

Opening markets and expending exports. To create more good jobs and increase wages, we must open markets abroad and expand U.S. exports. Trade has been key to the strength of this economic expansion—about a third of our economic growth in recent years has come from selling American goods and services overseas. The Information Technology Agreement signed in 1997 lowers tariff and other barriers to 90 percent of world trade in information technology services.

To continue opening new markets, creating new jobs, and increasing our prosperity, it is critically important to renew fast-track negotiation authority. This authority, which every President of either party has had for the last 20 years, enables the President to negotiate trade agreements and submit them to the Congress for an up-or-down vote, without modification. Renewing this traditional trade authority is essential to America's ability to shape the global economy of the 21st century.

SEIZING THE BENEFIT OF A GROWING, CHANGING ECONOMY

As we approach the 21st century the American economy is sound and strong, but challenges remain. We know that information and technology and global commerce are rapidly transforming the economy, offering new opportunities but also posing new challenges. Our goal must be to ensure that all Americans are equipped with the skills to succeed in this growing, changing economy.

Our economic strategy—balancing the budget, investing in our people, opening markets—has set this Nation on the right course to meet the goal. This strategy will support and contribute to America's strength and providing our people with the skills, the flexibility, and the security to succeed. We must continue to maintain the fiscal discipline that is balancing the budget, to invest in our people and their skills, and to lead the world to greater prosperity in the 21st century.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1998.*

RANDOM DRUG TESTING FOR MEMBERS AND STAFF

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from the Republican Members' retreat at Williamsburg, Virginia, and at that retreat the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), unveiled goals for our generation, of which the No. 1 issue is a drug-free America.

To honor that goal, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and I have been attempting for the last year to institute random drug testing for Members of Congress and their staffs, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and myself intend in the

next month and a half to actually implement the rule that was established at the start of this Congress that there shall be such a random drug testing plan for Members of Congress and their staffs.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a drug-free America, the House of Representatives must set the positive example and must take such measures as necessary to ensure that the Congress itself is drug free, and in my opinion, random drug testing must be a part of that plan.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 4 p.m.

□ 1604

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2604

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 4, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2604.

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

There was no objection.

WELCOME BACK TO MS. HELEN SEWELL

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as we welcome everybody back, I would like to make note that back in the kitchen, in the Republican cloakroom on this side, we have a wonderful woman who has been an employee of this House of Representatives for more than 65 years. Sixty-five years. She was sick over the break and she has returned in good health and we just want to welcome Mrs. Helen Sewell back. A wonderful, wonderful woman.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on Wednesday, February 11, 1998, or on

Thursday, February 12, 1998, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today makes in order at any time on Wednesday, that is today, February 11th, and Thursday, February 12th, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The resolution further provides that the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on any suspension considered under this rule.

This rule is necessary in order to provide for the expeditious consideration of some noncontroversial legislation which is before the House this week. It would be impractical to bring this legislation up under separate resolutions from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the majority attempted to work with the minority to reach a unanimous consent agreement to allow for suspensions, that means the expediting of noncontroversial measures today and tomorrow. However, the minority objected to that request, for whatever reason, and without the unanimous consent agreement, this rule is necessary to allow us to take up this legislation today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week many Members of both the majority and the minority participated in legislative planning sessions for this coming year. Members used this time to thoughtfully come up with solutions to many of the challenges our Nation faces this year.

Republicans are intent on achieving a drug-free America, which is very, very important to me, make a safer and healthier environment for all of our children and our grandchildren. We plan on providing the best education system for America's students by providing parental choice in education, education savings accounts, and opportunity scholarships for students in the District of Columbia. But above all, we intend to make sure that this Federal Government does not dictate educational curriculum to States and local school districts.

We will also take a careful look at America's retirement system by creating a national commission on retirement, thus providing greater security for the future of our retirement system.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Republicans intend to modernize, we intend to privatize and to downsize government in

order to reduce the total tax burden. For starters, this Congress will complete consideration of the Portman-Kerrey IRS bipartisan reform bill and send the legislation to the White House for the signature of the President.

