

people on their own side of the aisle, I want to take special note of some individuals who worked very, very hard on the majority side, simply because their job was monumental having to do it for the first time.

I particularly want to commend Charlie Howell, Janelle Hu and Matt Pinkus for their hard work. They worked closely with our team, and we were very happy to help them. But I can't emphasize enough what a horrendous task this is to put together all these budgets very quickly, and both sides did yeomen's work. I am very pleased.

I think they set a pattern for the committee because they worked so closely together on this, both parties equally shouldering the burden and not worrying about how many hours they were spending on whose job; and I think that is a good pattern for us to follow for the next 2 years.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the ranking member again in thanking him for his forbearance during that very strenuous hearing process.

I also join him in thanking the staff: Charlie Howell, who is just an extraordinarily effective person, and who worked very hard with me to make sure that all of the very thick material that was needed for this process of hearings was available. And also Matt Pinkus, Janelle Hu and Kristin McCowan, who all played an extraordinary part in making sure that the process went smoothly, although it was very long.

I would also like to thank the minority staff because together they worked very well with the staff to ensure that this process went as smoothly as it could. So I thank all of these folks and the ranking member and all of the members of the committee, the Chairs and the ranking members of all committees, for bearing with us in a tightly budgeted Congress.

I know that our resolution satisfies no one; however, I also know that when legislative and oversight agendas are set, they will be set with a keen eye to how to best use available funds. I want to assure all Chairs and ranking members that my committee will consider all requests for supplemental funding based upon whether or not additional funds are made available to the House. Right now, however, we must all live within our flatline budget constraints because, after all, there was no budget passed last year in the 109th Congress, and we are operating under a continuing resolution.

Indeed, the American people have spoken. They spoke last year, and the Congress must respond to their demands. We all serve as trustees for their voices and their dollars, and I know that each committee will use the funds entrusted to it wisely.

This committee recognizes that each standing committee carefully assessed

its anticipated workload and requested only the sums it considered necessary to discharge its responsibilities. Nonetheless, with severely limited resources, the across-the-board inflationary adjustments share the pain equally.

This resolution has the lowest overall committee expenditure authorization level in the last three Congresses, even including the new select committee. At \$280 million for the entire 110th Congress, it is an overall decrease of approximately 2 percent, Mr. Speaker. And that is a reversal for which this House should take credit.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend Speaker PELOSI for showing tremendous leadership on this issue and creating the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. This committee will provide Congress the opportunity to conduct important and essential oversight that is long overdue.

I remain deeply concerned about global warming and have been appalled by the Bush Administration's failure to provide any leadership on one of the most important environmental, economic, and moral issues of our time. As the largest producer of greenhouse gasses in the world, the United States must enact national emissions controls to curb our country's contribution to global warming.

European Union leaders are meeting this week to consider plans to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 20 percent by the year 2020, a first step in a post-Kyoto global warming strategy that could lead to mandatory limits for cars and pollution allowances for airlines.

While these actions are critical, the United States needs to lead in this area as Speaker PELOSI is working to achieve. It is high time for the Bush administration to stop questioning the science behind global warming and act to protect future generations.

The Secretary General of the United Nations stated this week that "the danger posed by war to all of humanity—and to our planet—is at least matched by the climate crisis and global warming."

As a Representative of California, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Safe Climate Act, which was introduced last year and will be offered again this year. The goal of the Safe Climate Act is to reach 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and then to continue to cut emissions through 2050.

In order to achieve these cuts, the Environmental Protection Agency would be instructed to set national standards for vehicle emissions at the levels mandated by California state law, which has the strictest vehicle emissions laws in the country. By focusing on an increased use of renewable energy and allowing the nation's largest polluters to meet new federal standards by buying and selling emissions allowances, the Safe Climate Act sets out effective common-sense energy policies that will reduce the United States' dependence on foreign oil while actively addressing global warming.

Again, I praise Speaker PELOSI for drawing attention to this important issue and working toward a solution.

I strongly support the passage of the Committee Funding Resolution for the 110th Congress and the authorization for the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNERNEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. EHLERS. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H. Res. 202.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 215 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 700.

□ 1244

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects, with Mr. MCNULTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1245

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007. This important legislation would reauthorize appropriations of \$125 million for the EPA's alternative water sources grant program.

Mr. Chairman, rapid population growth and development along with an increased awareness of the impact of massive water withdrawals and the threat of global climate change have forced many local communities to explore alternative sources of water.

H.R. 700 provides one alternative for meeting these future water needs by encouraging the testing and implementation of technology that reclaim and reuse water from municipal, industrial and agricultural needs.

I applaud the efforts of my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Congressman MCNERNEY and Congresswoman TAUSCHER, for their efforts in moving this legislation forward and ensuring that communities are able to meet current and future water needs.

This committee approved similar legislation in the 109th Congress, and it is my hope this year Congress will finally approve legislation and forward it to the President for his signature.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007. I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member, Mr. BAKER, for their hard work on this particular bill.

H.R. 700 extends the pilot program under the Clean Water Act for alternative water source projects.

Growth in population, increasing demands for water, and drought are resulting in water shortages in many areas around our Nation, both in the west and the east.

Many communities are finding that their water supply needs cannot be met by existing water supplies. As a result, many communities and their water resource development agencies are looking at alternative ways to alleviate their water shortages and enhance water supplies to meet their future water needs.

This is an important issue not only for my home State of Arkansas but for the many other parts of the country facing increasing demands for water.

Adequate water is needed to sustain our country's economic growth and viability. Some of the approaches they are looking at involve reclaiming, reusing or conserving water that has already been used.

H.R. 700 provides an authority to help communities meet some of their critical water supply needs through water reclamation, reuse, conservation and management.

H.R. 700 authorizes \$125 billion for the EPA to make grants to water re-

source development agencies for these sorts of alternative water source projects. The program leverages non-Federal resources by requiring a non-Federal cash of 50 percent.

I urge all Members to support this important bill.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairmen Oberstar and Johnson and Ranking Members Mica and Baker for their leadership on clean water issues and for their work to bring the legislation we are considering today to the floor. In addition, I would like to thank my colleague and good friend, Mrs. TAUSCHER, for supporting this legislation with me. Mrs. TAUSCHER and I have adjoining districts in California, and we have similar water needs.

My bill, H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007, is straightforward and helpful legislation that I hope both parties will support.

Everyone recognizes the need for clean water. It does not matter whether you live in a city or in the rural, it does not matter what your political persuasion is. We all need clean water. Therefore, it is vitally important to identify new water sources for use in agriculture, industry and for residential consumption.

