Mr. STENHOLM and I appreciate the good working relationship that we have. Our committee works on behalf of American agriculture, I think, on a bipartisan basis as well as any committee in the Congress.

It is vitally important, and I strongly urge my colleagues who have any reservation about the level of this funding to move forward with this suspension to allow the House to have completed its action so that we make for certain that the $5.5 billion which was established in the budget resolution is in fact eligible to be paid to farmers by the end of the fiscal year of September 30. I think it also sends a message to farmers that in fact there is some assistance on the way at a very critically needed time.

Mr. Speaker, to the Members who spoke posts a committee's action in the next few weeks in reporting a farm bill, I will say that we have heard them and all others. This will be a comprehensive farm bill. It will have a strong conservation title, as some have indicated, an area that we are looking at very carefully. It is something that we will be trying to craft to deal with all aspects of American agriculture, and we will be spending a great deal of time on it. It is the intent of our committee to report a bill by the beginning of the August recess so that consideration for a full farm bill in a much-needed sector of the American economy that is suffering tremendously can be moved forward; and that we will be able to send a message to American agriculture that there is help on the way. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest, the intensity, and passion of all of my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2213 will provide the much-needed help that many farmers in the Second Congressional District need today. The $5.5 billion is not sufficient to address all the farming needs, but it is an area that we are looking at very carefully. It is something that we will be trying to craft to deal with all aspects of American agriculture, and we will be spending a great deal of time on it. It is the intent of our committee to report a bill by the beginning of the August recess so that consideration for a full farm bill in a much-needed sector of the American economy that is suffering tremendously can be moved forward; and that we will be able to send a message to American agriculture that there is help on the way.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest, the intensity, and passion of all of my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2213 will provide the much-needed help that many farmers in the Second Congressional District need today. The $5.5 billion is not sufficient to address all the farming needs, but it is an area that we are looking at very carefully. It is something that we will be trying to craft to deal with all aspects of American agriculture, and we will be spending a great deal of time on it. It is the intent of our committee to report a bill by the beginning of the August recess so that consideration for a full farm bill in a much-needed sector of the American economy that is suffering tremendously can be moved forward; and that we will be able to send a message to American agriculture that there is help on the way.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2213, the bill just passed. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2299, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 178, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 178

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H.R. 2299, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisos in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: on page 13, line 24, through "section 40117;" on line 25; beginning with "Provided" on page 14, line 12, through line 20; beginning with "Provided" on page 15, line 9, through line 14; beginning with "Provided" on page 23, line 20, through page 24, line 2; "notwithstanding any other provision of law" on page 29, line 15, beginning with "together with" on page 26, line 15, through the closing quotation mark on line 16; page 31, line 9 through "as amended," on line 10; page 38, line 23, through page 45, line 2; page 50, line 22, through page 51, line 15; page 55, line 6, through line 13; page 56, line 16, through page 57, line 2. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. Points of order against the act, the amendment or any proviso of the act or amendment has caused to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule (H. Res. 178) because it contains an unfunded Federal mandate.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive this point of order.

In the rule of H. Res. 178, and I quote: "a point of order against consideration of the rule (H. Res. 178) because it contains an unfunded Federal mandate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. According to section 426(b)(2) of the act, the gentleman must specify language in the resolution that caused that effect. Having met this threshold burden to identify the specific language of the resolution under section 426(b)(2), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration under section 426(b)(4).

Following the debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the resolution?

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order because section 314 of this appropriations act directs the local transit authority to change the name of its transit station at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport with local funds. The cost to comply with this provision is estimated to be $405,476; but the principle being violated is far more costly.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the local jurisdiction which operates the transit board elected not to change the name of the Metro station at the airport. The board determined that the estimated cost of these changes would be better spent on other priorities. I had hoped that we could have avoided the additional cost by waiving this provision.

In addition to the rule that requires the request to come from the local jurisdiction in which the station is located, the regional transit board has a long-standing policy of not naming their transit stations after people, preferring instead that they be named after the location that they are serving.

At one time many Democrats wanted the RFK Stadium stop to be named
after Robert Kennedy, but that suggestion was rejected because Stadium-Armory is more descriptive, and named after a place rather than a person.

In my view, that was a correct use of local taxpayer resources. I have to think that if President Reagan were not tragically suffering from Alzheimer’s disease, he would join the board and the local governments in resisting these heavy-handed tactics of the Federal Government in forcing the local government to act contrary to its best judgment.

In 1964 following the tragic death of President Kennedy, an oversea-born Johnson administration by executive fiat renamed Cape Canaveral Cape Kennedy without consulting the local jurisdictions. Had the Johnson administration consulted the local jurisdictions, they would have learned the importance of the name Canaveral dating back to the time of the Spanish explorers and a part of the cape’s identity, culture and heritage for the succeeding 400 years. For the next 10 years, the local communities resisted the Federal action, preferring instead to use the name Canaveral. In the early 1970s, the Florida State legislature showed its defiance by enacting legislation to rename the cape Canaveral. By default and Federal inaction, that name still stands.