In addition, we will address the difficult tax burden Americans face, particularly by providing marriage tax relief and death tax relief. There will also continue to be a debate on what type of tax system is the most fair for the American people. We may even consider a proposal to sunset the entire Tax Code. And won't that be exciting, Mr. Speaker?

The passage of this rule simply allows the House to move forward with a compelling agenda for this second session of the 105th Congress. I urge support for the rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from my home State of New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 352 would allow the House to consider bills on the suspension calendar on Wednesday and Thursday of this week instead of the normal Monday and Tuesday consideration. Because both the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Conference held their annual retreats on this week's normal suspension days, the resolution seems like a reasonable housekeeping rule.

However, the resolution itself does not include the usual protection for Members that is often included in such resolutions; the requirement that Members be notified at least one hour in advance that a bill would be called up on the suspension calendar. While the majority has given us a list of three bills to be considered, we have no assurance that we will not be surprised by additional legislation.

Two of the three bills on the calendar do not meet the usual criteria for suspension of the rules, which is non-controversial bills with agreed-upon language, thereby obviating the need for floor amendments.

H. Con. Res. 202 was introduced less than a month ago. The committee of jurisdiction held no hearings and had no markup. The Children's Defense Fund has sent a memo to each House office outlining factual errors in the resolution's original language. We are now told that there may be a manager's amendment which may or may not correct these errors, but as of midday today, Members have not been given the final language on which they will be asked to vote this evening.

As important as the care of our children is to each of our families, why are we rushing to pass this sense of Congress resolution? Would not the usual process of hearings in a markup by the committee of jurisdiction help to ensure that we are not forced to vote on a resolution which may contain factual

errors? Is the issue it attempts to address a new or time-sensitive issue? Is it so pressing that the committee could not have had the benefit of public testimony and perfecting amendments? I think not.

H.R. 1428, another bill to be considered under suspension, is a more egregious example of shoddy legislative work. Referred to three committees, none have marked up this bill. Only one of the three held hearings. Again, as of midday, the final text of the bill on which we will ask the House to vote tomorrow was not available to Members, yet this bill could make unprecedented changes in our electoral system and overturn citizens' privacy act protections.

This kind of far-reaching change should certainly be carefully scrutinized and subject to amendments both at the committee level and on the floor, yet we are told it will be brought up on the suspension calendar, which allows no amendments and only 40 minutes of debate. Why use this process on a bill that is so controversial? Why are we putting at risk a core right of our citizenship, the right to vote, without having a full and free debate?

The lack of due deliberation on this bill is shameful and not worthy of this House. The scheduling of these controversial, flawed bills on the suspension calendar is damaging both to the comity of the House of Representatives and its legislative procedures. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to carefully consider the important process issues that I have outlined before voting on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the inclusion in the rule of H.R. 1428 and to the process, or lack thereof, by which this bill was brought to the floor.

This is a very sad day in the history of the House. Although on even relatively simple bills we have generally taken time to carefully deliberate on issues and ensure that ample committee and subcommittee review has taken place in order to prevent excessively flawed bills from taking up our limited floor time, unfortunately, the process by which this bill has been considered has been markedly different.

There has only been one hearing in the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims and this bill is now on the floor. There have been no hearings on the Subcommittee on the Constitution to determine what effects this bill may have on Voting Rights Act protections. There have been no hearings before the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security to determine if citizenship verification proposed in the bill is a practical idea.

Because this bill has been not properly considered, we have no idea where the money will be found to create what some have estimated to be a multibillion-dollar bureaucracy.

□ 1615

Does this mean that we are so interested in solving a problem that may not even exist that we will have to make major cuts in Social Security programs for the elderly and disabled? None of these questions have been answered, and we are still proceeding head over heels into a land of uncertainty and frolic. This process has been extremely irresponsible with the tax dollars and Social Security benefits of the American people.

Considering our negligent lack of process, it is very difficult to dignify the substance of this bill. However, I will do my best to add my voice to the colleagues of mine who will be speaking against the bill tomorrow.