In the past, the State Revolving Loan Funds and Clean Water Act construction grants were available for identifying new water sources. But communities now increasingly depend on those funds just to provide for the maintenance and upkeep of existing water infrastructure, rather than finding new and potentially less expensive water supplies.

H.R. 700 will provide \$125 million so that local governments can innovate to collect, clean and distribute new sources of water. The Healthy Communities Water Supply Act will encourage municipalities, public and private water agencies and nonprofit organizations to find ways to provide new sources of water.

For the small investment of Federal funding provided in this bill, we can spur innovation in water resources and move towards solving the increasingly pressing need to ensure clean water for drinking, for family farms, for businesses and for households.

H.R. 700 encourages innovation by funding pilot projects and forward-thinking ideas that lead to practical solutions, which can be applied across the board. This legislation means jobs in local communities by spurring the kind of research that can create new businesses and make our towns and cities more livable at the same time.

The constant threat of drought in the Western States, along with the reality of global warming, emphasizes why the Healthy Communities Water Supply

Act of 2007 is so important. We must begin to investigate alternative water sources now, so that we can make strides in ensuring that we have water that we need in the future.

I am hopeful that we can move quickly to pass H.R. 700 and to work with the other body so we can provide water relief for our communities.

Again, I urge all my colleagues to support the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Texas, for yielding the time and compliment her and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for developing this legislation and preparing it and bringing it so early in the session to the House floor. I also appreciate the bipartisan cooperation with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the ranking member of the full committee, and it is good to have the gentleman from Arkansas on the floor and managing the bill. I thank the gentleman for his ever thoughtful approach to legislation.

This alternative water sources initiative is not something that we developed in the course of this Congress. It started way back in 2000, in fact, earlier than that, as the committee held hearings over a period of several years to raise the visibility of issues of water supply and groundwater withdrawals and needs of communities well off into the future.

In fact, I should point out that a former colleague of ours, later Speaker, Jim Wright, in 1958 wrote a book entitled, "The Coming Water Famine," where then new Congressman Wright gathered enormous amount of data about water usage by industry, by agriculture, by homeowners, and did a calculation that showed the rising use of water intersecting with a line of steady availability.

All the water there ever was, there ever will be, is available now. We will not create new water, and he showed that in the 1980s the lines would intersect, and that, at that point, the Nation and the Congress need to face up to the need to assure the continuity of availability of water supplies, that continued withdrawal of water from the Ogallala aquifer that covers west Texas and eastern Oklahoma, a huge area of the central portion of the United States, could not continue forever. That water would be withdrawn, and there would be no further water available, just simply was not replenishing as fast as surface needs were drawing upon it.

That was the background. That was the stimulus for the alternative water

sources program that our committee included in the Estuaries and Clean Water Act of 2000, which passed the House, the Senate and was signed into law.

The legislation was developed to address the concerns by communities all across the country over availability of water to meet their future requirements, especially in the more arid regions of the country, as we have already heard from the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and Mrs. TAUSCHER, also from California, who was the initiator of this legislation in previous Congresses.

I have read a great deal about climate change that followed the enormous amount of scientific data pouring forth from the international geophysical year by the United Nations scientific panel, scientists in the U.S. who are reporting on global climate change, and the effect that it is having upon weather and the increasing volatility and variability of the amount, timing and distribution of moisture, not just rainfall but moisture that comes in the form of snow or freezing rain. There is consensus among the climatology scientific community that the timing, intensity and duration of floods, droughts and high-intensity storms are going to continue to plague us over the decades ahead.

Pressure for additional sources of drinking water, usable water for industry and agriculture will only grow and magnify across this country, putting greater pressure on reclamation, on reuse, on advanced wastewater treatment, and even on desalination, as many countries in the world are doing.

In the 1970s, there was an experiment by a Saudi prince who chartered a vessel to go to Antarctica and harness an iceberg, put a huge plastic wrap under that iceberg so it would not melt and had it towed by tug boats to a point off the shore of Saudi Arabia. Then they drilled a hole in the center of it and pumped the water out for several years to bring fresh water to Saudi Arabia. There are not going to be very many icebergs left to be towed as the polar caps melt faster than we can harness the icebergs.

Furthermore, that experiment proved enormously expensive. It also demonstrated that there is a considerable amount of loss of iceberg water capability as the 'berg is towed.

We have to do much better than just towing icebergs. We create with this legislation a modest start on a program to help communities provide for their current needs, for household requirements, industrial needs, for agricultural uses of water, well off into the future.

□ 1300

This is but one important step in the long-term effort we must make to ensure the availability of water supplies and the viability of those water supplies off into the future in this time of highly uncertain climate conditions.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the committee chairman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, what time do we have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arkansas has 28 minutes remaining.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, the primary author of the legislation, Mrs. TAUSCHER.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank my friend, Chairman JOHNSON, for the opportunity to speak today in support of the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act.

Mr. Chairman, I can't tell you how pleased I am to have joined my good friend and neighbor, JERRY MCNERNEY, in introducing H.R. 700. As Californians, Mr. MCNERNEY and I know how precious every drop of water is to our communities, our economy, and our way of life.

Our legislation provides a real Federal commitment to exploring alternative water sources now so we can have the water supplies we will need in the future. This legislation will reauthorize a critical EPA program which was authorized in 2000 by the then Republican-controlled Congress.

Unfortunately, the Republican Congress' commitment to the program and water supply reliability ended with words, not deeds. The program was never funded, and the EPA never implemented it.

Fortunately, today is a very new day. This Congress has the opportunity to provide local communities with the means to invest in critical alternative water source projects.

By providing a modest \$125 million authorization for this EPA program, we will help communities plan for their future; and investing in innovative projects such as water recycling, water reuse and aquifer storage will allow our local communities to use water more effectively and efficiently.

In my own district, these types of projects are already under way and will benefit from today's legislation. Projects like the Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program and the Bay Area Regional Desalination Project are all advancing alternative water sources now and will be able to continue their work through access to these grants.

If we are effectively to plan for our Nation's future to use critical resources, there has to be Federal investment and innovation. The passage of H.R. 700 will clearly indicate that this Congress is ready to lead.

Today, some are trying to say that this program is duplicative, that these types of projects can already be funded through existing sources. First, let me say that we all understand that programs such as the Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds can

be used for alternative water source projects.

However, in fiscal year 2007, the President's budget cut the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by 22 percent, and in the fiscal year 2006 he recommended that the fund be cut by \$370 million.

So let me ask a simple question: Where will our communities find the resources to maintain and improve critical infrastructure and plan for the future if the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress keep cutting the funds? It is disingenuous for anyone to claim that there are already resources available for these critical water projects while they are cutting the funds.