In the instance of the airport, the localities were never consulted on the 1998 act to rename the airport. Had Congress conducted hearings and allowed local elected officials to testify, it would have learned that Washington National Airport already had a name in honor of our first President, George Washington, one of our founding fathers, commander in chief of the Continental Army during the War of Independence. If President Roosevelt were a resident of northern Virginia, living just down the very road that runs by the airport. The airport was literally built on land owned by George Washington’s family.

Recognizing the direct relationship and strong historical roots of the property, President Roosevelt asked that the airport’s main terminal, completed in 1946, be designed to resemble Mount Vernon. That resemblance is now a historic landmark.

Like the renaming of Cape Canaveral, resentment of the name change is on the minds of northern Virginia’s local residents. We had a compromise proposal that the new terminal, after President Reagan. That was rejected even though its existence bears testimony to the success of devolving the operations of the federally owned airport to a local authority. When it was purchased by the local government control, no capital improvements were undertaken. Now the local authority has invested a billion dollars in capital improvements with non-Federal funds.

Substantial honors have already been conferred upon President Reagan and more will be. There is nearly a $1 billion Ronald Reagan building and international trade center. Other than the Pentagon, it is the largest Federal building in existence. It is just a few blocks from the White House. We have a Nimitz class aircraft carrier. And, of course, the renaming of the airport. President Reagan’s legacy will be defined by what he did as President, not by what we do for him. I am sure he would join me in opposing this provision that mandates the local transit authority rename the transit station.

In referencing the controversy of the Metro station issue in his weekly column, George Will said:

“How many ways are there to show misunderstanding of Reagan’s spirit? Let us count the zealots’ ways. Political freedom implies freedom from political propaganda—from being incessantly bombarded with symbols and messages intended to shape public consciousness in conformity with a contemporary agenda. Such bombardment is the hallmark of some Reaganite monument mongers. They have the mentality that led to the lunatic multiplication of Lenin portraits, busts and statues throughout the Evil Empire.

Let us resist the lure to establish Ronald Reagan’s legacy by renaming everything after the former President, thereby trivializing the principles that he stood for.

I urge that we oppose this unfunded Federal mandate.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

I would like to take this opportunity to put on the record this provision would violate the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. While a review by the Congressional Budget Office determined the requirement to rename the station to be an intergovernmental mandate under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, renaming the station falls well below the 2001 threshold of $56 million. In fact, this project is estimated to cost approximately $500,000. I submit CBO’s findings for the RECORD.


HON. JAMES P. MORAN, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you requested, the Congressional Budget Office has reviewed an amendment to H.R. 2299, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002, that was adopted by the Appropriations Committee on June 20, 2001. The amendment would require the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to redesignate the National Airport Station as the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Station, and to change all signs, maps, directories, and other documentation to reflect the new name. Our review was confined to determining whether that requirement constitutes an intergovernmental mandate as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and, if so, whether the costs of that mandate would exceed the threshold established in that act.

The amendment defines an intergovernmental mandate as an enforceable duty imposed upon state, local, or tribal governments, unless that duty is imposed as a condition of federal assistance. Because the requirement to rename the station is not a condition of federal assistance, it would be considered an intergovernmental mandate under UMRA. No funding is provided in the bill to cover the costs of complying with the mandate. However, based on information from WMATA, CBO estimates that those costs would be less than $500,000, well below the threshold established in UMRA ($56 million in 2001).

If you wish further information, we will be pleased to provide it. The CBO contact is Susan Tompkins.

Sincerely, BARRY B. ANDERSON

(For Dan L. Crippen, Director.)
Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consider necessary.

First, I would just say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that you cannot put a price tag on principle. It is a principle, Ronald Reagan's principle, in fact, that we are attempting to uphold here. It is being violated with this action.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of his unfunded mandate point of order.

Section 343 of H.R. 2249 orders the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to change the Metro stop at the airport to read Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Station. This is both an unfunded mandate and legislation on an appropriations bill and should not be protected from points of order by the rule that we consider today.

The Washington Transit Authority is an interstate compact dating back to 1967. It has a specific written policy in place adopted by the board of directors covering names of its stations. The specific procedure for station name changes says in part that one, the local jurisdiction in which the station is located shall endorse and formally request a name change to WMATA's board of directors; two, WMATA's Office of Engineering and Architecture will evaluate the proposed name change concerning length of name, other factors and provide cost estimates; three, the local jurisdiction proposing the name change shall obtain community support and bear the cost of the name change; four, the local jurisdiction shall then bring the proposal and supporting data to the WMATA board for action; and, five, the WMATA board of directors must approve the proposal.

None of this is being followed in the procedure directed in the appropriation bill. And the proposers themselves, if this Congress tried to do the same thing in their district, would scream to high heaven that we are invading local jurisdiction.

Over the last several years, a number of communities have proposed name changes, including local funding for the cost, and have built the necessary community support and received WMATA's approval. However, an equal number of name-change proposals have been rejected by the WMATA board. To cite one example, in 1996, councilman for the District of Columbia Jack Evans proposed that the Foggy Bottom-GWU Station be changed to include the Kennedy Center. The board rejected the proposal, saying in part, 'The board of directors considers name changes when they enhance our patrons' ability to orient themselves and circulate through the system. To rename stations affording special recognition or a specific institution in which neighborhood the station is located, or other establishments may challenge our ability to provide clear and concise public information.'