First of all, considering that turnout for elections is now at an all-time low in this country, I find it odd that we put so much fervor into creating new barriers to voting instead of strengthening motor voter and other voter encouragement initiatives which actually inspire people to take part in this great democracy.

Furthermore, this country's not-so-distant past of discriminatory enforcement, of facially neutral election laws should give pause to any knee-jerk efforts to strike important parts of the Voting Rights Act, the only shield we have from our despicable heritage of poll taxes, literacy tests, and a host of over facially neutral schemes that are designed for one reason, and one reason only, to intimidate and prevent minorities from voting.

Although we had anti-discrimination laws and the 15th Amendment in the Jim Crow south, it still took the 24th Amendment, which banned poll taxes, and the Voting Rights Act to finally arm citizens with an ample set of tools to fight against discrimination in the fundamental exercise of voting.

Today we stand poised to eradicate a delicate and important part of our hard-fought voting rights protections for an unworkable system supposedly intended to fix a nonexistent problem. Both the Social Security Administration and the INS have said that the information necessary for this proposed verification system does not exist. Moreover, who would want to empower some new, big government bureaucracy with the almighty ability to say, who can vote and who cannot, based on records which do not exist or are inaccurate? We can do better than this.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should not include H.R. 1428 in this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to perhaps respond a little bit.

I was surprised to hear both my good friend the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York, (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) stating that this rule brings certain bills to the floor. That just is not the case. This bill does not bring any bill to the floor. This rule does not. It simply creates two suspension days.

Suspension days means that bills can be brought to the floor without necessarily having gone through a committee or through our Committee on Rules. It can be brought to the floor for debate, they cannot be amended and have an up-or-down vote. There can be a manager's amendment, but that is subject to a vote of this House. So every Member has to approve that.

Secondly, I am just surprised to hear people complaining about a bill like day care fairness for stay-at-home parents. That is so terribly, terribly important today. As a matter of fact, I have 5 children and 6 grandchildren, and my wife was good enough to voluntarily stay home with those 5 children all through their life until they went away to college; and that was the best thing that ever happened to those children. Because I was away more than half the time during the week all that time. And I think if we had more spouses that could stay at home and take care of children like that, I think we would have a better America and a better world today.

This one bill simply states that day care fairness for stay-at-home parents will be brought to this floor. Even if these bills are voted on today, it is going to take a two-thirds vote. That is the difference when you go through the regular process, go through our Committee on Rules, and then bring it to the floor. Then a simple majority of 50 percent plus 1 vote can pass a bill. But these bills cannot pass with 50 percent plus 1; they require two-thirds. So it is fair.

So I point out again that this rule does not waive any other rules whatsoever. All it does is create a suspension day, and then the bills that my colleagues were just referring to come to the floor under regular order. Nothing is changed.

Now, having said that, let me just keep my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), waiting here for just a minute to talk about the question of utilizing this day. All of this week, both the Republican and Democratic parties have been in private caucus among themselves talking about their priorities for their legislative agenda.

Next week we will be in recess, in work periods back in our districts, and that will take us through about two-thirds of the month of February. We will then return. And as my colleagues know, committees are meeting, but they have not had a chance to generate really important legislation on this floor yet.

So I want to point out to the membership just how short this legislative period is between now and the October 1st scheduled deadline for adjournment for the end of this Congress, the 105th Congress. We will actually be considering legislation on this floor from March 1st until October 1st. How many weeks is that? Twenty-eight weeks.

Now, 10 of those 28 weeks we are going to be back in the districts; we

are going to be back for work periods just like the one coming up this week. We will be back for Easter. We will be back for Memorial Day. We will be back for the 4th of July. Ten of those 18 weeks we are going to be back home, where we should be, with our constituents. That leaves 18 weeks.