So it is time for us all to be responsible. It is time to make critical investments in water infrastructure which have been neglected for all too long, and it is time to ensure our communities can plan for their future water needs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act, which was passed by a voice vote in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise to support this bill, very much so. I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Chairman JOHNSON, Ranking Member MICA and Ranking Member BAKER and their staffs for their hard work and the efforts that they put into this.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for speakers. I want to express my appreciation to all of the staff of the committee. I ask for support of H.R. 700.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 700, Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007, a reauthorization of a Pilot Program for Increasing Usable Water Supply. As you well know, this Pilot Program for increasing usable water supply was authorized for 2002 through 2004, but the previous majority never appropriated any funds and let the authorization expire.

I want to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues just how important it is to supplement existing water supplies by providing reliable high-quality sources of water, particularly in areas of the country that are under the threat of the desert. In California, especially in Orange County, the population is increasing; so is the need for water.

For over 15 years, the Orange County Water District has maintained a Groundwater Replenishment System designed to reuse advanced treated wastewater to recharge the County's groundwater aquifers and basin. This will help them meet the annual water needs of over 144,000 families that keep growing. Also, the county is barely 3 miles from the coast and has an added need to protect the Basin

from further degradation due to seawater intrusion. To this end, the OCWD under its Phase I project provides over 72 million gallons of water per day to replenish its aquifers as well as protect them from seawater intrusion by pumping water through injection wells. This phase will end in September, 2007.

In Phase II of the project, they will be able to process over 250 million gallons of wastewater per day and have enough to support the recharge effort and combat seawater intrusion. There are currently 30 such injection wells that can pump water up to 60–100 feet depth.

The beauty of this project is the collaboration the Water District has with the County's Sanitation District (OCSD) who provides the wastewater that would have been pumped out to the ocean thereby which would have deprived the Water District of the water that is now being reclaimed for the replenishment of groundwater aquifers. And the State Health Department provides the oversight, to make sure water quality is maintained.

With projects like this, communities such as Orange County will benefit tremendously. This OCGW project has attracted experts in public water management systems from other States and countries (Japan, Korea, and Taiwan) who come to Orange County to look at this tertiary system and learn from it. So, this is of national and even international significance. Also, projects like the OCGWR provides for the necessary investments to ensure water security for the future.

This bill will help improve water availability and quality by authorizing a total of \$125 million to fund projects that increase usable water supply by encouraging innovation in water reclamation, reuse and conservation. The Orange County Water Reclamation Project is a perfect example of such a project and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 700.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I rise in strong support of H.R. 700, the "Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007" which authorizes \$125 million to enhance water supplies in shortage-plagued areas through the development of such alternative sources as waste water reuse and other water recycling projects. The funding will be used to help finance pilot projects to recycle water for drinking and agricultural use in states like Texas that have long faced chronic supply shortages amid continuing population booms. States would have to pay half the cost of the projects.

Mr. Chairman, the new majority in this House understands that ensuring clean water is a top priority for America's working families. A clean and healthy environment begins with clean water. H.R. 700 will help to make the Nation's water supply cleaner and healthier by utilizing alternative water sources such as waste water and recycled water. If we explore alternative water supplies now, we take a giant step toward ensuring that we will have adequate supplies in the future.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TIERNEY). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCE PROJECTS.

Section 220(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(j)) is amended by striking "\$75,000,000 for fiscal years 2002 through 2004" and inserting "\$125,000,000".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KUCINICH: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 220(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end "and the entity does not permit the use of its water for retail sale of water in containers of 5.7 gallons (20 liters) or less".

Page 2, line 6, before "Section" insert "(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act, is designed to help communities with current or impending water shortages. I support the bill.

We know that such shortages can have many causes. For example, global warming is likely to cause or exacerbate water shortages in the U.S., especially in the Southwest. Under those conditions, alternative water sources will be more important than ever, but communities all over the United States are also fighting to protect their water supplies from overpumping by bottled water companies, who are making billions of dollars from this public resource. My amendment would remove from consideration for these Federal subsidies those areas where bottled water companies are contributing to the demise of the water supply.

According to the International Bottled Water Association, the volume of water privatized has increased between 8 and 12 percent every year since 2001. In 2006, bottled water companies enjoyed \$11 billion in revenue from the United States alone. It is estimated that about 25 percent of the bottled water consumed in the United States comes from municipal water supplies.

The effects of the excessive influence of the bottled water industry can go beyond the regional confines of water

source depletion and environmental destruction. It codifies a preference for corporate access to water over public access.

I represent the Cleveland area, that, like many cities nearby, relies on Lake Erie for drinking water. A few years ago, there were two instances in which a company received a permit to privatize Great Lakes water in bulk.

In both instances, the projects were abandoned because of the public outcry. In response, the Great Lakes States, with assistance from Canadian Premiers and other stakeholders, attempted to negotiate the conditions under which water could be withdrawn from the lake.

As the negotiations closed, bottled water companies managed to wedge their language into the final agreement. The language also allowed virtually unlimited withdrawals for bottled water companies, while attempting to protect against other privatization attempts.

Such unprecedented favoritism can actually represent a giant step backwards for the notion of water as a public trust. The loophole leaves the entire agreement open to commerce clause challenge or to a challenge in the World Trade Organization. If such a challenge were successful, there would be no limits to privatization of Great Lakes water. It would open the water of the Great Lakes to use by the growing and increasingly thirsty regions where they are having water shortages and where water shortages make it financially viable to pipe water across several States. We would not just be back to square one; we would take a giant step backwards.

This is a classic example, Mr. Chairman, in which greed of the bottled water companies is garnering profits at the expense of the public. I have not even talked about the overeffect of pumping, like the increased cost of finding a replacement source, the loss of connected streams, lakes and rivers, the land subsidence, the salt water intrusion near coasts that render the water undrinkable, and the loss of wildlife habitat.

Another example is emblematic of conflicts between communities and bottled water companies all over the United States. In two small towns in New Hampshire, Nottingham and Barrington, a company called USA Springs is attempting to drill wells that would pump 310,000 gallons a day in an area populated with homes that get their water from small private household wells. The community is worried about a loss of water supply, loss of water quality, and degradation of nearby wetlands.

A very conservative estimate said that USA Springs is looking at about \$303 million per year in revenue from this site alone. With that kind of revenue potential, it can be expected they will spend big to make this project happen. This is exactly what they are doing. The result is that USA Springs

is now dangerously close to winning a battle that started in 2001.

The basic building blocks of life, like water, must be accessible by people before corporations, period. When access to the essentials is threatened by outside excessive private gain, I will stand firmly in defense of the public every time.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to explore this issue deeply as Chair of the Domestic Policy Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I ask the chairman, my good friend from Minnesota, to work with me as Chair of Transportation and Infrastructure on the broader issue of water privatization and its effects on quality and access.