Now, this is a proper exercise of local prerogative. No one has ever suggested that this decision is disrespectful to the memory of President Kennedy. Not at all. But to name a Metro stop for President Ronald Reagan meets none of the five tests outlined in the WMATA policy. The local community, Arlington, has not proposed it. In fact, they do not even support it. And they surely do not want to pay for it.

To continue the quote of commentator George Will, one of President Reagan's strongest supporters, about this Metro stop: 'There is something very un-Reaganesque about trying to plaster his name all over the country the way Lenin was plastered over Eastern Europe, Mao over China and Saddam Hussein all over Iraq.'

We ought not to sully the legacy of President Reagan by going against one of his fundamental principles. Leave local control to the States, to the cities. Give them due respect.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very interesting that we hear this cry that this is an unfunded mandate. I would like to make a couple of points about that.

First of all, these same local jurisdictions that Mr. MORAN mentions are required to abide by OSHA regulations. Would the gentleman from Virginia want to oppose OSHA regulations, in his district, on his streets? The answer is no, of course. The same is true of EPA regulations, considered an unfunded mandate. And the Americans with Disabilities Act, again complied with by the Metro authorities. Instead, we have the gentleman rising in opposition to putting a proper name of the location and a destination point on the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Station. It should not have to be this way. We should not be required to have a piece of legislation merely to do something currently, such as putting the proper name on the Metro maps, on Metro designations and on the signs.

Another point I want to make is that no cost was provided here. I would like to offer a little bit of history about the Metro: the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority was conceived by Congress. It has been largely funded by Congress. This year in the Transportation Appropriations bill alone, over $100 million are from U.S. taxpayers to fund the Metro. There is plenty of money to handle the cost of signs.

Let us talk more about the cost of signs. Recently there have been seven changes to the Metro in signs. These changes have occurred since President Clinton signed the law naming National Airport the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. That's seven changes at a cost of $713,000. I do not know where this half a million dollar figure is coming from, but Metro has made seven system-wide changes at a total cost of $713,000. So whether it is $100, $125,000, or whatever the cost, I am sure there is the necessary amount of money in the over-$100 million being provided by United States taxpayers all across this Nation.

People from the great State of Kansas who ride this Metro system when visiting or working in D.C., are helping subsidize this. I do not think it is too much to ask for Metro to list the entire name of a stop, so that when people come in 19 percent of the time, they know that they are going to the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Station, a location, a destination on the Metro. We are not asking for a great deal.

This is a request that has been repeated many times since February 6, 1998. And in this time, there have been these seven changes. There was a letter sent in April by 22 Members of Congress asking the Metro authorities to change this. It has been completely ignored. This has been transformed into a political issue. It should not be. It should just be a simple matter of having accurate maps reflecting destination points within the Washington area system.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we carry forward with this. It is not an unfunded mandate. There is money there. It does not fit the definition of an unfunded mandate according to the Congressional Budget Office, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) points out.

I request that the Chair rule against this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to share with the gentleman the fact that OSHA is exempt from the unfunded mandates law because it is a civil rights provision, and the Federal Government only contributes 6 percent of operating costs to the Metro system.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR), the original sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

If you look at the total cost, let us put all of our cards on the table. The other side has been irritated no end that they are in the minority, and it irritated the heck out of them 3 years ago when the name
of National Airport, over which this Congress has jurisdiction, was changed by majority vote of the people of the United States, by their representatives, was changed to reflect Ronald Reagan’s name. They lost that vote. Get over it, guys. You lost it.

Not satisfied with that, not satisfied with simply playing by the rules and recognizing that the name change went through the Congress, was signed by none other than President Bill Clinton, what they are doing now is they keep trying to come in the back door. They go to their friends on the Metro board, which has never before had a problem with any name change. They have operated like any other metropolitan transit board. When there is an official name change by law, the signage and the literature is changed to reflect that official name change. It is always done, it is always handled in the past.

The other side over there have gotten together and they have decided, well, what we could not do fairly, let us come in through the back door.

It is time for this Congress to tell these guys to grow up, recognize reality, handle this matter the way it has always been handled in the past, when there is a name change by law, signed by the President at a Federal facility, and it relates thereafter to a Federal transit board that receives hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. It is time to just simply let them move on, make the name changes that are always made.

In this case there have been not one, not two, but, count them, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), seven name changes, comprehensive name changes of stations within the Metro system, some considerably longer than the now official name of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. Metro has never had a problem with any of those.

There is nothing defective in this rule. The gentleman on the other side knows that, but he is wasting the time of this Congress raising a specious unfunded mandate objection. This clearly, Mr. Speaker, is not an unfunded mandate. The Metro board receives far more, in excess of $100 million, in this upcoming fiscal year for the running of the Metro system, some considerably longer than the now official name of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, which we are going to consider as the legislation is before the House, where $30 million under section 9 in the formula for funding will go to the District of Columbia’s Metro system. That money is eligible for signs and other important aspects of how this legislation has been created within the appropriations bill.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has raised the possibility that H.R. 2299 may contain an unfunded mandate. I urge that we proceed forward from the point of order.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 202, not voting 12, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the vote was announced by the Clerk. So the question of consideration was agreed to, by a vote of 219 to 202, not voting 12.

