OK)	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen
Conyers	Kennedy	Roskam
Cooper	Kildee	Ross
Costa	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Costello	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Cramer	Kirk	Rush
Crenshaw	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Klaine (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Cuellar	Knollenberg	Salazar
Cummings	Kuhl (NY)	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	LaHood	T.
Davis (CA)	Lampson	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Sarbanes
Davis (KY)	Lantos	Saxton
Davis, David	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis, Lincoln	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davis, Tom	Latham	Schmidt
DeFazio	LaTourette	Schwartz
DeGette	Lee	Scott (GA)
Delahunt	Levin	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)	Serrano
Dent	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Sherman
Dicks	Loeb sack	Shimkus
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuler
Doggett	Lowey	Shuster
Donnelly	Lynch	Sires
Doyle	Mahoney (FL)	Skelton
Duncan	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
Ehlers	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Ellison	Marshall	Smith (WA)
Ellsworth	Matheson	Snyder
Emanuel	Matsui	Solis
Emerson	McCarthy (NY)	Souder
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Space
English (PA)	McCotter	Spratt