I yield to Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman raises a very important issue, one that has been of deep concern. He raises two aspects of a question, one that raises deep concern among communities along the Great Lakes who do not want to see waters of the Great Lakes pumped west to quaff the thirst of arid western States.

Several years ago, there was a proposal for a coal slurry pipeline to bring coal in a slurry pipeline from the Powder River Basin to the western end of Lake Superior to ports of Duluth and Superior; and we vigorously opposed it, because that pipeline, if it pumps east, can also pump west and could suck water out of the Great Lakes in vast amounts.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, subsequently, in a Water Resources Development Act, I succeeded with legislation to prohibit any withdrawals from the Great Lakes unless there is unanimous agreement among the eight Governors and the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario. That language is current law, but it is not strong enough. It really needs to be reinforced. Now that I am in a position to do that, we are going to reinforce it.

The second concern of the gentleman is private companies profiting from the public sector provision of water supplies, and I think we should find a way in which we can limit the profiteering while not interfering with private sector developments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. For example, the little town of Buhl, population 900 in my district, has on its water tank the slogan, "The Finest Water in America," and the city began bottling that water for sale. They are using their

open resources to bottle this water in these little 8-ounce and 16-ounce bottles. I wouldn't want to prevent Buhl, which has fallen on hard times, from drawing on its resources. But they are using their own money to do that.

What the gentleman is concerned about is a public, federally funded process that might stimulate the private sector. I commend the gentleman for his concern, and we shall work together to address the situation.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the chairman for his comments and his dedication to the public good. I look forward to working with you on this to protect public water supplies and to protect the public's right to access.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms "deficit" and "surplus" have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise with a very simple amendment, an amendment of responsibility.

As you and the House know, H.R. 700 grants \$125 million for alternative water source projects. It is a program that Congress has never funded, may be a very appropriate program. For some in this Chamber, \$125 million may not be very much money, but for folks in my district, and I suspect for folks around this Nation, \$125 million is a lot of money.

□ 1315

And, again, while what this bill does may be very important, it is important that we also make a statement for financial responsibility. This amendment would apply the principle of pay-as-you-go, pay-as-you-go to any new spending that would be authorized in this legislation.

Very simple: If you are going to spend money for this project, you ought to make it a priority and identify an area where you desire to take that money from in order to pay for this project. It is a concept that has been embraced by many in this Cham-

ber. In fact, many Members on the majority side embraced the pay-as-you-go project in their campaigns this past year. In fact, the New Direction for America, which was proposed by the majority party in the 109th Congress, says, "Our new direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting. No more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans."

Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. It is a wise idea. We ought to follow that. We ought to follow that in this new Congress.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. I would respectfully suggest that, unless adopted, then the new direction in which we are heading is one that will take us in a direction of greater red ink and not that of financial responsibility. So I offer this simple amendment, this PAYGO amendment to H.R. 700, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I appreciate the fashion of the gentleman from Georgia, and I respect his consistency. He offered the same amendment yesterday. We had quite a thorough and extensive discussion and a recorded vote, which ended 166-260.

Again, I appeal to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that we are dealing with an authorization. Tomorrow we will be dealing with a different bill that does result in a direct spending reduction as determined by the Congressional Budget Office and for which the committee created an offset and reduced the size of the bill.

This bill, H.R. 700, is not a direct spending bill, and has been so verified by the Congressional Budget Office and by the Office of Management and Budget. It is not subject to the so-called PAYGO rules. An appropriation subsequently could well be subject to PAYGO, but we have yet before us the congressional budget process. We have to vote on a budget, and then we consider the appropriations. If this legislation is enacted in time for the appropriation process, hopefully it could be considered and included, and then there is a question of whether it is subjected to the PAYGO rules.

But in its present form, this is an authorization. It is not a direct spending. It is not subject, as Congressional Budget Office has ruled, to the PAYGO rules. And we made that point yesterday. We make it again today. And I rise in opposition to the amendment, but not in opposition to the approach of the gentleman, who is a true fiscal conservative and wants to ensure that dollars are wisely spent and that we are not overspending.

I assure the gentleman, this legislation, modest as it is in its scope of dollars authorized, will be subjected to the

rigorous oversight of OMB, Congressional Budget Office, procedure and the appropriation process in its new course.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), almost to say the same thing we said yesterday: He has gotten the appropriations mixed up with the authorization.

This is an authorization committee, and actual funding of these programs through the appropriations process, which is where this will be more appropriate. A similar manner it was offered yesterday, as we said, to H.R. 569, the Water Quality Investment Act, and was defeated by 166-260.

This amendment would require that any authorization of appropriations be considered with corresponding offsets regardless of whether the program ever receives any funding. It is possible that it won't.

In the example of the Alternative Water Source pilot program under consideration today, a program that again has never been funded through the appropriations process, this amendment would require the identification of \$125 million in offsets, regardless of whether appropriations are ever enacted for this program.

During the first few days of the legislative session, the new Democratic majority renewed the PAYGO rules to require the identification of offsets to any changes in direct spending by legislative initiatives.

This bill has no effect on direct spending. According to the Congressional Budget Office in its analysis of the bill, enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues. Therefore, the offset requirements of PAYGO are never triggered.

I also remind my colleagues that the PAYGO provision was allowed to expire under Republican control of the House, with no attempt by the former Republican leadership to restore its protections to the Federal budgetary process. To now claim to be the champions of fiscal responsibility and attempt to hold Congress to stricter budgetary principles than instituted under their own leadership is a fairly hollow argument.

The gentleman's amendment would require offsets for any authorization of appropriations, regardless of its impact on Federal receipts. Were the gentleman's amendment adopted, my expectation is that every authorization of appropriations, whether it be for clean water, safer schools, better health care, or national defense, would require equal offsets. This is an inappropriate limitation on the ability of Congress to address the needs of the Nation.

Fiscal responsibility is a noble cause, but not at the cost of hindering Congress's ability to meet the needs of our constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding. I will be very brief.

I rise to point a couple points of clarification. And I appreciate the gentleman from Texas and her comments, but she did say that this amendment would require finding \$120 million of offsets somewhere else, regardless of whether there was any money that was ever authorized for this particular grant project. In fact, that is not the case.

On line 4 of the amendment, it says that, "any other provision that results in costs to the Federal Government." So it would require that the Congress had determined that, yes, there should be money spent for these grant projects, and then the equal amount of offset money would need to be found.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think what I did say is, it is not the authorization; it is the appropriations that I spoke about that would cause this to happen. It would trigger it. It is not the authorization. We are an authorizing committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I understand this is an authorizing piece of legislation; it is not requiring the money to be spent; and that we have the Appropriations Committees to do that.