Mr. LINDER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

The Speaker pro tempore. So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

The rule provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment by paragraph.

In addition, the rule waives clauses 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill) against provisions in the bill, except as otherwise specified in the rule.

Further, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has worked diligently to produce legislation that meets the Nation’s transportation priorities. As more and more Americans hit the airways as the high season approaches this Congress can take pride in the fact that the underlying legislation represents an increase in safety measures and resources in every area of our transportation system.

With all of the travel we do back and forth to our home districts, I am sure my colleagues can relate to the frustration of airline delays. That frustration is tenfold for countless Americans who rely on air travel for work and for pleasure each and every day.

This bill includes several provisions to address the problem of airline delays such as fully funding the “Free Flight” program and raising funding for the “Safe Flight 21” programs. These programs develop technologies to aid in the improvement of airway capacity both responsibly and prudently.

Moreover, the bill meets the funding obligation limitation in the transportation legislation known as TEA 21, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, by providing $31.7 billion in highway program obligation limitations, a 4 percent increase over the current fiscal year’s level. Continuing our commitment toward investments in
the Nation’s infrastructure, this bill provides nearly $59.1 billion in total budgetary resources, a responsible 2 percent increase over the current fiscal year.

This bill, much like last year’s, continues to improve and enhance motor carrier safety by providing $206 million for motor carrier safety grants, an increase of $20 million that is consistent with truck safety reforms enacted as part of the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999.

This body recently passed the Coast Guard Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002. The Coast Guard’s duties include promoting the safety of life and property at sea, enforcing all applicable Federal laws on the high seas, maintaining navigation aids, protecting the marine environment, and securing the safety and security of vessels, ports, and waterways.

The legislation before us today appropriates in the amount of $5 billion, including $300 million to the Coast Guard’s capital needs and $300 million available to initiate the “Deepwater” program, which will fight the scourge of illicit drugs, provide support for offshore search and rescue, and work to protect Americans and American shores.

In addition, the bill provides $521 million for Amtrak’s capital needs. This funding will cover capital expenses and preventive maintenance. This bill sustains the Federal commitment to continue in partnership with Amtrak and to help it reach its goal of self-sufficiency.

These, along with other modest increases within the bill, will allow the Department of Transportation to have greater flexibility and oversight control for both large and small projects alike. Ensuring proper funding levels ensures the ability of the Department of Transportation to do its job, making travel safer and easier for us all.

Safety should remain the Federal Government’s highest responsibility in the transportation area. Clearly, whether by land, by sea, or by air, this bill addresses those needs and concerns, while maintaining the fiscal discipline that has been the hallmark of this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey), the ranking member, for their hard work on this measure. I would also like to commend the Chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation and its ranking member. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. HOUSTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Kentuck (Mr. Rogers) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Sabo) for all of their hard work in bringing this bill to the Floor. In the meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Transportation, we have brought us a good bill that funds a number of vital transportation projects, including one important to many congressmen: a District in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

I am pleased that the bill will provide $70 million to the North Central Light Rail Transit Extension. A bipartisan group of North Texas members worked very hard to get this funding that will allow for more than double DART’s light rail coverage and help stimulate development in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex.

However, Madam Speaker, while this is a good bill overall, I cannot support the rule supported by the Republican majority because they have denied a request made by the Democratic ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, who sought to offer an amendment to address safety issues not being raised by allowing Mexican trucks to enter the United States.

I must also oppose this rule because of the issue of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority and the renaming of the National Airport Metro stop. Time and again over the last 6% years, the Republican majority has selectively ignored their own mantra of local control when it suits an ideological purpose. The renaming of this Metro stop ignores the wishes of the local authorities, as well as the Member representing this area. And for that reason, as well as the fact that the Sabo amendment was shut out by the Committee on Rules, I oppose the rule.

One of the greatest defects of this rule is the fact that the Republican leadership, working in concert with the President, has prevented the House from addressing a serious highway safety issue: the safety standards of Mexican trucks entering this country under NAFTA.

The Bush administration has lifted all restrictions on the movement of Mexican trucks on our highways effective January 1, 2002. Next year, Mexican trucks will be free to drive across the country, despite clear evidence that many are unsafe for our highways.

In May, the Department of Transportation’s Inspector General found that the Federal Government needs to add dozens of additional border inspectors before lifting restrictions on Mexican trucks. The few inspectors now policing the borders found that 40 percent of Mexican trucks that are currently allowed into the U.S. were pulled out of service for significant violations of our safety regulations, which is higher than the percentage of violations among U.S. trucks.

So many of these trucks are deemed unsafe for our roads because they are allowed to operate in Mexico with virtually no oversight. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is the one who addresses these issues on a routine basis, also expressed their deep concerns to the Committee on Rules about these trucks coming into the United States; yet their concerns were also ignored by the Republican leadership.

