every year, which makes them an increasingly ripe target for attack by everyone from militias to drug gangs to common criminals. In fiscal year 1995, the FBI investigated nearly 70 armored car robberies. In the first 6 months of 1996, they investigated more than 30 new cases of robbery attempts against armored cars and their crews, and I know that it comes as no surprise that there were injuries and fatalities in a number of these cases, as pointed out by previous speakers.

Armored car crews are trained professionals who need to be able to protect themselves and their cargo against attack. This bill simply makes it easier for these companies and employees to operate safely and legally and safely in interstate commerce, and that is why I have supported this legislation in the past, why I continue to support it today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] for what he has done on this bill and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] for bringing this bill to the House floor.

In the United States armored cars are used to transport millions and millions of dollars in currency, coins, food stamps, and other valuable property. The Federal Government remains the largest customer to the armored car industry. As a result of their cargo, armored cars are often a target of crime. In order to protect the safety of both the cargo and the individuals responsible for its transport, we are once again considering amendments to the Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have been an original cosponsor of similar legislation which passed the House unanimously during the 104th Congress.

The need for these amendments can be illustrated by an incident, a case in New Jersey, in which the operation of an armored car across the State lines almost ended in the loss of $40 million in very valuable Federal property. The armored car was stopped by a policeman for a traffic violation, and when the licenses were checked of the armored car guards, it is found that they did not have the proper permit, and they were arrested for carrying a weapon without a permit in that State. The armored car remained on the side of the highway overnight, containing $40 million worth of very valuable property. Had the amendments we are considering today been in place, the potential for a financial detrimental situation could have been avoided altogether.

I think it important, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that these amendments do not place weapons in the hands of additional people. The reciprocity of the licenses extends only to those professionals who have obtained a weapons license in that primary State of employment, and of course when they get this permit, they must commit to a safety test, and their record is checked and a background check is made.

Since the genesis of this legislation involves the reciprocity of weapons licenses, I want to briefly mention legislation that I have introduced to allow reciprocity for concealed weapons, licenses that would be given to individuals. H.R. 339 establishes the right-to-carry parameters across State lines. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in support of further reciprocity for gun owners.

Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with an easy task. By passing H.R. 624 we will remove the barriers that currently inhibit interstate travel of armored cars. It is senseless that armored car guards who have met the professional licensing requirements to carry a weapon in one State should be required to obtain a license in every State that they travel through when they are transporting their cargos.

So I urge passage of this bill and I again compliment the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have no more requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume merely to again thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] for his extraordinary help and cooperation in moving this bill forward, and all the members of our subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce who participated in this effort, and I urge final passage of the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 624, the Armored Car Reciprocity Improvement Act.

In the United States, armored cars are used everyday to transport millions of dollars in currency, coins, food stamps, and other valuable property for both private entities and the Federal Government. The value of this cargo is not in dispute, but the ability of those charged with the responsibility of transporting it is.

The legitimacy of those who currently transport cargo by armored car across State lines, must be universally recognized by all States. H.R. 624 will go a long way in accomplishing this goal.

This bill will accomplish several important functions for the armor car industry and its customers, who depend on the ability of armored cars and their attendants to function across the State lines.

The bill requires that a criminal background check be conducted on an individual applying for a firearms license only when that person applies for his or her initial license, and it clarifies that it is the State that must conduct the initial criminal background check, and not some third party.

Finally, this bill would establish that reciprocity be granted for both weapons licenses and any other permits or licenses required in a State, if the crew member has met all relevant requirements for working as an armored car crew member in the State in which he or she is primarily employed.

Currently, only five States meet the eligibility requirements for reciprocity under the Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993. It is estimated that the change in the law proposed by this bill would enable 28 other States to become immediately eligible for reciprocity.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 624.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. 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. 624 and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REPEALING FEDERAL CHARTER OF GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to repeal the Federal charter of Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 497

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF FEDERAL CHARTER OF GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.

(a) REPEAL OF FEDERAL CHARTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Act entitled ''An Act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.'', approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1412), is repealed.

