

I voted against the passage of this bill from the committee, and yet I know it is important for the process to continue. We have hope that additional dollars will be placed in this legislation before this bill returns from the Senate.

Two weeks ago I spoke on the House floor about the difficulties facing farmers in my State. I talked about corn prices at \$1.89 and gasoline at \$1.93. That does not work. Combines and custom cutters are working their way across Kansas now. Wheat prices dropped 25 cents last month; and when I looked at the board this morning, in Dodge City wheat was \$2.71, down another 4 cents.

Assistance today is important. Many of my farmers will not be able to wait around and see what happens with the farm bill and the improvements that we hope to make in agricultural policy in this Congress unless they have some dollars to tide them over now. The crisis is real, and the consequences of our failure to act are significant.

I joined the chairman in supporting an increase for assistance for farmers. Our position failed by one vote, 24 to 23. So even within the House Committee on Agriculture, there is disagreement in the best way to help producers. However, I think now is not the time to hold up this bill over our previous disagreements. It is time for those of us concerned about agriculture and rural America to come together and to work on behalf of our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

I look forward to that process continuing, and I look forward to working with my chairman and the ranking member to see that good things happen in Kansas and American agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time; and really for the benefit of some of my colleagues who are not from farm country, I thought I would like to take a minute today to talk about what is happening to agriculture here in the United States and around the world. Because it is easy for some people to say the problem is the farm bill, the problem is freedom to farm.

It may well be true that some of the problems we face in agriculture today were exacerbated by the last farm bill. But the truth of the matter is what we are into now is the 4th consecutive year of worldwide record production.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, I think against that backdrop with any farm policy in the United States, our farmers would be facing a tough year as it relates to our commodities.

The second thing we have to appreciate, in Europe we see huge subsidies for agriculture. Beyond that, we have permitted, we have allowed our trading competitors to subsidize their exports to the tune of \$6 billion while we limit

ourselves to \$200 million. We have put ourselves and our farmers behind the eight ball relative to our trade policy and relative to our agriculture policy. Ultimately that is all coming together.

There is a desperate need in agriculture today for some kind of help. We are here today, and the Committee on the Budget has responded appropriately. The bill in front of us today is the right answer. Ultimately there will be negotiations between the House and Senate and the White House, and hopefully this can be plussed up. There are serious problems in agriculture, most of which are not controllable by our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill, and I hope all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in supporting this legislation today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I associate myself with all of the remarks saying we should do more; but I would also point out that this amount of money today is within the budget that was passed that we have agreed to live under this year. I think that is a significant point. And also, as the chairman pointed out in his opening remarks, time is of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, we must have this bill to the President for his signature by August 1 if we are to have any hope of dealing with the multitude of problems that this bill is designed to help.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to pass this bill today and move the process forward, and encourage the other body to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and 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 of the 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 indi-

cated is needed. 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 my farmers in the Second Congressional District need today. The \$5.5 billion is not sufficient to address all the farming needs, but it goes a long way in helping our family farmers. Input costs have skyrocketed for every one including our farming community. I hope this supplemental bill moves quickly to help alleviate some of these costs.

I am happy with the way our peanut farmers concerns have been addressed in this bill, \$25.83 a ton for quota peanuts and \$13.55 for additional peanuts will help ease the burden that our peanut farmers face today.

I am glad that we continue as we should stand by our American farmers. This will provide immediate relief while our Committee continues to work hard on drafting the new Farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2213 and speedily get these funds to our farmers.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2213, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 the bill (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 for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "for administration" 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 26, line 10; 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. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it 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. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment 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.

UNFUNDED MANDATE POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. 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: "All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived." Therefore, I make a point of order that this bill may not be considered pursuant to section 426.

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 has 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 343 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 jurisdictions which comprised 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.

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.

□ 1230

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 overzealous 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 term Canaveral. In the early 1970s, the Florida State legislature showed its defiance by enacting legislation to rename the cape 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, our first President and 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 historical 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 to rename 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 under Federal 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 naming 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 by government-imposed symbols and messages intended to shape public consciousness in conformity with a contemporary agenda. Such bombardment is unquestionably the aim 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 urge 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 to rest fears that 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.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2001.

Hon. JAMES P. MORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

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.

UMRA 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).