For example, Mexican trucks are 10 years older than U.S. trucks, on average, and do not comply with weight standards. Mexico has no hours-of-service regulations, while U.S. drivers can only drive 10 hours per shift. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Sabo) offered a sensible amendment that would require the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to conduct a safety compliance review of each Mexican truck entering the United States, and to require that they be found to be satisfactory under the same standards applicable to U.S. carriers before being granted conditional or permanent operational authority.

However, the Republican leadership has refused to allow the House to vote on the Sabo amendment. I simply cannot understand why the administration and the House leadership oppose what the gentleman has proposed. The Republican leadership’s refusal to recognize safety concerns related to the use of these trucks throughout the United States is nothing short of negligent, Madam Speaker.

This highway safety issue is particularly critical in Texas, as well as in my own congressional district where I-35 runs through the middle of the district, since two-thirds of Mexican trucks enter the U.S. through Texas; and many of those trucks will travel on I-35 to serve interior destinations. But make no mistake: this is a serious safety issue coming to highways all across America, now that the President has lifted any and all restrictions on Mexican trucks operating on American roads and highways.

This rule also prevents discussion of how to pay for relabeling Metro signs for National Airport. In 1998, over strong local opposition, the Republican leadership decided to rename Washington’s National Airport, in honor of President Ronald Reagan. Now, in this bill, they are requiring the already strapped Washington Metro Authority to change all of their station signs, maps, directories, and documents to reflect the new name, but Republican leaders are not providing one single penny of the $400,000 it will cost to do this.

Madam Speaker, I served in the Congress when Ronald Reagan was President. I understand that many Republicans and Democrats want to honor him. Indeed, this Congress and this Nation have already done much to ensure President Reagan’s accomplishments
get the respect they deserve. But a $400,000 unfunded mandate hardly seems like a fitting tribute to President Reagan. After all, he made a career of campaigning on behalf of local control.

In my own district, we would not take kindly to the Federal Government forcing us to spend $400,000 in local funds that might otherwise have been already budgeted for health care or schools or other local priorities. I understand why this local community would resist spending $400,000 on a symbolic name change while far too many children in the District of Columbia go without food at the end of the month.

Madam Speaker, if the Republican leadership and Grover Norquist believe new Metro signs and maps are such an important priority, then they should provide the money to pay for them. It is just plain wrong to force local governments to spend this money on maps for tourists instead of meals for children. Mr. Norquist and other Republican leaders do President Reagan no favor by imposing this unfunded mandate on his name.

Madam Speaker, I believe the House should be allowed to consider and vote on the issue of the safety of our Nation's highways. These are the same roads school buses travel and people use to get to and from work.
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Their safety should be paramount.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule so we may go back to the Committee on Rules and find a better way to address this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS, Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the Chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. It is a good rule, it is a fair rule, and it needs to be adopted. At the outset, I want to advise the Members that we have worked closely and cooperatively with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to resolve areas of disagreement on the bill.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and this gentleman have been able to work out almost everything to our mutual satisfaction. We do not agree with their position on every matter, but we do not begrudge their right to assert their concerns and jurisdiction.

Under this rule, the authorizing committee will in a number of instances exercise its prerogatives under the rules of the House to remove provisions that our committee believes are important and necessary, but which fall within their jurisdiction. The rule preserves their right to do that. In a number of other cases, the authorizing committee has agreed not to object to provisions included by our committee, which, again, we believe are necessary to carry out the programs in the bill.

It is vitally important, Madam Speaker, that we adopt this rule and proceed to consider the Transportation appropriations bill. The bill contains $59 billion for highways, airport grants and other aviation programs, highway safety activities, pipeline safety programs, many other items that are critical to every State and to individual Members of the House and, of course, our people.

We are within our funding allocation and the budget resolution. The bill is balanced. It is bipartisan and deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Let me briefly discuss the issue of Mexican trucks and NAFTA. As my colleagues know, the President says that we will be opening our border pursuant to NAFTA in January of next year.

This administration has a plan to ensure the safety of Mexican carriers that transport goods beyond the commercial zones and into the interior of the United States. The administration has put money behind that plan in its budget request. We fund that plan to the penny and then some. In fact, we provide increases above the President's request for the inspection of Mexican carriers at the border. The administration requested $88.2 million above current-year spending. We include $100.2 million above the current year, an 80 percent increase.

This money will pay for border inspection facilities and more inspectors. It pays for a common-sense plan that the House needs to support. In addition, our committee included language in the committee report directing the Department of Transportation to implement a strong safety oversight program that ensures the operational safety of Mexican motor carriers who seek permission to operate in the U.S. Madam Speaker, together these provisions ensure compliance with U.S. safety laws and regulations while it allows free trade to go forward. It is the responsible approach, and it complies with NAFTA.

Madam Speaker, I have some serious reservations that the proposal from the other side would, in fact, violate NAFTA, subjecting the United States to severe fines.

Madam Speaker, this is a good rule. It is a good bill, and I would hope that Members would support both today.

Mr. FRANK of Wisconsin, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I simply want to rise to express my opposition to this rule because of its failure to include the right of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABA) to offer his amendment on truck safety.

Very simply, what his amendment seeks to do is to require the establishment of procedures to guarantee that Mexican trucks will be safe before they are allowed to travel all over the United States. It just seems to me that we ought to understand that right now Mexican motor carriers operate with virtually no safety oversight to date.