(2) AUTHORIZATION TO FILE ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION.—Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. is hereby authorized to file articles of incorporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect upon the filing and effectiveness of articles of incorporation of Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

(b) EFFECTS OF BECOMING A DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NONPROFIT CORPORATION.—Effective

upon the filing and effectiveness of articles of incorporation of Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. as authorized in paragraph (2) of subsection (a), Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc.—

(1) Shall be District of Columbia nonprofit corporation subject to he articles of incorporation;

(2) shall be deemed organized and existing under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 4 of the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act regarding organizations subject to any of the provisions of the insurance laws of the District of Columbia;

(3) shall be legally domiciled in the District of Columbia;

(4) shall be regulated by the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia in accordance with the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia;

(5) shall continue to exist; and

(6) shall continue to be authorized to transact business—

(A) under existing certificates of authority and licenses issued to Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. before such filing and effectiveness,

(B) under the name ''Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc.'', and

(C) under applicable laws and regulations.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.

Notwithstanding section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act (sec. 1–233(c)(1), D.C. Code), the Hospital and Medical Services Corporation Regulatory Act of 1996 (D.C. Act 11–505) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of such Act or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 497 repeals the Federal charter of the Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Plan of the National Capital Area.

GHMSI, as it is known, is the only insurance company to have a Federal charter. It was granted in 1939. Under the charter, provision is made for its repeal by Congress.

The GHMSI Federal charter has become an anachronism and an impediment to competition. This bill seeks to level the playing field. When granted in 1939, the District of Columbia Code did not have provisions to regulate such an entity. It has had such regulatory provisions now for a number of years. As recently as 1992 and 1993, Congress amended the charter to specify that GHMSI be domiciled in the District and governed by local laws and regulations. At the present time, GHMSI is subject to the District's Nonprofit Corporation Act and is under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance.

By waiving the congressional review period for D.C. Act 11–505, as provided for in this bill, the new entity, upon acceptance of its articles of incorporation, will continue to be governed by local laws without a gap or a delay in enforcement. The bill authorizes GHMSI to file articles of incorporation under the District's Nonprofit Corporation Act. The new entity would continue to be governed under its existing certificate of authority and licenses and will continue to be bound by applicable laws and regulations. Local regulation would continue to be the responsibility of the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 497 is necessary because of the significant changes which have occurred in health care delivery systems nationwide and in the Washington metropolitan area. These changes are the result of market-based reforms stimulated by the growth of managed care. Health care plans must now compete to survive. Successful plans must be keyed to consumers, markets, and products. All other Blue Cross plans in the country are State-chartered corporations operated under State regulatory oversight. GHMSI alone needs congressional approval to change its corporate structure.

These arguments are not theoretical. On January 14, 1997, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of the National Capital Area and Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Maryland signed a letter of intent to combine by forming a nonprofit holding company, with both plans as subsidiaries. This is subject to review by the insurance commissioners for Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, but without this bill Congress would also have to vote its approval. To require congressional approval of such an action puts GHMSI at a competitive disadvantage.

This bill is essential in order for GHMSI to fully compete in the marketplace and for the ability of subscribers in the region to obtain and maintain quality and affordable health care benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make very clear that GHMSI will be the very same corporation after the repeal of the Federal charter as it was before the repeal of the Federal charter. This is merely a change in identity, form, or place of organization for the group health of GHMSI of the type recognized as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING H.R. 497, TO REPEAL THE FEDERAL CHARTER OF GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.

Q. What does this bill do?

A: It repeals the Federal Charter of Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. This is the entity that holds a license from the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association to do business as Blue Cross and Blue Shield of the National Capital Area.

Q: Why repeal the federal charter?

A: To help regional consumers by giving the District Blues the same flexibility that all other health insurance companies in the country have. The charter has become an anachronism and an impediment to competition. GHMSI is the only health insurance company to hold a federal charter. This bill creates a more level playing field.

Q: When was the federal charter granted?

A: It dates back to 1939, when there was no local home rule in the District of Columbia and no local laws governing nonprofit health insurance companies. There is now a Superintendent of Insurance in the District and a local Nonprofit Corporation Act.

Q: How are other Blue Cross plans in the country treated?

A: All others are state chartered corporations operating under state regulatory oversight. GHMSI alone needs congressional approval to change its corporate structure.

Q: Does Blue Cross support this bill?

A: Yes. In fact, they requested it.

Q: Does the bill effect any other health insurance company in the country?

A: No. The bill, if enacted, would become part of the District of Columbia Code.

Q: Does the bill have any impact on federal employees?

A: No.

Q: Is the bill supported by District local officials?

A: Yes. It is supported by locally elected officials and by the control board.

Q: Does the bill change anything for Blue Cross subscribers?

A: Not at all.

Q: Does the bill have any direct effect on the federal budget?

A: No. The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation have so stated in writing.