My colleague may claim as he did last night in the Committee on Rules that this provision is impractical. However, in the past, Metro has made name changes to other existing stations, changes that have been just as long and in some cases longer. A station in Virginia that is George Mason University, you would see GMU University. And so we could say RR National Airport. We could look at other provisions where Metro has worked on it.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note, as I who have always watched closely unfunded mandates to make sure that we are not saddling

local government with an unfair burden. I have cited for the record the threshold of \$56 million. But I also must bring out something else very important to my colleagues, that is, when we look at the report which we will consider in the rule and then following as the debate goes on the floor for the transportation appropriations committee, we will find on page 111 that under section 9, Formula Money, that the signs are eligible for funding for the \$30 million that Metro will receive from the Federal Government as this year's allocation of appropriation just under section 9. That is \$30 million, of which a half a million dollars is eligible for signage.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia helped craft the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and in playing such a key role in that creation, he should know that these thresholds were instilled to prevent time-consuming and unwarranted attacks on House legislation. While I appreciate my colleague's efforts to uphold the integrity of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, this is clearly a dilatory tactic meant to delay consideration of the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 esti-

mates; 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, quote, "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 to a specific institution in neighborhoods with many 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,

which are unfunded mandates? 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 correctly, 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 from out of town 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 Metro 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.

□ 1245

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. 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.

Mr. Speaker, 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 of America through 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. Yet this time it is different. The two sides 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 this system. This change would cost, at most, several thousand dollars. The inflated estimates that we hear from the other side are just inflated propaganda estimates. They do not reflect reality. They do not reflect the reality of any of the other name changes.

This is not an unfunded mandate. This is a proper rule, and, as I say to the distinguished gentleman on the other side, let this issue die. This has never been a problem with this or any other Metro board. I would say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Let us move forward. There are other pressing matters that relate to the Metro board. I think the gentleman would agree with that. Yet they are stubbornly, and with the support of the gentleman, refusing to simply do what the board has done in every other instance, and every other transit board has always done, whether it is reflecting the name of John F. Kennedy or former President Eisenhower or anybody else, and simply make the changes and let us move on.

Would the gentleman agree that that makes sense, let us just move on?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. No, I do not agree. The gentleman's recollection of the facts is not accurate.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I take back my time. That is what I suspected, and I wanted to give the gentleman the benefit of the doubt and get him on record.

The other side is not interested in just moving on. We are, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking for anything out of the ordinary, out of standard operating procedure, but to simply say the name of the airport has been lawfully changed. It was signed by a Democrat President into law over 3 years ago. It is high time that the Metro board did what they have done in every other situation. Change the name. Let us move on with this rule and move on with the adoption of the appropriations bill for the American people.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not in order to force name changes upon local governments when they are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record, there have been eight proposals, as I cited in my opening remarks, in which WMATA rejected renaming proposals, some of them equally as long as this one.

Secondly, the naming of National Airport was flawed in its inception.

Some years ago when Senator Dole proposed changing the name of Dulles Airport, his legislation left it up to the airport authority to make the decision; did not shove it down their throats.

As for the gentleman's comment about get over it, we are not the ones proposing name changes. It is the other side. I say to the gentleman, get over it. Stop acting like a playground bully trying to shove Reagan's name down the throats of every place in this country.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge this body not to force Washington's local governments to pay \$400,000 with local funds to make a name change to a transit station. It does not fit in length. It does not fit with the policy of naming stations after places rather than people. In attempting to honor Reagan, we are contradicting everything he stood for. I have several quotes that I ought not to have to share with the body where President Reagan urged us to respect local government. This is not respecting local government. What is being said is, we stand by Reagan's principles as long as it suits our politics. That is not right. The principle of deference to local government is correct, and in this case it is being violated not only with the naming of the airport, but certainly with the naming of the transit station.

I would urge my colleagues to read George Will. I would urge them to read President Reagan's statements, and I would particularly urge them to abide by President Reagan's principles of recognition and respect for local government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, to close, we have a rule before us. The gentleman has brought a point of order. I disagree with the point of order. While very, very sensitive to local government unfunded mandates, we have a threshold. It is \$56 million. This is a normal course of business, as both my colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), have pointed out in their opposition to this point of order.