But I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a matter of principle. It is a matter of principle, and it is a matter of making the statement now that we believe that, if we are going to spend money for this project and we believe that it is a priority, that we ought to find the money elsewhere in order to cover that so that we do not increase the deficit.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SESSIONS: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "for fiscal years ending before October 1, 2008".

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 700 follows an authorization that the Republican Congress provided for in the year 2000, which authorized \$75 million in grants for alternative water source projects.

We learned that the population growth was causing a number of communities to have to explore alternative supplies through reclamation, reuse and conservation. And so Congress created section 220 of the Clean Water Act. This amendment to the Clean Water Act required a 50 percent non-Federal cost share. And it expired in 2004.

Today's legislation doubles this authorization, but the troubling part to me is it allows this authorization to continue indefinitely. So if this legislation passes, there will be no sunset, no further oversight and no review of the effectiveness of these grants. My amendment would provide for the expiration of this authorization in fiscal year 2008.

I think it is fiscally responsible and allows Congress to reevaluate these grants, and not just leave them forever without oversight.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I understand that the gentleman Mr. OBERSTAR would wish to engage with me in a colloquy on this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman from Texas, a member of the Rules Committee, and I had a discussion about the principle involved in the gentleman's amendment in the course of our presentation at the Rules Committee for the rule covering this bill. As a result, the gentleman has offered an amendment that I think is entirely appropriate. But the point at which we are in the consideration of the legislation, and given the time it might take for the other body to act on it, would create a time frame problem through fiscal 2008. I would suggest that the language be changed to reflect two fiscal years from date of enactment, so that we have a precise time but that it is linked to date of enactment of the act, which then would be a very appropriate way to do it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time.

It is my understanding then that the chairman and I have engaged in an agreement; that I would withdraw my amendment, pending such that he would place within the legislation that agreement. And I would agree with that, and I would agree to withdraw my amendment. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful presentation and the questioning in the Rules Committee, and we will draft language in cooperation with the gentleman and include that as we move forward to conference with the Senate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY
Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CONAWAY:
Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—Section 220(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(d)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or whether the project is located in an area which is served by a public water system serving 10,000 individuals or fewer”.

Page 2, at the beginning of line 6, insert the following:

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, for the past decade, within rural communities throughout the country, home water bills have increased faster than the rate of inflation, and it seems likely that this trend will continue. Currently, rural populations across America are being forced to comply with extremely costly regulations regarding standards that have been set forth by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I have rural constituents who are currently paying upwards of 770 percent more for water service than that of urban populations due to regulatory items and the inability to spread these costs over a wide basis.

As deregulations are implemented and aging infrastructures replaced, the affordability of water service in rural America will continue to be of great concern. Water systems, consumers, administrators and policy makers will need to focus on the ability of rural households to pay for public water service.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not a solution to the underlying problem; it is a recognition of the issue and a step in the right direction. My amendment would simply add to the considerations for these grants recognition of water systems serving 10,000 people or less.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as water bills continue to rise larger, in the rural communities throughout the country home water bills have increased faster than the rate of inflation. Over 50,000 community water systems serve populations under 10,000. In North Carolina, 95 percent of our community water systems service populations of less than 10,000.

Currently, rural populations across America are being forced to comply with costly regulations. At this time, many rural areas have a greater percentage of the poverty and lower mean household income.

□ 1330

This is imposing a major burden on the rural families of America. In the same rural communities, some citizens are now paying 770 percent more for the water services than that of urban populations.

The Conaway-Shuler amendment does not call for more money or strike existing language. This is a fiscally responsible approach which points us in the right direction to take some of the strain off of the rural communities as they struggle to provide safety.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Both gentlemen offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, to our bill that is well intentioned to respond to the needs of small communities, to assure that communities under a population of 10,000 are not left behind, as this program is administered. And I certainly am in consonance with that concern.

There are only maybe four communities in my congressional district that have population greater than 10,000. I think of Big Fork, population 950, and others of similar size who have needs for water resource as great proportionately as do the major metropolitan areas.

In fact, in a drought in 1988, Minneapolis was trying to encourage the Corps of Engineers to draw down the head waters of the Mississippi River to increase the flow to Minneapolis while at the same time not banning car washes, not banning sprinkling of lawns, not taking other water conservation measures and also drawing water from the Jordan Basin Reservoir underneath the Twin Cities, a 50-mile diameter basin that is water left over from the melting of the glacier 10,000 years ago, water that can never be replaced because it is an impermeable area.

And I said, oh, wait a minute. It just happened I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight; called the Corps of Engineers in and made sure they didn't draw any matter down from the head waters of the Mississippi River to serve the thirst of Minneapolis while at the same time St. Paul was incorporating water conservation measures.

Well, I cite that history to show that I am really sensitive to these needs. But we do not want to create in this legislation a preferential consideration. And when the gentleman says consider, when the language of the amendment the gentlemen are offering says consider, I take this to mean a factor to be considered, along with other relevant factors and not a set-aside and not a preference.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), and I yield to the gentleman, to be assured that he concurs in that interpretation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Yes, sir. This goes into the part of the bill that talks about additional consideration. The administrator has wide leeway in how they grant these grants, and I would simply like in the RECORD, in the law, that this is one of the things that administrator should take into consideration. This in no way binds or ties

their hands to any particular size of community or use but allows good judgment by the administrator and in recognition that rural America is outnumbered on this floor. And having those words in this language will be particularly important to the constituents I serve who recognize that and understand that from time to time you guys have got us outnumbered. So it does not set up a preference, but it simply says, here is one other criteria to look at when you decide on these questions.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman. Let me ask the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) whether he shares that viewpoint.