Q: Has this bill been introduced before?

A: No. But it was included in the Omnibus Continuing Resolution passed by the House last year.

Q: Is there any known opposition to this bill at the present time?

A: No. Co-sponsors include members of the regional delegation from both sides of the aisle.

Q: Does the bill have any impact on for-profit health insurance companies?

A: No.

Q: How does this bill compare to the laws governing nonprofit health insurance companies in the bordering states of Maryland and Virginia?

A: It establishes comparability. The bill authorizes GHMSI to file articles of incorporation under the District's Nonprofit Corporation Act. The new entity would continue to be governed under its existing certificates of authority and licenses. It would continue to be bound by applicable laws and regulations. Local regulation would continue to be by the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia upon certification of the articles of incorporation.

Q: Is this bill strictly theoretical?

A: No. On January 14, 1997 Blue Cross/Blue Shield of the National Capital Area and Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Maryland signed a Letter of Intent to combine by forming a holding company, with both plans as subsidiaries. This is subject to review by the insurance commissioners for Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Without this bill Congress would also have to vote its approval. To require congressional approval of such an action puts the Blues at a competitive disadvantage. Successful plans, reflecting market-based reforms, must compete to survive by being keyed to consumers.

Q: What about the waiver provision in the bill for D.C. Act 11–505?

A: This is necessary in order to insure that there will be no delay and no gap in enforcement of local laws to the new nonprofit Blue

Cross company authorized by this bill. D.C. Act 11–505 is the new Hospital and Medical Services Corporation Act enacted by the District government. It passed unanimously and was approved by the control board.

Q: Is there any known opposition to D.C. Act 11–505?

A: No. It was transmitted to Congress by the District Government on February 4, 1997.

Q: What happens if the congressional review period for D.C. Act 11–505 is not waived?

A: Then the enactment could not pass into the District Code until after H.R. 479 passes, hence creating a likely delay in enforcement. Thus, this section of the bill was included out of an abundance of caution.

Q: Why was D.C. Act 11–505 deemed necessary?

A: Because otherwise there would be no local laws governing GHMSI or its successor corporation in the District of Columbia. GHMSI is now operating under a consent order with the District of Columbia Insurance Administration. The original federal charter expressly exempts GHMSI from District Government regulation, though this was amended by Congress in 1992 to permit such regulation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for allowing us to expedite consideration of this bill, and I want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee chair, the gentleman from Virginia [TOM DAVIS], for his work in making certain that this bill came to the floor this morning.

Mr. Speaker, in August 1939 Congress granted a Federal charter to Group Hospitalization, Inc., which authorized it to arrange for the provision of hospital services on a nonprofit basis to individuals residing in the District of Columbia. This was necessary because, at the time, the District had no laws in place to regulate nonprofit health insurance companies and, of course, there was no self-government at the time, but this body was the legislating body for the District of Columbia. The District only had the means to regulate mutual insurance companies, which group hospitalization did not wish to become. As a consequence, Group Hospitalization, Inc. began its operations exempt from local regulation.

In October 1984, the charter was amended to expand Group Hospitalization's purpose beyond arranging for hospital services to include arranging for the provision of medical services on a nonprofit basis. This amendment also provided for a change of the company's name to Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., otherwise known as GHMSI. GHMSI is currently licensed by the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association to do business as Blue Cross and Blue Shield of the National Capital area.

□ 1145

In the early 1990's, GHMSI's management engaged in a wide range of questionable business practices which threatened the corporation's financial stability. The Senate Government Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations held hearings on the situation. The subcommittee determined that the situation might have been avoided had GHMSI been fully regulated by the District government.

To remedy this situation and protect the interests of the citizens served by GHMSI, the Congress amended its charter in both 1992 and 1993 to provide that it be licensed and regulated by the District government.

Last December, the District government enacted the Hospital and Medical Services Corporation Regulatory Act. This legislation establishes an improved statutory framework for the District's insurance administration to regulate GHMSI and any other similar nonprofit insurance corporations.

Last month GHMSI and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Maryland announced that they had signed a letter of intent to combine their business operations through the formation of a nonprofit holding company. Both health plans will continue to operate as subsidiaries of the holding company. This arrangement is expected to enhance their financial stability and provide their members with access to a wider array of service providers.

The completion of this transaction would be made possible by the repeal of GHMSI's Federal charter. However, it would still be subject to regulatory reviews and approvals by the insurance commissioners of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

Today, GHMSI is the only federally chartered health insurance corporation. All other Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans and all other commercial insurance companies are State chartered and subject to State regulatory oversight.