Most important, I have also cited in my opening that on page 111 of the report, which we are going to consider as the rule is hopefully passed and 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 so that we may continue consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, an aye vote is a vote for continuation of the consideration of

the resolution. I urge an aye vote as we move forward from the point of order on to the rule and then to the legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 202, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Gekas	McKeon
Akin	Gibbons	Mica
Armey	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Bachus	Gillmor	Miller, Gary
Baker	Gilman	Moran (KS)
Ballenger	Goode	Myrick
Barr	Goodlatte	Nethercutt
Bartlett	Goss	Ney
Barton	Graham	Northup
Bass	Granger	Norwood
Bereuter	Graves	Nussle
Biggert	Green (WI)	Osborne
Bilirakis	Greenwood	Ose
Blunt	Hart	Otter
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Boehner	Hayes	Paul
Bonilla	Hayworth	Pence
Bono	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Brady (TX)	Heger	Petri
Brown (SC)	Hilleary	Pickering
Bryant	Hobson	Pitts
Burr	Hoekstra	Pombo
Buyer	Hooley	Portman
Callahan	Horn	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Hostettler	Quinn
Camp	Houghton	Radanovich
Cannon	Hulshof	Ramstad
Cantor	Hunter	Regula
Capito	Hutchinson	Rehberg
Castle	Hyde	Reynolds
Chabot	Isakson	Riley
Chambliss	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Coble	Istook	Rogers (MI)
Collins	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooksey	Johnson (IL)	Rothman
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Crane	Jones (NC)	Royce
Crenshaw	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cubin	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Saxton
Cunningham	Kerns	Scarborough
Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Schaffer
Deal	Kingston	Schrock
DeLay	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
DeMint	Knollenberg	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Shadegg
Dreier	LaHood	Shaw
Duncan	Largent	Shays
Dunn	Latham	Sherwood
Ehlers	Leach	Shimkus
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Simmons
English	Linder	Simpson
Everett	LoBiondo	Skeen
Ferguson	Lucas (OK)	Smith (MI)
Flake	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fletcher	McCrary	Smith (TX)
Foley	McHugh	Souder
Forbes	McInnis	Spence
Fossella		Stearns
Frelinghuysen		Stump
Gallegly		Sununu
Ganske		Sweeney

Tancredo	Toomey	Weldon (FL)
Tauzin	Trafcant	Weldon (PA)
Taylor (NC)	Upton	Weller
Terry	Vitter	Whitfield
Thomas	Walden	Wicker
Thornberry	Walsh	Wilson
Thune	Wamp	Wolf
Tiahrt	Watkins (OK)	Young (AK)
Tiberi	Watts (OK)	Young (FL)

NAYS—202

Abercrombie	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Green (TX)	Morella
Allen	Gutierrez	Murtha
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Baca	Harman	Napolitano
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Baldacci	Hill	Oberstar
Baldwin	Hilliard	Obey
Barcia	Hinchee	Olver
Barrett	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Becerra	Hoeffel	Owens
Bentsen	Holden	Pallone
Berkley	Holt	Pascarell
Berman	Honda	Pastor
Berry	Hoyer	Pelosi
Bishop	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Blagojevich	Israel	Phelps
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Borski	(TX)	Rahall
Boswell	Jefferson	Rangel
Boucher	John	Reyes
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Capps	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rush
Cardin	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Carson (IN)	Kleczka	Sanchez
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	Sanders
Clay	LaFalce	Sandlin
Clayton	Lampson	Sawyer
Clyburn	Langevin	Schakowsky
Condit	Lantos	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott
Costello	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Coyne	Lee	Sherman
Cramer	Levin	Shows
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cummings	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Lowey	Solis
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)	Spratt
Davis, Tom	Luther	Stark
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeGette	Markey	Strickland
Delahunt	Mascara	Stupak
DeLauro	Matheson	Tanner
Deutsch	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Thurman
Dooley	McDermott	Tierney
Doyle	McGovern	Towns
Edwards	McIntyre	Turner
Engel	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Meehan	Velazquez
Evans	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Fattah	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Filner	Millender	Waxman
Ford	McDonald	Weiner
Frank	Miller, George	Wexler
Frost	Mink	Woolsey
Gephardt	Mollohan	Wu
Gonzalez	Moore	Wynn

NOT VOTING—12

Burton	LaTourette	Putnam
Clement	Maloney (CT)	Smith (WA)
Doolittle	Payne	Tauscher
Kaptur	Platts	Watson (CA)

□ 1317

Messrs. BERRY, STARK, TAYLOR of Mississippi and Ms. KILPATRICK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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.