Mr. SHULER. I most certainly would. In rural America, they struggle so often. Although it is not binding, it doesn't cost any more; I would certainly like to see this in the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, when I was elected to Congress, took office in 1975, we formed a Congressional Rural Caucus. There were 250 members. We had a voice on this floor, and a presence on this floor. Today there are less than 90 of us representing primarily rural areas, so we do have to be watchful for small towns, rural areas. And in the spirit of our discussion just concluded, I will accept the amendment of the gentlemen.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 256, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

AYES—176

Aderholt	Boustany	Chabot
Akin	Brady (TX)	Coble
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Conaway
Baker	Ginny	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Buchanan	Cubin
Bartlett (MD)	Burgess	Culberson
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Davis (KY)
Bilbray	Buyer	Davis, David
Bilirakis	Calvert	Davis, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Deal (GA)
Blackburn	Cannon	Dent
Blunt	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Capito	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bonner	Carter	Drake
Boozman	Castle	Dreier

Duncan	Knollenberg	Ramstad	Millender-	Rodriguez	Stupak
Emerson	Kuhl (NY)	Rehberg	McDonald	Rogers (KY)	Sutton
Everett	LaHood	Reichert	Miller (MI)	Ross	Tanner
Fallin	Lamborn	Renzi	Miller (NC)	Rothman	Tauscher
Feeney	Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Taylor
Ferguson	Linder	Rogers (AL)	Mitchell	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Flake	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Mollohan	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Forbes	Lucas	Rohrabacher	Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Tiahrt
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen	Moore (WI)	Salazar	Tierney
Fortuño	E.	Roskam	Moran (VA)	Sánchez, Linda	Towns
Fossella	Mack	Royce	Murphy (CT)	T.	Turner
Fox	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)	Murphy, Patrick	Sanchez, Loretta	Udall (CO)
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Sali	Murphy, Tim	Sarbanes	Udall (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Matheson	Saxton	Murtha	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Gallely	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt	Nadler	Schiff	Velázquez
Garrett (NJ)	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Napolitano	Schwartz	Visclosky
Gerlach	McCotter	Sessions	Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Walz (MN)
Gingrey	McCrery	Shadegg	Norton	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Gohmert	McHenry	Shimkus	Oberstar	Serrano	Schultz
Goode	McHugh	Shuster	Obey	Sestak	Waters
Goodlatte	McKeon	Oliver	Oliver	Shays	Watson
Granger	McMorris	Ortiz	Ortiz	Shea-Porter	Watt
Graves	Rodgers	Pallone	Pallone	Sherman	Waxman
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Pascarell	Pascarell	Shuler	Weiner
Hastert	Miller, Gary	Pastor	Pastor	Simpson	Welch (VT)
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Payne	Payne	Sires	Wexler
Hayes	Musgrave	Perlmutter	Perlmutter	Skelton	Wilson (NM)
Heller	Myrick	Peterson (MN)	Peterson (MN)	Slaughter	Wilson (OH)
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Terry	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Herger	Nunes	Thornberry	Price (NC)	Snyder	Wu
Hoekstra	Paul	Tiberi	Rahall	Solis	Wynn
Hulshof	Pearce	Upton	Rangel	Space	Yarmuth
Inglis (SC)	Pence	Walberg	Regula	Spratt	Young (AK)
Issa	Peterson (PA)	Walden (OR)	Reyes	Stark	
Jindal	Petri	Walsh (NY)			
Johnson (IL)	Pickering	Wamp			
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Weld (FL)			
Jones (NC)	Platts	Weller			
Jordan	Poe	Westmoreland			
King (IA)	Porter	Whitfield			
King (NY)	Price (GA)	Wicker			
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Wilson (SC)			
Kirk	Putnam	Wolf			
Kline (MN)	Radanovich	Young (FL)			

NOES—256

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hooley
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Allen	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Altmire	Davis, Lincoln	Israel
Andrews	DeFazio	Jackson (IL)
Arcuri	DeGette	Jackson-Lee
Baca	DeLauro	(TX)
Bachus	Dicks	Jefferson
Baird	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Baldwin	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barrow	Donnelly	Jones (OH)
Bean	Doolittle	Kagen
Becerra	Doyle	Kanjorski
Berkley	Edwards	Kaptur
Berman	Ehlers	Kennedy
Berry	Ellison	Kildee
Biggert	Ellsworth	Kilpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Emanuel	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Klein (FL)
Blumenauer	English (PA)	Kucinich
Bordallo	Eshoo	Lampson
Boren	Etheridge	Langevin
Boswell	Faleomavaega	Lantos
Boucher	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Boyd (FL)	Fattah	Latham
Boyd (KS)	Filner	LaTourette
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Lee
Braley (IA)	Giffords	Levin
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Butterfield	Gillibrand	Lewis (GA)
Capps	Gillmor	Lipinski
Capuano	Gonzalez	Loebsack
Cardoza	Gordon	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Green, Al	Lowe
Carney	Green, Gene	Lynch
Carson	Grijalva	Mahoney (FL)
Castor	Gutierrez	Maloney (NY)
Chandler	Hall (NY)	Markey
Christensen	Hare	Marshall
Clarke	Harman	Matsui
Clay	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Herseth	McCollum (MN)
Clyburn	Higgins	McDermott
Cohen	Hill	McGovern
Conyers	Hinchee	McIntyre
Cooper	Hinojosa	McNerney
Costa	Hirono	McNulty
Costello	Hobson	Meehan
Courtney	Hodes	Meek (FL)
Cramer	Holden	Meeks (NY)
Crowley	Holt	Melancon
Cuellar	Honda	Mica
Cummings		Michaud

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Keller
Camp (MI)	Hunter	Larson (CT)

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1404

Messrs. KAGEN, GONZALEZ, RODRIGUEZ, DINGELL and TIAHRT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. SOUDER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects, pursuant to House Resolution 215, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. In its current form, I am, yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 700 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

None of the funds authorized by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used—

(1) to lobby or retain a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing a Federal, State, or local governmental entity or officer; or

(2) to pay for expenses related to the membership of any individual or entity in an organization or association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer this motion to recommit. And I am more pleased to commend my Democratic colleagues for yesterday's recognition of the motion to recommit. They will recognize today's because it is exactly the same motion.

I think with that recognition came the realization and appreciation that motions to recommit are, indeed, substantive moves and they are substantive proposals of policy by this House of Representatives.

This motion to recommit is one about honesty; it is about honesty in the provision of the funds in the bill that is about to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit would reinforce existing Federal law by making it clear that none of the funds authorized under this act may be used to lobby or retain a lobbyist to attempt to influence Federal, State or local governmental officials. It would also expand upon existing law by specifically prohibiting Federal funds from being used to pay for membership in any association or organization. And, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, many of those dues rise to the sum of \$48,000 to \$50,000 or more. The funds should only be used for the purposes intended by Congress, namely, identifying alternative water source projects.