How many days are there, floor days, in 18 weeks? Seventy-eight. So now we are down to only 78 days on this floor when we can pass important legislation. But my colleagues have to remember that Tuesdays are suspension days, like this one that we are considering today. So noncontroversial matters will be coming up on those Tuesdays. There are 21 Tuesdays and other suspension days out of those 78. So subtracting 21 from 78 leaves 57, Mr. Speaker.

Now, that means that we are going to spend an awful lot of time back in our districts, where we should be finding out how our constituents feel about legislation, but we have only 57 days on this floor to pass a budget, to pass a supplemental, to pass a reconciliation bill, and to pass 13 appropriations bills.

Now, we all know these appropriators can use 57 days all by themselves just to pass 13 bills. So then comes all the other legislation that my colleagues and I are interested in. Whether it deals with education, whether it deals with a drug-free America, whether it deals with the very important issue of Iraq or Bosnia or these other issues, we have got to squeeze all that into 57 days on this floor. That is why we are here today, asking to create these 2 suspension days so that we can get by some of the noncontroversial issues.

So I hope I have given my colleague a little education lesson here, my good friend from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER), just how important this is.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding.

I came down to the well today to express my concern about this rule. I am concerned because this rule makes in order H.R. 1428, a bill that I think is probably one of the worst examples of legislation that I think I have seen since I have been here. I say that not as a matter of overstatement, but really just stating a fact.

The fact is, number one, the bill is unnecessary. We have current laws regarding voter eligibility. When a voter registers or when a prospective voter registers, he signs at the bottom that he is a U.S. citizen. That system of self-certification has worked for decades. We have a system to create criminal penalties if, in fact, someone is lying. It is called voter fraud. It is punishable today. We do not need a new law. This bill is unnecessary.

But second and probably most important, what I think repels me the most

is that this bill is vindictive. It is an attempt by the Republicans to intimidate and discourage Hispanic, Asian, and other minority voters. Under this bill, it is not enough that we sign and say that we are American citizens. Now this bill would allow local boards of elections to, quote, "verify us."

How does this verification process work? Well, it works like this: The local board can decide who and whether they want to verify individuals. They do not have to verify everyone; that might make some sense. They can pick and choose who they want to verify. When do they verify us? That is not specified in the bill. Potentially, we could come up on election day seeking to vote and be told, "Well, we have got to verify you first."

That is why it intimidates, that is why it discourages voters. And it is mainly being done because they tried to oust one of our own Democrats, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), and they were unsuccessful in doing so. They tried to suggest that there was voter fraud and they were not able to prove it. So now they come back with this vindictive bill to say, "Well, what we need to be able to do is verify people's eligibility."

Well, they say what we could do is, we could get the INS and Department of Social Security to verify people. Well, I have had experience with these agencies, and I can tell you that, though they do good work, they are ill-equipped.

My experience with INS and Social Security is that they are both well-intentioned agencies, but that they are ill-equipped to perform this verification process. They already have a backload performing the duties associated with their legitimate tasks.

INS certainly has more work than it can handle, seeking to find illegal aliens. We do not need them to be voter patrols, and that is what they would become.

Under this system, Americans would be intimidated, just as African Americans were intimidated years ago by attempts to thwart their voting rights. We do not need a bill like this. It is totally unnecessary.

People can certify themselves as Americans under the threat of criminal penalties. That is sufficient. It has worked in the past. I believe it will continue to work.

The only reason the Republicans are addressing this bill and advancing this bill is because they want to try to get back at a group of people that they could not defeat at the polls, and I think that is shameful.

So I hope today that we will, if we accept this rule, certainly when this bill comes up, H.R. 142, send it back where it belongs, and that is back to the back room of politics.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Members of this body is the chairman of our Education and Workforce Committee. He is the gentleman hailing from Pennsylvania (Mr. BILL GOODLING).

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wanted to point out that, as a matter of fact, the resolution that I am bringing here today has been around for at least 2 weeks, and the fine-tuning of the statistics were in the hands of the Democrats as of 6 o'clock last evening.

But the fine-tuning from statistics really does not amount to anything anyway because the resolution simply says, if this Congress is going to discuss child care, they will discuss it in relationship to all children. It does not tell how they should do it. It just says, since 70 percent of preschool children are not in a formal day care setting, we should also think about the parents of those 70 percent.