There are no motor carrier hours of service regulations in Mexico. There is no way at this point to check the driving records, the driving history of Mexican motor carrier drivers. The out-of-service record for those trucks in the areas where they have been checked near the border is astronomically low. We are allowing Mexican trucks to operate on our road without severe safety precautions.

It is asserted that somehow the Sabo amendment would be a violation of NAFTA. That is nonsense. NAFTA is a trade pact. It is not a suicide pact. We are not required to guarantee the safety of our motorists at risk in order to satisfy some international bureaucracy. We have already had a ruling that makes quite clear that the United States has the authority, whatever authority we need to exercise in order to protect the safety of American travelers.

I find it ironic that this House will spend a lot of time on this Mickey Mouse amendment to require the renaming of a train station in the District of Columbia area and yet will not take the time to fully the debate the issue raised by the gentleman from Minnesota. I think that represents a warped set of priorities.

I also find it ironic that the Republican majority has said through legislation that when the question of worker safety is at stake, as was the case with the ergonomics regulations that the Labor Department wanted to put into effect some time ago, I find it ironic that at this point the Republican majority of this House said, "Oh, no, the regulations must wait. We are not going to worry about safety."

Yet at this point, when we are asking them again to take into account the safety considerations for American drivers, they are saying, "Damn the truck safety consequences, full speed ahead!" If I can plagiarize from Admiral Farragut.

It just seems to me that this House ought to come back to a rule of common sense. Just because the committee did not adopt the amendment in full committee is no reason this House should not have the opportunity to take whatever action is within our reach to ensure the safety of American drivers on our highways.

Madam Speaker, I think the bill itself is basically a good bill, and I intend to support it, but I think it is
Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle), the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NUSSELE. Madam Speaker, first, I rise in support of the rule. I share the concern that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) is raising about the Mexican truck issue, and we need to find a way to resolve that. This is not the place. I rise in support of the underlying bill. H.R. 2299, making transportation appropriations for fiscal year 2002. As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I want to report to my colleagues that this bill is consistent with the budget resolution, and it complies with the applicable sections under the Congressional Budget Act. H.R. 2299 provides $14.9 billion for the Department of Transportation and several transportation-related agencies. The bill includes $307 billion in rescission of previously enacted budget authority.

The bill is within the 302(a) allocations of the Committee on Appropriations. On the committee on Transportation and, therefore, complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits the consideration of appropriation measures that exceed the appropriate subcommittee’s 302(b) allocation.

Madam Speaker, I would observe that, based on the congressional scoring that we have before us, the bill would exceed the statutory caps on highways and mass transit. Under the Budget Act, any bill that breaches its caps triggers an across-the-board sequester in programs under that cap, but I further understand that the Committee on Appropriations believes and will work to ensure that this bill will come in under the caps when it is scored by OMB. It is OMB scoring that is used to enforce the caps and trigger any sequester.

Madam Speaker, I urge that the conference committee and the chairman consider this concern and ensure that the final bill is consistent with both the budget resolution and the highway and mass transit caps.

Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers) and not the rule, but the underlying bill of H.R. 2299.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Sabo).

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Frost) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, first, let me say that this is a good bill, and I will have more to say about that later. I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers) for producing a good bill. At the very least, it is a bill that deserves broad bipartisan support and should be passed by an overwhelming margin.

Madam Speaker, however, I cannot support this rule. The reason is that we have a problem, a serious problem, with the advent of Mexican trucks having access to the United States outside of the 20-mile commercial zone starting January 1.

This bill did not create the problem, it has been created for us, and if there is one place we can begin to deal with the remedy, that place is in this bill.

The amendment that I had offered, which would require preinspection of carrier applicants in Mexico before they receive conditional certification, something that would add to the safety potential that we have in this country, to go along with the additional inspectors. None of us can guarantee perfect safety, but those working together would give us some greater hope that we will have safe trucks operating in this country.

Madam Speaker, no one disputes the fact that Mexico-domiciled motor carriers operate with virtually no safety oversight today. There are no motor carrier hours of service regulations in Mexico. Even though the Mexican Government is now implementing a driver record database, there is currently no way to check the driving history of Mexico motor carrier drivers. In addition, Mexico will not finalize its roadside inspection program until October 2001.

Let me add that while we are focusing on inspection and out-of-service rates for trucks, equipment is important, but the driving capability of the driver is the most important. A greater proportion of fatal truck crashes are driver-related rather than equipment-related.

I might add that this committee and this Congress has been seriously involved in the last several years of trying to improve the truck safety of American trucks, and then we look at what the history is of Mexican trucks coming into the commercial zones today. Let me simply say that for trucks coming into Mexico and Arizona, the highest 40 percent of the Mexican-domiciled trucks today are put out of service.

I urge a no vote on this rule so we can quickly get a new rule which makes my amendment in order.

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

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Borski).

Mr. BORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I believe it is very, very important for this House to be able to vote on the Sabo amendment.

Madam Speaker, just last month, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman Petri) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Filner) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Holden), we paid a visit to some permanent truck inspection facilities along the Mexican border.