And while associations and organizations provide meaningful opportunities for collaboration and knowledge dissemination, it would not be appropriate to use hard-earned scarce Federal tax dollars for such a purpose. Such a diversion of these funds would not only limit the amount of funds available for the actual use and construction of alternative water source projects, it could indeed constitute an end run around the lobbying restrictions since many of these associations engage in lobbying activities.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, growth in population and increasing environmental awareness is causing many communities to explore alternative water supplies through reclamation, reuse and conservation. And while the Clean Water Act construction grants prior to 1991 and State revolving loan funds since 1989 have been available for such activities, most expenditures to date have been for more traditional wastewater projects and not for enhancing water supplies through wastewater reuse and water recycling. For these compelling reasons, we need to ensure that all available resources provided through this reauthorization are used specifically for the purpose of building and improving alternative water source projects for municipal, industrial or agricultural uses in areas that are experiencing critical water supply needs.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize what they recognized yesterday, and that is that motions to recommit are substantive policy motions. I urge the adoption of this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, although I am not opposed to the motion, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was offered yesterday by a different gentleman from the other side. I just want to read from the legislative language in the act.

Subsection F: Uses of Grants. "Amounts from grants received under this section may be used for engineering, design, construction and final testing of alternative water source projects designed to meet critical water supply needs. Such amounts may not be used for planning, feasibility studies, for operation, maintenance, replacement, repair or rehabilitation." Although we do not specifically prohibit use of funds for lobbying, no such authorization is permitted. Nonetheless, the gentleman proposes to close a potential opportunity for money to be diverted, and, therefore, we are prepared, as yesterday, to accept the gentleman's motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recom-

mit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 700, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 202.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—427

Abercrombie	Culberson	Hodes
Ackerman	Cummings	Hoekstra
Aderholt	Davis (AL)	Holden
Akin	Davis (CA)	Holt
Alexander	Davis (IL)	Honda
Allen	Davis (KY)	Hooley
Altmire	Davis, David	Hoyer
Andrews	Davis, Lincoln	Hulshof
Arcuri	Davis, Tom	Inglis (SC)
Baca	Deal (GA)	Inslee
Bachmann	DeFazio	Israel
Bachus	DeGette	Issa
Baird	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Baker	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Dent	(TX)
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jefferson
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jindal
Bartlett (MD)	Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Barton (TX)	Dingell	Johnson (IL)
Bean	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	Donnelly	Johnson, Sam
Berkley	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Berman	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Berry	Drake	Jordan
Biggert	Dreier	Kagen
Bilbray	Duncan	Kanjorski
Bilirakis	Edwards	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Ehlers	Keller
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kennedy
Bishop (UT)	Ellsworth	Kildee
Blackburn	Emanuel	Kilpatrick
Blumenauer	Emerson	Kind
Blunt	Engel	King (IA)
Boehner	English (PA)	King (NY)
Bonner	Eshoo	Kingston
Boozman	Etheridge	Kirk
Boren	Everett	Klein (FL)
Boswell	Fallin	Kline (MN)
Boucher	Farr	Knollenberg
Boustany	Fattah	Kucinich
Boyd (FL)	Feeney	Kuhl (NY)
Boyd (KS)	Ferguson	LaHood
Brady (PA)	Filner	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Flake	Lampson
Braley (IA)	Forbes	Langevin
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Lantos
Brown, Corrine	Fossella	Larsen (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Latham
Ginny	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Lee
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Butterfield	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Buyer	Gerlach	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Giffords	Linder
Campbell (CA)	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Cannon	Gillibrand	LoBiondo
Cantor	Gillmor	Loeb sack
Capito	Gingrey	Loftgren, Zoe
Capps	Gohmert	Lowey
Capuano	Gonzalez	Lucas
Cardoza	Goode	Lungren, Daniel
Carnahan	Goodlatte	E.
Carney	Gordon	Lynch
Carson	Granger	Mack
Carter	Graves	Mahoney (FL)
Castle	Green, Al	Maloney (NY)
Castor	Green, Gene	Manzullo
Chabot	Grijalva	Marchant
Chandler	Gutierrez	Markey
Clarke	Hall (NY)	Marshall
Clay	Hall (TX)	Matheson
Cleaver	Hare	Matsui
Clyburn	Harman	McCarthy (CA)
Coble	Hastert	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Hastings (FL)	McCaul (TX)
Cole (OK)	Hastings (WA)	McCollum (MN)
Conaway	Hayes	McCotter
Conyers	Heller	McCrery
Cooper	Hensarling	McDermott
Costa	Herger	McGovern
Costello	Herseth	McHenry
Courtney	Higgrins	McHugh
Cramer	Hill	McIntyre
Crenshaw	Hinchey	McKeon
Crowley	Hinojosa	McMorris
Cubin	Hirono	Rodgers
Cuellar	Hobson	McNerney

McNulty	Rahall	Souder
Meehan	Ramstad	Space
Meek (FL)	Rangel	Spratt
Meeke (NY)	Regula	Stark
Melancon	Rehberg	Stearns
Mica	Reichert	Stupak
Michaud	Renzi	Sullivan
Millender-	Reyes	Sutton
McDonald	Reynolds	Tancred
Miller (FL)	Rodriguez	Tanner
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Tauscher
Miller (NC)	Rogers (KY)	Taylor
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Miller, George	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Mitchell	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Mollohan	Roskam	Thornberry
Moore (KS)	Ross	Tiahrt
Moore (WI)	Rothman	Tiberi
Moran (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Moran (VA)	Royce	Towns
Murphy (CT)	Ruppersberger	Turner
Murphy, Patrick	Rush	Udall (CO)
Murphy, Tim	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Murtha	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Musgrave	Salazar	Van Hollen
Myrick	Sali	Velázquez
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	T.
Napolitano	T.	Walberg
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walden (OR)
Neugebauer	Sarbanes	Walsh (NY)
Nunes	Saxton	Walz (MN)
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Wamp
Obey	Schiff	Wasserman
Oliver	Schmidt	Schultz
Ortiz	Schwartz	Waters
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Watson
Pascrell	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Pastor	Serrano	Waxman
Paul	Sessions	Weiner
Payne	Sestak	Welch (VT)
Pearce	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Pence	Shays	Weller
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Westmoreland
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Wexler
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Whitfield
Petri	Shuler	Wicker
Pickering	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson (OH)
Platts	Sires	Wilson (SC)
Poe	Skelton	Wolf
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Woolsey
Porter	Smith (NE)	Wu
Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Pryce (OH)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Putnam	Snyder	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Soils	

NOT VOTING—6

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Larson (CT)
Camp (MI)	Hunter	Scott (GA)

□ 1436

Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 700, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

None of the funds authorized by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used—

(1) to lobby or retain a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing a Federal, State, or local governmental entity or officer; or

