It has been demonstrated that just pouring more money into the system is not working. By looking at this and studying this, we can see firsthand if it is going to work. Frankly, I think it is irrational for anybody to be opposed to such a small school choice study right here in the capital city of the United States. For the life of me, I do not understand why anybody would oppose something this small, just to see if it works. If it fails, they will have their day. They can all rise up and say, ''It has been a disaster.''

But if it works, we have set a new model, a new standard for communities all over the country.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we know some private schools work.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I came late to the floor. I understand that my colleagues are for this rule because the Moran amendment is made in order. I understand that rationale and I am for the Moran amendment.

I do not believe the majority has the intent of supporting the Moran amendment. I do not know that. Some will vote for it, I hope, on the other side. If not, this process is a sham, it is an ideological quest that will ultimately clearly and unequivocally fail. It will be the closing down of Government of November 1995. Everybody knows if the Moran amendment is not adopted, this bill is deader than a doornail. They are wasting our time and America's time with this ideological quest they are about.

Why do we waste time pretending that we are going to make policy when everybody knows, America knows and we all know, that this bill will be deader than a doornail if the Moran amendment is not adopted?

I rise, in addition to that, to say that I lament the failure of the Committee on Rules to be responsible on this legislation, and precluded me from making an amendment to strike a provision which puts at risk the President of the United States, his family's safety, the staff of the White House's safety, and the visitors to the White House's safety.

After a bipartisan group, of which Bill Webster, the former head of the FBI and the CIA, was a member, former General Jones, chairman of the Joint Chiefs was a member, unanimously recommended the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue, and I know that is controversial, but to change that policy in the twinkling of an eye denies the reality of the bombing in New York, denies the reality of the deaths of 168 people in Oklahoma City, denies the reality of the deaths of over 100 military personnel in Saudi Arabia.

It is irresponsible, I say to my colleagues, to not give this House the opportunity to strike the provision which puts at risk the symbol of executive leadership, not just of America but of the world, knowing full well that we have terrorists throughout this country who would use that as a symbol for some demented objective. I urge the rejection of this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief one minute remaining, so I do not plan to yield, even to my friend, the gentleman from Los Angeles, CA [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. Speaker, let me say that what we have come down to here, Mr. Speaker, is a very important question. My friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] just talked about partisanship and ideology. The fact of the matter is we should get beyond those things. I agree with that. What we should do is look at why it is that we are here dealing with this very important question.

What is it? We want to empower parents to have some choice to do what? Help their children, improve their plight. Everyone acknowledges that the education system here in the District of Columbia is in very serious trouble. The Washington Post has said we should try this experiment of parental choice, and when we do that, with this experiment we will be spending half as much as is being expended on a per student basis today here in the District of Columbia.

So let us put this issue of partisanship and ties to these special interests to the side, and at least try some creativity, an innovative way to deal with this very serious question.

I urge support of this bipartisan rule. I said on WAMU this morning, in response to Mark Plotkin, we have a bipartisan agreement on the rule. Let us pass the rule, and then move ahead with what obviously will be a very interesting debate.

Mr. 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. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed until later today.

The point no quorum is considered withdrawn.

☐ 1045

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2169, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 263 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 263 waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, in brief, the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998 provides vital transportation resources that will ensure a strong infrastructure for the United States and contains significant safety and security protections for American families across the Nation.

The conferees have provided $9.07 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration and assured the necessary funding to ensure aviation safety and security, enhance the capacity of the aviation system, improve weather forecasting systems, and provide automatic alerting systems to prevent runway collisions. These are provisions that are vital to provide the effective services and protection that the American public deserves.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report also provides $333.5 million to reduce fatalities on the Nation's roadways, $3.9 billion for the Coast Guard, and $354.1 million for the Coast Guard's drug interdiction program, $1.7 billion for the airport improvement program, and highway spending that is consistent with levels assumed in the bipartisan budget agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the subcommittee chairman, for providing no special highway

demonstration projects and for cutting unnecessary administrative expenses that will help ensure that America's transportation and safety needs are met as we enter the 21st century.

In closing, I commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member, for their productive work in crafting this conference report. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with general debate and consideration of the merits of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for their very, very hard work on this bill. They and the conferees have come up with a very good bill that funds Amtrak, the Coast Guard, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Northeast do not have many tornadoes, we do not have many floods, not many of us need crop insurance or disaster relief, but one thing we do need more than just about any other part of the country is improvements to our infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, when a Member represents cities and towns that were established in the 1630's, they realize that we need to do much more than the rest of the country to be sure that our infrastructure is sound. We need to shore up our roads, our bridges, our bus lines, our highways, which are obviously some of the oldest in this country. And we rely particularly heavily on passenger rail.