So even if we fine tuned the statistics, it does not matter because the resolution simply states that if the Congress is going to consider child care in this particular session, it should consider all children, it should consider all parents. The resolution is that simple.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 19½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is what I have always admired about the gentlewoman from New York. She gets the job done in a hurry, and I appreciate that. And, therefore, I am not going to let her outdo me. I am going to get the job done, too.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this resolution are postponed until 5 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED NEW TAX INCREASES

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will not bother taking the well, but I just wanted to say that last week President

Clinton proposed a budget with \$106 billion of new tax increases in it.

While all taxes punish personal thrift and freedom, the President's proposal to raise taxes on financial products which encourage long-term investment and savings are particularly ill-conceived.

It is incredible that the President, who is fully aware of the impending crisis in Social Security, would propose to hike taxes on the products that American families and businesses use to plan for their own retirements. Millions of American families use this very life insurance product to save for retirement, adding to the supplemental Social Security check that they might receive.

Mr. Speaker, surveys show that many moderate-income families use private sector retirement products such as annuities to plan for their future. In fact, many of the owners of annuities are women. They are women, 55 percent of whom are married, while 28 percent of them are widowed.

□ 1630

They are the people that control most of these small annuities in America.

The President proposes to increase the tax burden on these same annuities—annuities that 85% of the owners intend to use as the fundamental source of their retirement savings. Why should government discourage these families from saving their money?

Mr. Speaker, this is an irresponsible and ill-advised proposal for the many Americans struggling to get by and yet still plan for the future.

I urge my colleagues to reject President Clinton's tax increases on America's families and their future. The future of the American family deserves better.

EDUCATING AMERICA ON COLORECTAL CANCER

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I filed a resolution with 20 of my cosponsors, a bipartisan resolution, connected with colorectal cancer. We have spent a lot of time in the House talking about breast cancer and other forms of cancer and how important it is to be screened, but we have neglected colorectal cancer.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of New York, we are ninth in the number of fatalities. We have 55,000 people that die each year from an absolutely curable or preventable disease.

We think it is terribly important. We have asked Secretary Shalala of HHS if they will help formulate an educational process for both medical professionals and their patients to make sure Americans are screened for this disease. It is terribly important for women, because women have a feeling that this is a man's disease, but it is an equal-opportunity killer. We have some

Members of this House who are recovering from colorectal cancer who are sponsoring this bill, and I invite all my colleagues to join us in what I think is one of the most important health issues facing America. This disease is over 92 percent preventable. No one need die from colorectal cancer. It is up to us to educate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to House Resolution 352, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 191, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Combest	Goodling
Archer	Cook	Goss
Armey	Cooksey	Graham
Bachus	Cox	Granger
Baker	Crane	Greenwood
Ballenger	Crapo	Gutknecht
Barr	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hamilton
Bartlett	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Barton	Deal	Hastert
Bass	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Bateman	Dickey	Hayworth
Bereuter	Dreier	Hefley
Bilbray	Duncan	Herger
Bilirakis	Dunn	Hill
Bliley	Ehlers	Hilleary
Blunt	Ehrlich	Hobson
Boehlert	Emerson	Hoekstra
Boehner	English	Horn
Bonilla	Ensign	Hostettler
Brady	Everett	Houghton
Bryant	Ewing	Hulshof
Bunning	Fawell	Hunter
Burr	Foley	Hutchinson
Burton	Forbes	Hyde
Buyer	Fossella	Inglis
Calvert	Fowler	Istook
Camp	Fox	Jenkins
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Gallegly	Jones
Castle	Ganske	Kasich
Chabot	Gekas	Kelly
Chambliss	Gibbons	Kim
Chenoweth	Gilchrest	King (NY)
Christensen	Gillmor	Kingston
Coble	Gilman	Klug
Coburn	Goode	Knollenberg
Collins	Goodlatte	Kolbe