(2) to pay for expenses related to the membership of any individual or entity in an organization or association.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 59, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie	Costello	Hare
Ackerman	Courtney	Harman
Aderholt	Cramer	Hastert
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Altmire	Cubin	Hayes
Andrews	Cuellar	Heller
Arcuri	Cummings	Herseth
Baca	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hill
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hinchev
Baker	Davis, David	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	Hirono
Barrow	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Barton (TX)	DeFazio	Hodes
Bean	DeGette	Hoekstra
Becerra	Delahunt	Holden
Berkley	DeLauro	Holt
Berman	Dent	Honda
Berry	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Dicks	Hulshof
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Insee
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Israel
Blumenauer	Donnelly	Jackson (IL)
Blunt	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Boehner	Doyle	(TX)
Bonner	Drake	Jefferson
Boozman	Dreier	Jindal
Boren	Duncan	Johnson (GA)
Boswell	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boucher	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Boustany	Ellison	Jones (NC)
Boyd (FL)	Ellsworth	Jones (OH)
Boyd (KS)	Emanuel	Kagen
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Brady (IA)	Engel	Kaptur
Brown (SC)	English (PA)	Keller
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Kennedy
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Kildee
Ginny	Everett	Kilpatrick
Buchanan	Fallin	Kind
Butterfield	Farr	King (NY)
Calvert	Fattah	Kirk
Cannon	Ferguson	Klein (FL)
Capito	Filner	Knollenberg
Capps	Forbes	Kucinich
Capuano	Fortenberry	Kuhl (NY)
Cardoza	Fossella	LaHood
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Carson	Gallely	Lantos
Carter	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Castle	Giffords	Latham
Castor	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Chabot	Gillibrand	Lee
Chandler	Gillmor	Levin
Clarke	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Cleaver	Gordon	Lipinski
Clyburn	Granger	LoBiondo
Coble	Graves	Loebsack
Cohen	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Cole (OK)	Green, Gene	Lowe
Conaway	Grijalva	Lucas
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lungren, Daniel
Cooper	Hall (NY)	E.
Costa	Hall (TX)	Lynch

Mahoney (FL)	Perlmutter	Sires
Maloney (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Skelton
Manzullo	Peterson (PA)	Slaughter
Markey	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Marshall	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Matheson	Platts	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Poe	Snyder
McCarthy (CA)	Pomeroy	Solis
McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Souder
McCaul (TX)	Ramstad	Space
McCollum (MN)	Rangel	Spratt
McCotter	Regula	Stark
McCreery	Rehberg	Stupak
McDermott	Reichert	Sullivan
McGovern	Renzi	Sutton
McHugh	Reyes	Tauscher
McIntyre	Reynolds	Taylor
McKeon	Rodriguez	Terry
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
McNerney	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Meek (FL)	Roskam	Towns
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Turner
Melancon	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Upton
Millender-	Rush	Van Hollen
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Miller (MI)	Salazar	Visclosky
Miller (NC)	Sali	Walberg
Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Linda	Walden (OR)
Miller, George	T.	Walsh (NY)
Mitchell	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)
Mollohan	Sarbanes	Wamp
Molloy	Saxton	Wasserman
Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Schultz
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Watson
Moran (KS)	Schmidt	Watt
Moran (VA)	Schwartz	Waxman
Murphy (CT)	Scott (GA)	Weiner
Murphy, Patrick	Scott (VA)	Welch (VT)
Murphy, Tim	Serrano	Weller
Murtha	Sestak	Wexler
Nadler	Shays	Whitfield
Napolitano	Shays	Wicker
Neal (MA)	Shea-Porter	Wilson (NM)
Nunes	Sherman	Wilson (OH)
Oberstar	Shimkus	Wolf
Obey	Shuler	Woolsey
Oliver	Shuster	Wu
Ortiz	Simpson	Wynn
Pallone		Yarmuth
Pascarell		Young (AK)
Pastor		Young (FL)
Payne		
Pearce		

NAYS—59

Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Bachmann	Gingrey	Myrick
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Paul
Bilbray	Hensarling	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Herger	Pitts
Blackburn	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Issa	Royce
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	King (IA)	Sessions
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Shadegg
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lamborn	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Linder	Thornberry
Feeney	Mack	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Marchant	Westmoreland
Foxx	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	

NOT VOTING—6

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Larson (CT)
Camp (MI)	Hunter	Tanner

□ 1445

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adop-

tion of House Resolution 202, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 150, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—269

Abercrombie	Giffords	Michaud
Ackerman	Gilchrest	Millender-
Allen	Gillibrand	McDonald
Altmire	Gonzalez	Miller (NC)
Andrews	Gordon	Miller, Gary
Arcuri	Granger	Miller, George
Baca	Green, Al	Mitchell
Baird	Green, Gene	Mollohan
Baldwin	Grijalva	Moore (KS)
Barrow	Gutierrez	Moore (WI)
Bean	Hall (NY)	Moran (VA)
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Murphy (CT)
Berkley	Hare	Murphy, Patrick
Berman	Harman	Murtha
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Bilirakis	Herseth	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Neal (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Oberstar
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Obey
Boren	Hinojosa	Olver
Boswell	Hirono	Ortiz
Boucher	Hodes	Pallone
Boyda (KS)	Holden	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Holt	Pastor
Braley (IA)	Honda	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Hookey	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Butterfield	Insee	Platts
Buyer	Israel	Pomeroy
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Porter
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Cardoza	(TX)	Pryce (OH)
Carnahan	Jefferson	Rahall
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ramstad
Carson	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Castor	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Chandler	Jones (OH)	Renzi
Clarke	Kagen	Reyes
Clay	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Cleaver	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Clyburn	Keller	Ross
Cohen	Kildee	Rothman
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kirk	Rush
Costello	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Knollenberg	Salazar
Cramer	Kucinich	Sanchez, Linda
Crowley	Lampson	T.
Cuellar	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Cummings	Lantos	Sarbanes
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	Saxton
Davis (CA)	Lee	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Levin	Schiff
Davis, Lincoln	Lewis (CA)	Schwartz
Davis, Tom	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)
DeFazio	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
DeGette	LoBiondo	Serrano
Delahunt	Loebsack	Sestak
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Shays
Dent	Lowey	Shea-Porter
Dicks	Lynch	Sherman
Dingell	Mahoney (FL)	Shuler
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Sires
Donnelly	Markey	Skelton
Doyle	Marshall	Slaughter
Edwards	Matsui	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Ellison	McCaul (TX)	Snyder
Ellsworth	McCollum (MN)	Solis
Emanuel	McDermott	Space
Engel	McGovern	Spratt
English (PA)	McIntyre	Stark
Eshoo	McKeon	Stupak
Etheridge	McMorris	Sutton
Farr	Rodgers	Tanner
Fattah	McNerney	Tauscher
Ferguson	McNulty	Taylor
Filner	Meehan	Thompson (CA)
Fortenberry	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Frank (MA)	Meeks (NY)	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	Melancon	Tiberi
Gerlach	Mica	Tierney