At Otay Mesa in California, we saw an inspection system that works and works pretty well and hopefully could...
serve as a model for the rest of our country.

In California, they perform a comprehensive level one inspection on all trucks crossing the border at least once every 90 days and issue a certificate. If a truck does not have a certificate, it is pulled over and inspected.

The out-of-service rate in California is very similar to our experience in the rest of the United States. Around 24 percent of trucks are taken out of service, way too high in the United States, but something we can continue to work on.

The situation in Texas was an absolute nightmare. There is no inspection in Texas. At Laredo, we visited it on a Sunday, a slow day. Major Clanton of the Texas Rangers or Texas Department of Public Service told us a truck that is absolutely no discussion on that day Major Clanton told us he pulled five or seven or eight trucks over to inspect, and five of them were taken out of service. We asked if there were serious concerns. The answer was, yes, extremely serious, things like brakes that are not working.

Madam Speaker, the situation in Texas is very serious. We should not allow trucks to come into the United States unless they are safe, unless they are inspected.

We asked the people in Texas how soon they could put inspection stations up at the border. They told us it would take at least 18 months.

So I would strongly urge that we defeat this rule, we allow the Sabo amendment to be in order so that we can protect the safety of the traveling public in the United States. Whether one is for NAFTA or against NAFTA, we can all be for public safety on the highways.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to stop attacking Mexico. I cannot quite understand what the motivation is. If we look at the issue, we are talking about trucks coming into our Nation that would be held at the same standards that American trucks would be held by. We are prepared to have them come in and bring their cargo through in a safe manner, complying with American law.

Let me also tell my colleagues what free trade has meant to some of these border communities that used to have unemployment rates at 40 to 45 percent. Free trade has dropped the unemployment in border communities drastically. In some areas, like in Laredo, Texas, the Laredo region has become the second fastest growing community in America. It is a boom area, and we enjoy the fruits of free trade.

Allowing these trucks to come in would help those folks as well. So to try to talk about offering an amendment to stop these trucks from coming in not only discriminates against Mexico, but it discriminates against a lot of minority communities along the border that want these trucks to come through because it has improved the quality of life. Trade has improved the quality of life. This is part of free trade that would improve it even more.

So leave us alone. Let the border communities, the high Hispanic population on the Mexico border, benefit from free trade. Stop discriminating against us and stop discriminating against Mexico.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman represents an area of Texas I think is the largest border area of any Member of Congress.

Mr. BONILLA. The gentleman is correct, Madam Speaker.

Mr. ROGERS. So all of the gentleman's constituents live on the border; is that correct, Madam Speaker?

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, the vast majority of my constituents, although I have areas that are also several hundred miles from the border.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, knowing what the administration, the Department of Transportation is doing even as we speak. That is, DOT is designing a plan for the safety of the trucks coming up from Mexico, and knowing generally what the plan is, does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) have concerns for the safety of his constituents through which these trucks would pass to the rest of the U.S.?

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, not any more than I would have a concern about an American truck coming from the Mexican border.

Let me also just add, if I could, to the gentleman from Kentucky, I would challenge any Member here who continues to pursue this action against Mexico, next time they speak about this issue, and the television camera is on them, I challenge them to look at that camera in the eye and tell us that they are not discriminating against Mexico and border area residents.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. BONILLA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, is the Motor Carrier Safety Administration, in fact the Motor Carrier Safety Administration, currently conducting a rulemaking to lay out the specific rules about the topic of which we are talking about today—the safety of Mexican carriers coming into the U.S.? They are conducting a rulemaking procedure. Even as we speak, members of the public can register their fears, their complaints about their ideas, whatever they want to say to the Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and the comments are published in the record. If that record reveals that many, many, many people are concerned about safety, the government is required to change the rule that they adopting. Is the gentleman aware of that rulemaking?

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, re-claiming my time, I am aware of that. I am aware of that, because I know all of us are concerned about having the highest standards compiled with by anyone who drives trucks in our country.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman aware of any Members who have spoken here today that have registered a complaint with the Motor Carrier Safety Administration?

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I am not aware of any such problems that have existed, not to create a premise on which to file any complaints. These are simply scare tactics and, as I have pointed out, targeted just against Mexico, nothing mentioned about Canada.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. BONILLA. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, does the gentleman also realize that, if the rulemaking that will be adopted some time this early fall is not severe enough to ensure the safety of American citizens from Mexican trucks, that Congress can always address the question at that time?

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I am aware of that, and I am sure that that is something we would want to do in a bipartisan way.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and because of its refusal to allow the common-sense Sabo amendment on truck safety.

This gentleman represents a border community. This gentleman represents an area where 30 percent of the trucks cross the border.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has filed a complaint on the rulemaking. I will tell my colleagues that I know of the dangers of the trucks to our citizens and to our driving public. I know what happens when uninsured drivers have accidents. I know what happens when trucks do not have brakes. I know what happens
when tired drivers are on the roads in San Diego and the rest of this Nation. I will tell the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) who just spoke, and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who talks about an administration plan, I live on the border. There is no evidence of such a plan. There is no national standard. I have traveled to Texas. I have looked at our border inspections in California. This is not discrimination against Mexico, Madam Speaker. This is a plea on behalf of the safety of our constituents who would be in danger.