Stated against:

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 190, I was delayed because of constituents in my office, however, I would have voted "no" on the question of consideration.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 178 is an open rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 2299, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations for the Fiscal Year ending September 30, 2002. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule also provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

In addition, the rule waives clause 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 priority 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 and the highways each year, 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 transpor-

tation 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 \$29 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 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 \$600 million for 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. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for all of their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor. The members of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation have brought us a good bill that funds a number of vital transportation projects, including one important to my congressional 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 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 important amendment relating to the safety issues 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 6½ 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 standards, much 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 Democrats, who address 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 motor carrier that seeks to operate throughout 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 operating 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 I35 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 I35 to reach 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 Presi-

dent 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 in 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.

□ 1330

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 the 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 above the current year, an 800 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 has 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. FROST. Madam Speaker, 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. SABO) 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 astronomical. Those trucks should not be on the 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 put 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 assure 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 egregiously erroneous for the House not to allow a debate on the Sabo amendment, and that is why I would vote against the rule and urge that other Members do likewise.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, first, I rise in support of the rule. I share the concern that the gentleman from Wis-

consin (Mr. OBEY) is raising about Mexican trucks. This is the wrong place and the wrong way to address it, in an appropriations bill. I think there is a lot of concern over 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, Subcommittee 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 Enforcement 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 support not only 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 end of the day, 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, in my judgment, 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, 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 accidents involving big trucks 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, we find that 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.

□ 1345

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

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time, and I thank my colleague from Minnesota for raising this issue.

The Sabo-Ney amendment, bipartisan amendment, is in conformity with the February 6 ruling of the NAFTA arbitration panel on cross-border trucking services. The panel found that "inadequacies of the Mexican regulatory system provide an insufficient legal basis" to maintain a blanket moratorium on cross-border trucking. But it made it very clear that the United States could treat applications from Mexican trucking firms in a manner different from U.S. firms as long as they are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. That is what this issue is about.

We do not inspect all these trucks coming in from Mexico. Less than 1 percent of all northbound crossings at the Mexican border were subject to inspection last year. One-third of the Mexican-domiciled trucks were found unsafe, so unsafe inspectors removed the trucks or removed the drivers from service, a 50 percent higher out-of-service ratio than we have in the United States. Obvious reason, there are no permanent truck inspection facilities at 25 of 27 southern border crossings that account for 3½ million northbound trucks every year.

There is no systematic method in place to verify registration on Mexican-domiciled trucks. The inspector general of our DOT found 254 Mexican trucks operating illegally beyond the commercial zones in 24 States. Those trucks are in a position to kill our constituents. Five thousand people a year die in truck-car accidents. There are going to be half as many more deaths if we allow these Mexican trucks to come unsafely into the United States.

They have a woefully inadequate safety regime in Mexico, no systemic safety rating process, no truck weight enforcement process, no roadside domestic inspection program, no hours of service regulations in Mexico, no credible enforcement of drug and alcohol testing. We ought to defeat the rule, allow the Sabo amendment to be offered.

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 of the 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 Depart-

ment of Public Service told us a truck that is not inspected will be neglected. 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. There is absolutely no discussion here about trying to put the same restrictions on Canadian trucks, for example. This simply seems to be an effort to try to discriminate and target Mexican trucks.

Again, let me emphasize that, in the State of Texas, like in my area that I represent spans 800 miles of the Texas-Mexico border. We want the trucks. 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, it has now caused it to be 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 populations along the Texas-Mexico border, benefit from free trade. Stop discrimi-

nating 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 through.

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 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 further yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman aware that the Department of Transportation, in fact the Motor Carrier Safety Administration, currently is 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, 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, reclaiming 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 complied 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 sometime 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 about the insurance of the driver. They know nothing about the history of the driver or their safety or how long they have worked.

If you go to Texas, and we were in the district of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), who just spoke, in Laredo, there is no inspection. In fact, the Department of Transportation of Texas and the local officials in Laredo have great controversy of what kind of inspection should go on. There will not be inspection stations in there under whatever plan, I assume a secret plan that the President has, to inspect in Texas, because they cannot come to any agreement on what could happen there.