The Northeast corridor, which stretches from Boston to Washington, is the most traveled rail route in the entire country. It carries over 100 million passengers a year. Unfortunately, the U.S. rail system is also one of the most outdated in the world, and before the conferees fixed this bill, Amtrak's operating costs were seriously cut to the point that our national passenger rail system would probably have stopped ''dead in its tracks,'' so to speak.

But luckily for all Americans who use passenger rail, the conferees reversed the decision to cut Amtrak and provided $344 million for operating subsidies. The conferees also provided $250 million for the Northeast corridor which will allow many, many much-needed improvements.

This conference report, Mr. Speaker, does not stop at trains and automobiles. It also provides $2.7 billion for the Coast Guard, which is an increase over last year's funding.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides over $9 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration. This money will enable the FAA to improve its safety measures, which should reduce the dangers of acts of terrorism on American airplanes and in American airports.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a good rule. The conference report is a good conference report. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER].

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying Transportation appropriations bill.

My opposition to this bill is reluctant because of my deep respect and admiration for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], our committee chairman, and my regard for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia runs his committee with the utmost thoughtfulness and respect for every Member of this body. He works hard to make sure that our Nation's roads, airplanes, and infrastructure will meet our 21st century needs, and the gentleman conducts himself personally and professionally with candor, class, and character.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because it contains changes to the Wright amendment that are wrong on both policy and process grounds.

The Wright amendment was enacted almost 20 years ago at the behest of the cities of Fort Worth and Dallas in order to permit the safe development and operation of Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport while still permitting limited flights from Dallas Love Field. This legislation protects safety, safeguards taxpayers' investments in Dallas/Fort Worth Airport, and ensures local control by respecting the desires of the local communities.

The changes to the Wright amendment contained in this bill are bad policy because they will injure Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport, risk the hard-earned taxpayer dollars that have developed this airport, and trample on the desires of the local communities. And as so often happens, this bad policy was forced upon this House by the other body in a complete disregard for regular order or process.

Mr. Speaker, this changes almost 20 years of aviation law and was inserted without a single hearing or public forum, no discussion, no debate, no consideration, just a decision, Mr. Speaker, a decision made over the opposition of both Texas Senators, most of the local Members of Congress, the mayors of Fort Worth and Dallas, the city councils of Fort Worth and Dallas, the chambers of commerce of Fort Worth and Dallas, and the North Texas Commission.

As a strong supporter of local control, as a fiscal conservative who believes in the prudent use of taxpayers' dollars, and as a believer in regular order, I must oppose this rule and this conference report.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her effectiveness and for the commitment that she had on this issue with regard to safety.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the efforts of the gentlewoman and the effort of a couple of other Members, and I would like to put myself in that category, there would not have been the provision with regard to safety.

As the gentlewoman knows, this was going to be much broader. There was initially going to be a complete repeal of the Wright amendment, which I did not support. They also had other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman and let the body know, because a lot of the meetings were private, and let the gentlewoman's constituents know and the country know that she is an advocate and a champion and, I respect very much her vote against this rule. And, Mr. Speaker, if I were the gentlewoman, I would vote against this rule, too, and I would try to get as many people to vote against the rule.

But, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her effectiveness and her staying in to the very end in a very, very difficult process.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield time, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who is now here, for a wonderful job. He was not here when I spoke. But between the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], they did an outstanding job on this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], a diligent, very hard-working member of the Committee on Rules who has got a very, very germane point which Members should listen to.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the Committee on Rules met to consider this rule, I offered an amendment to the rule which would have, in essence, stricken section 337 from the conference report. I offered this amendment to the rule since this section of the conference report has an immediate and negative impact on my congressional district, as well as the entire Dallas area.

Section 337 alters a longstanding agreement between the Federal Government and the cities of Fort Worth and Dallas relating to air service out of Dallas Love Field. However, the committee majority did not see fit to agree to my amendment, and for that reason I will oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I do support the content of the conference report, except for this provision in section 337, and I would like to take a few minutes to explain the importance of this matter to the

Dallas area and as has previously been indicated by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER], who spoke just a moment ago.

Mr. Speaker, in the early 1960's, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth each wanted to have their own airport and the competition between the cities resulted in intense disagreements and fragmented air service. The old Civil Aeronautics Board, frustrated with this rivalry, forced the cities to coordinate their efforts and resources. This coordination resulted in the construction of a regional airport now known as Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport, the second busiest airport in the United States.

Before construction began, however, Dallas and Fort Worth executed concurrent bond ordinances to finance the airport and agreed under contract to phase out commercial traffic from each city's local airport in order to protect both cities' substantial investment in the new airport.

To further facilitate this agreement, in 1979 Congress enacted the Love Field amendment, popularly known as the Wright amendment. The Wright amendment expanded allowable service from Love Field by permitting flights to Texas and its four contiguous States, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas, and New Mexico. Exempted altogether from the provisions of the Wright amendment were commuter airlines operating aircraft with passenger capacity of 56 passengers or less.