I will tell my colleagues every State is left to itself to determine standards of inspection. We heard that the California inspection station in my district at Otay Mesa has a state-of-the-art inspection station, and they do. But do my colleagues know how many trucks they inspect of the 3,000 or more that come across every day? Less than 1 percent. They do not do anything. They do not do anything. A truck driver in the United States cannot get a license in Mexico, the age is 18. Mexico does not have a national commercial truck driver's license information system to detect driving violations. U.S. drivers can drive only 10 hours per shift, must keep a log of their hours worked, must pass a knowledge and skills test, and must have regular medical examinations.

In Mexico there are none of those requirements. Madam Speaker, President Bush is wrong on truck safety. He is wrong to open the border to unsafe trucks. The Republican leadership is wrong on this issue. Vote "no" on the rule.

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman wishes to yield back, we will close this and move to the vote.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, we had several other requests for time. The Members are not present on the floor. I would ask the gentleman whether he has any additional speakers.

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, I do not. It is obvious I have been reserving the balance of my time to close the debate on our side when the gentleman is ready.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge that the rule be defeated. The rule does not make in order the very important amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and the rule also did not take into consideration the objections raised by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Madam Speaker, this is an open rule. It is a fair rule. It is a rule that allows the transportation legislation of the Committee on Appropriations to come before the House. There has been consideration, with the will of the Committee on Appropriations passing a second degree amendment to the Sabo amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS). That amendment passed 37 to 27, reflecting the will of the Committee on Appropriations in the amendment.

Madam 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 (Mrs. WILSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8(c) of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the adoption of House Resolution 178 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules postponed earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 205, not voting 9, as follows:

(Roll No. 191)

YEAS—219

Aderholt Davis, Tom Helley
Armey Deal Herger
Basha DeLay Hillrey
Baker DeLauro Holum
Ballenger Dollittle Horn
Barrett Dreier Hogetler
Bartlett Duncan Houghton
Barton Dunn Huellhoff
Bescheller Edlers Hughes
Berenger Ehrlich Hutchinson
Biggert Emerson Hyde
Hilarakis English Isakson
Blunt English Isakson
Boehner Ferguson Istook
Bonilla Flake Jenkins
Bono Flettner Johnson (CT)
Bono Foley Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX) Forbes Johnson, Sam
Brown (SC) Forrester Jones (NC)
Bryant Frelinghuysen Keller
Burr Gallegly Kelly
Beyer Gianfagna Kennedy (MN)
C Salmon Kean
Calvert Gibbons King (NY)
Camp Gilchrest Kingston
Cannon Gillmor Kirk
Cantor Gilman Knoellberg
Capito Goode Kohe
Castle Goodlatte Laffoon
Chabot Goss Largent
Chambliss Graham Latham
Cheney Granger Leach
Cole Collins Graves Lewis (CA)
Combest Green (WI) Lewis (KY)
Cornyn Green (TX) Lindner
Cox Gruney LoBiondo
Crescenz Foxman Loe
Crenshaw Hanauer Mannylo
Cubin Hart McCrery
Creeson Hastings (WA) McIntosh
Cunningham Hayes McNinch
Davis, Jo Ann Hayworth McKean
Davis, Tom Helley

NAYS—205

Aderholt Davis, T-B-Helley
Armey Deal Herger
Basha DeLay Hillrey
Baker DeLauro Holum
Ballenger Dollittle Horn
Barrett Dreier Hogetler
Bartlett Duncan Houghton
Barton Dunn Huellhoff
Bescheller Edlers Hughes
Berenger Ehrlich Hutchinson
Biggert Emerson Hyde
Hilarakis English Isakson
Blunt English Isakson
Boehner Ferguson Istook
Bonilla Flake Jenkins
Bono Flettner Johnson (CT)
Bono Foley Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX) Forbes Johnson, Sam
Brown (SC) Forrester Jones (NC)
Bryant Frelinghuysen Keller
Burr Gallegly Kelly
Beyer Gianfagna Kennedy (MN)
C Salmon Kean
Calvert Gibbons King (NY)
Camp Gilchrest Kingston
Cannon Gillmor Kirk
Cantor Gilman Knoellberg
Capito Goode Kohe
Castle Goodlatte Laffoon
Chabot Goss Largent
Chambliss Graham Latham
Cheney Granger Leach
Cole Collins Graves Lewis (CA)
Combest Green (WI) Lewis (KY)
Cornyn Green (TX) Lindner
Cox Gruney LoBiondo
Crescenz Foxman Loe
Crenshaw Hanauer Mannylo
Cubin Hart McCrery
Creeson Hastings (WA) McIntosh
Cunningham Hayes McNinch
Davis, Jo Ann Hayworth McKean
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Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. CAPP, and Messrs. INSLEE and JONES of Washington offered their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOUGHTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The vote was recorded as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING OUTSTANDING AND INVALUABLE DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED DURING TROPICAL STORM ALLISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). The pending business is a question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution. H. Res. 166. The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution. H. Res. 166, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

YEA—411

[Roll No. 192]