I tell my colleagues, if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) wants those problems in Laredo, that is fine. But let us leave them there and not go to the rest of the Nation where we have problems. I urge a no vote on this amendment. I urge we protect U.S. citizens and the driving public throughout America.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

President Bush's decision to open the border to Mexican trucks is wrong. A report released on May 8th from the Department of Transportation's inspector general showed the U.S. Border Patrol can only inspect 1 percent, 46,000 of the 4.5 million trucks that were crossing the border.

Three years ago, at my expense, I went to Laredo, Nuevo Laredo. I went to the border and watched the truck inspections. One person was inspecting trucks that day. Two thousand five hundred trucks were going through the border at Laredo; one inspector working for Governor George W. Bush and the Department of Public Safety in Texas.

I asked him how many trucks he inspected a day. He said 10 to 12. I said, how many trucks do you take out of service each day? He said, somewhere between about 9 to 11.

He had told us, complained that the State of Texas had not fixed the scales which had been broken for 3 months, that the State of Texas and the Government of the United States simply were not very interested in truck safety.

Whether these trucks, these 2,500 a day that were going from Nuevo Laredo to Laredo, Texas, the 4.5 million trucks a year, whether they have faulty brakes or tire failures or loads that exceed weight limits, Mexican trucks fail to meet American standards.

Mexican trucks on average are 10 years older than U.S. trucks. A truck driver in the United States cannot get a license until 21. 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.

□ 1400

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	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Akin	Graham	Petri
Army	Granger	Pickering
Bachus	Graves	Pitts
Baker	Green (WI)	Pombo
Ballenger	Greenwood	Portman
Barr	Grucci	Pryce (OH)
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Quinn
Barton	Hansen	Radanovich
Bass	Hart	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Biggert	Hayes	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Reynolds
Blunt	Hefley	Riley
Boehlert	Hergert	Rogers (KY)
Boehner	Hilleary	Rogers (MI)
Bonilla	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Horn	Roukema
Brown (SC)	Hostettler	Royce
Bryant	Houghton	Ryan (WI)
Burr	Hulshof	Ryan (KS)
Buyer	Hunter	Saxton
Callahan	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Calvert	Hyde	Schaffer
Camp	Isakson	Schrock
Cannon	Issa	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Istook	Sessions
Capito	Jenkins	Shadegg
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Shays
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Sherwood
Coble	Jones (NC)	Shimkus
Collins	Keller	Shuster
Combust	Kelly	Simmons
Cooksey	Kennedy (MN)	Simpson
Cox	Kerns	Skeen
Crane	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	Kirk	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Souder
Cunningham	Kolbe	Spence
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Largent	Stump
Deal	Latham	Sununu
DeLay	Leach	Sweeney
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Doolittle	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	LoBiondo	Terry
Duncan	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Dunn	Manzullo	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCrery	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Tiahrt
Emerson	McInnis	Tiberi
English	McKeon	Toomey
Everett	Mica	Traficant
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Upton
Flake	Miller, Gary	Vitter
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Walden
Foley	Morella	Walsh
Forbes	Myrick	Wamp
Fossella	Nethercutt	Watkins (OK)
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Watts (OK)
Gallely	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Ganske	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Nussle	Weller
Gibbons	Osborne	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Ose	Wicker
Gillmor	Otter	Wilson
Gilman	Oxley	Wolf
Goode	Paul	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Pence	Young (FL)

NAYS—205

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Condit
Ackerman	Bonior	Conyers
Allen	Borski	Costello
Andrews	Boswell	Coyne
Baca	Boucher	Cramer
Baird	Boyd	Crowley
Baldacci	Brady (PA)	Cummings
Baldwin	Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Barrett	Capps	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Capuano	DeFazio
Bentsen	Cardin	DeGette
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Delahunt
Berman	Carson (OK)	DeLauro
Berry	Clay	Deutsch
Bishop	Clayton	Dicks
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Dingell

Doggett	Larson (CT)	Rangel
Dooley	Lee	Reyes
Doyle	Levin	Rivers
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Engel	Lipinski	Roemer
Eshoo	Lofgren	Ross
Etheridge	Lowe	Rothman
Evans	Lucas (KY)	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Luther	Rush
Fattah	Maloney (CT)	Sabo
Filner	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez
Ford	Markey	Sanders
Frank	Mascara	Sandlin
Frust	Matheson	Sawyer
Gephardt	Matsui	Schakowsky
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Schiff
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Green (TX)	McCollum	Serrano
Gutierrez	McDermott	Sherman
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Shows
Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Skelton
Harman	McKinney	Slaughter
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Smith (WA)
Hill	Meehan	Snyder
Hinchev	Meek (FL)	Solis
Hoefel	Meeks (NY)	Spratt
Holden	Menendez	Stark
Holt	Millender-	Stenholm
Honda	McDonald	Strickland
Hooley	Miller, George	Stupak
Hoyer	Mink	Tanner
Inslee	Mollohan	Tauscher
Israel	Moore	Taylor (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Thompson (MS)
(TX)	Nadler	Thurman
Jefferson	Napolitano	Tierney
John	Neal	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Turner
Jones (OH)	Obey	Udall (CO)
Kanjorski	Olver	Udall (NM)
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Velazquez
Kildee	Owens	Visclosky
Kilpatrick	Pallone	Waters
Kind (WI)	Pascrell	Watson (CA)
Kleczka	Pastor	Watt (NC)
Kucinich	Pelosi	Waxman
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Lampson	Phelps	Wexler
Langevin	Pomeroy	Woolsey
Lantos	Price (NC)	Wu
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Burton	Hinojosa	Payne
Clement	Kaptur	Platts
Hilliard	LaTourette	Putnam

□ 1426

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. CAPPIS, and Messrs. BECERRA, INS-LEE and JONES of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HOUGHTON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced 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 the 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:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie	DeMint	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	Deutsch	(TX)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Jefferson
Akin	Dicks	John
Allen	Dingell	Johnson (CT)
Andrews	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Army	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Baca	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Bachus	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Baird	Dunn	Jones (OH)
Baker	Edwards	Kanjorski
Baldacci	Ehlers	Keller
Baldwin	Ehrlich	Kelly
Ballenger	Emerson	Kennedy (MN)
Barcia	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Barr	English	Kerns
Barrett	Eshoo	Kildee
Bartlett	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Barton	Evans	Kind (WI)
Bass	Everett	King (NY)
Becerra	Farr	Kingston
Bentsen	Fattah	Kirk
Bereuter	Ferguson	Kleczka
Berkley	Filner	Knollenberg
Berman	Flake	Kolbe
Berry	Fletcher	Kucinich
Biggert	Foley	LaFalce
Bilirakis	Forbes	LaHood
Bishop	Ford	Lampson
Blagojevich	Fossella	Langevin
Blumenauer	Frank	Lantos
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Boehlert	Frost	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Gallegly	Larsen (CT)
Bonilla	Ganske	Latham
Bonior	Gekas	Leach
Bono	Gephardt	Lee
Borski	Gibbons	Levin
Boswell	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Boyd	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Linder
Brady (TX)	Goode	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Brown (OH)	Gordon	Lofgren
Brown (SC)	Goss	Lowe
Burr	Graham	Lucas (KY)
Buyer	Granger	Lucas (OK)
Callahan	Graves	Luther
Camp	Green (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Cannon	Green (WI)	Maloney (NY)
Cantor	Greenwood	Manzullo
Capito	Grucci	Markey
Capps	Gutierrez	Mascara
Capuano	Gutknecht	Matheson
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Carson (OK)	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)
Castle	Harman	McCollum
Chabot	Hart	McCrery
Chambliss	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McGovern
Clayton	Hayes	McHugh
Clyburn	Hayworth	McInnis
Coble	Hefley	McIntyre
Collins	Hergert	McKinney
Combust	Hill	McNulty
Condit	Hinchev	Meehan
Conyers	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Cooksey	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Costello	Hoefel	Menendez
Cox	Hoekstra	Mica
Coyne	Holden	Millender-
Cramer	Holt	McDonald
Crane	Honda	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Hooley	Miller, George
Crowley	Horn	Mink
Cubin	Hostettler	Mollohan
Culberson	Houghton	Moore
Cummings	Hoyer	Moran (KS)
Davis (CA)	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Davis (FL)	Hunter	Morella
Davis (IL)	Hutchinson	Murtha
Davis (MO)	Hyde	Myrick
Davis, Jo Ann	Inslee	Nadler
Davis, Tom	Isakson	Napolitano
Deal	Israel	Neal
DeFazio	Issa	Nethercutt
DeGette	Istook	Ney
Delahunt	Jackson (IL)	Northup
DeLauro		Norwood