In order for GHMSI to make a change in its corporate structure, the Congress would have to amend its charter. This is a burdensome process that encumbers GHMSI's efficient operation.

In order to enable GHMSI to compete within the insurance industry on a level playing field, it is appropriate that Congress grant its request to repeal the charter and allow the local government to exclusively regulate GHMSI's affairs.

This bill is fully in keeping with self-government and home rule. We therefore have before us, Mr. Speaker, a bill that facilitates the operations of a very important company located in the District of Columbia at the same time that it removes a remnant from the prehome rule period of the District of Columbia. So it serves the interests of all involved. I am pleased that it also serves the interests of the local governments in the neighboring regions as well.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the proposal that we are considering today will help bring improved services and benefits to the many Blue Cross/Blue Shield subscribers in my district in Baltimore and to many of the constituents of representatives from suburban Maryland, Northern Virginia, and Washington, DC.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia for introducing this necessary legislation.

This bill extinguishes the Federal charter of Blue Cross/Blue Shield of the National Capital Area, which will permit it to organize and come under the jurisdiction of D.C. insurance laws—as it should have long ago. A merger between the National Capital area Blue Cross/Blue Shield and Maryland Blue Cross/Blue Shield will create a $3 billion-dollar-a-year nonprofit company—providing health care coverage to 25 percent of the 8 million residents of Maryland, the District, and the Northern Virginia suburbs.

Just as important, my constituents in Baltimore that are enrolled in the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan will receive tangible results from the merger. It will increase competition, which will result in better service, more options, and access to a larger number of doctors, hospitals, and pharmacies at a lower cost for its customers.

The passage of H.R. 497 is essential to giving my constituents in Baltimore, and the constituents of the members of Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, DC the type of comprehensive, quality health care they deserve.

I am glad to know that we in Congress are doing all that we can to give health care providers greater flexibility to meet our constituents health care needs.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS for introducing this meaningful legislation and for working with the minority in such a bipartisan fashion.

I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 497.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 497, a bill to repeal the Federal Charter for Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., better known as Blue Cross and Blue Shield of the National Capital Area.

H.R. 497 eliminates an outdated arrangement under which GHMSI, alone among health insurance providers, has had to operate. H.R. 497 authorizes GHMSI to file articles of incorporation with the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. The bill thus paves the way for GHMSI to become a District of Columbia nonprofit corporation—legally domiciled in the District of Columbia and subject to regulation by the superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia.

GHMSI will continue to exist under the same name and will be authorized to transact business as it has—under all existing licenses and certificates of authority.

With the exception of GHMSI, Blue Cross Blue Shield plans and all other commercial insurance companies around the country are State chartered corporations operating under State regulatory oversight.

H.R. 497 will place GHMSI on an equal footing with other plans and health insurers—enabling it to continue to provide comprehensive and affordable coverage to residents of the District of Columbia and the Washington Metropolitan area, while meeting the challenges of a changing health care marketplace.

Of particular importance to my Maryland constituents, H.R. 497 will facilitate the proposed merger of GHMSI with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Maryland. A recent letter of intent announced the plan to combine the business operations of the two entities under a single holding company.

This combination of business operations will provide a larger provider network—offering

greater portability and choice, broader product options, and improved customer service to residents of the District of Columbia, northern Virginia, and Maryland who work in one area and reside in another.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill which will enable GHMSI to face the abundant challenges of the fast-changing health care marketplace and to compete and serve its customers on a fair and equal footing.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 479.

The question was taken.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 479, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule 1, the Chair will now resume proceedings on approval of the Journal and put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained, and then on the motion to suspend the rules postponed from Tuesday, February 25, 1997.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal de novo; H.R. 624, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 497, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 668 by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. DAVIS 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 378, nays 36, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—378

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—36

Abercrombie
Borski
Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Clyburn
Crane
DeFazio
English
Ensign
Fazio
Filner
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Oberstar
Pascrell
Pickett
Pombo
Ramstad
Rush
Sabo
Stearns
Thompson
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Yates

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis
Buyer
Carson
Clay
Danner
Doolittle
Engel
Hostettler
Kaptur
Lantos
Largent
Linder
McCarthy (MO)
Morella
Reyes
Smith (OR)
Taylor (MS)
White

Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DELAHUNT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS]. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.