The Wright amendment has served the communities of Dallas and Fort Worth well in the 18 years it has been in place. It protected neighborhoods surrounding Love Field, which is, after all, right in the middle of the city, from the noise and other hazards of a full-fledged commercial airport. And it has preserved relations between the two cities on an issue which many consider to be the most important to the economic development of the entire north Texas region.

This conference report does grave injustice to my district as well as to the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth. The Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation has seen fit to insert language in the Senate-passed bill and this conference report, which expands the area of service as well as the type of service allowed from Dallas Love Field.

He has done this in spite of the fact that the city councils of the affected cities, the mayors of the two cities, as well as myself, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. GRANGER, the former mayor of Fort Worth, and the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, in whose district Love Field lies, as well as the two Senators from Texas, are opposed to this change in the Wright amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a local matter, and it is one that should be settled locally, not by an appropriations conference report, and this body should not allow itself to be bullied by one U.S. Senator who does not represent the area affected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rejection of this rule and the rejection of this conference report.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that what we just heard about the Wright amendment ought to be discussed a little bit, because it has been in place 18 years. The Wright amendment was put in place to protect Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport, which is now the second busiest airport in the world.

Mr. Speaker, they are working on their eighth runway. Dallas/Forth Worth Airport houses the largest airline in the United States, American Airlines and it has a virtual monopoly on travel in and out of the Dallas/Fort Worth area.

What this change to the Wright amendment does is allow traffic in and out of Love Field, which adds a little competition to American Airlines. Well, that lack of competition has had an effect on the surrounding area. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, travelers going in and out of Dallas have had to spend, in 1992, an additional $183 million in higher fares. Much of that is burdened by Kansas travelers who are trying to get in and out of the Dallas/Fort Worth area, just because of lack of competition.

Well, this provision allows that competition to happen. This is America. This is free enterprise. This is the strength of our country.

□ 1100

It is not bullying by one Senator. It is a whole nation that believes we ought to have competition, who thinks this Wright amendment is a virtual monopoly that has created a very high profit for one airline and allow growth to the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport.

So it is time for change. It is time for a little competition. This minor change to the Wright amendment does not strike it down, although that would have been my preference. Thanks to the hard work of a freshman Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER] on the House side, it was not completely stricken down. I still believe it should be, but we are making minor changes to allow competition, particularly in the Kansas area, which will allow Kansas to have lower airfares, and to break the virtual monopoly that American Airlines has held.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Georgia yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of this fair and customary rule.

One critical component of our war on drugs is the Coast Guard drug interdiction program. By providing full funding for this initiative in this bill, we are sending a clear message to drug runners that drug trafficking in our waters will not be tolerated and will be punished. We are willing to commit the resources necessary to win the war on drugs. I emphasize that, to win the war on drugs, not to settle for stalemate or not to go backward, as we are in some areas now.

I am also pleased that the committee has once again held the line on highway demonstration projects. These are projects that infuriate Americans because it is not wise expenditure of their tax dollars. Once again this year, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has resisted these projects, and he should be commended for sticking with what is sometimes a difficult position in this Chamber.

I urge adoption of this noncontroversial rule, as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. 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 [Mr. LATOURETTE]. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. LINDER. 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 413, nays 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—413

Ackerman	Bonior	Coburn
Aderholt	Bono	Collins
Allen	Borski	Combest
Andrews	Boswell	Condit
Archer	Boucher	Conyers
Armey	Boyd	Cook
Bachus	Brady	Cooksey
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Costello
Baker	Brown (OH)	Cox
Baldacci	Bryant	Coyne
Ballenger	Bunning	Cramer
Barr	Burr	Crane
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Crapo
Barrett (WI)	Buyer	Cubin
Bartlett	Callahan	Cummings
Bass	Calvert	Cunningham
Bateman	Camp	Danner
Becerra	Campbell	Davis (FL)
Bentsen	Canady	Davis (IL)
Bereuter	Cannon	Davis (VA)
Berman	Capps	Deal
Berry	Cardin	DeFazio
Bilbray	Carson	DeGette
Bilirakis	Castle	Delahunt
Bishop	Chabot	DeLauro
Blagojevich	Chenoweth	DeLay
Bliley	Christensen	Dellums
Blumenauer	Clay	Deutsch
Blunt	Clayton	Diaz-Balart
Boehlert	Clement	Dickey
Boehner	Clyburn	Dicks
Bonilla	Coble	Dixon

Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
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
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Barcia
Frost
Granger
Oberstar

NOT VOTING—16

Abercrombie
Barton
Brown (FL)
Chambliss
Dingell
Foglietta
Gonzalez
Hilliard
Lewis (KY)
Miller (CA)
Murtha
Oxley
Saxton
Schiff
Tanner
Young (AK)

□ 1121

Mr. COBURN 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 507, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2607, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The pending business is the question de novo on agreeing to House Resolution 264.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 50, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

YEAS—370

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry