WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the membership, giving credit to the Democrats that more Democrats voted to stay here and work than voted to go home. I wanted to make that point, and we thank them.

Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the very distinguished gentlewoman [Ms. SLAUGHTER], pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to complete our work in a timely and expeditious manner and send us back to our districts this weekend. I would like to quote a very distinguished former Member of this House. His name was Tip O'Neill, and we all revered Tip. He was a great guy. But he said, quote, ''If you stay in session, a lot of things can happen, and all of them are bad.''

Well, I say to my colleagues, we are rushing to adjournment. We are going to get out of here this Sunday if we all cooperate with each other, and that is why we have this resolution before us today.

House Resolution 305 is a customary rule for considering legislation at the end of the legislative session. The first part of this rule waives provisions of clause 4(b) of rule XI, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules, and it is waived against certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules before November 10, 1997, or rather between today and actually next Monday.

The waiver applies to any special rules providing for consideration of a bill or a joint resolution that makes appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon. This will enable the House to expeditiously conclude the remaining appropriation bills for fiscal year 1998, hopefully by this Sunday, and perhaps even sooner.

The waiver also applies to any special rule providing for consideration of a bill for a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon. As the current continuing resolution is scheduled to expire on Friday, tomorrow, November 7, this will allow the House to consider any needed short-term extension as efficiently as possible so that the Government does not shut down and all of the agencies and bureaus and departments can continue to serve the American people.

Section 2 of the rule provides that the Speaker may entertain motions to suspend the rules at any time before Monday, November 10, 1997, provided that the object of the motion is announced from the floor at least 1 hour before the motion is offered, and that deals in layman's language for suspensions after the minority is given at least 1 hour's notice.

In order to accommodate the schedule in the interests of all Members, this rule also provides that the Speaker will consult with the minority leader regarding any bills scheduled under the authority to suspend the rules.

The final section of the rule provides that during the remainder of the 1st session of the 105th Congress, the Speaker may not recognize a Member, other than the majority leader or the minority leader, to offer from the floor or to announce an intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

This section of the rule further provides that the Speaker may postpone the consideration of any noticed resolution as a question of the privileges of the House prior to the adoption of this resolution during the remainder of the first session of the 105th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the procedures for calling up a rule on the same day that it is reported from the Committee on Rules are familiar to the House. It is customary for the appropriation measures at the end of the session. Also, providing for motions to suspend the rules on days other than Mondays or Tuesdays is very useful so that bipartisan, noncontroversial legislation can move rapidly at the end of the session.

We have a particular problem in the borders with Canada where there are problems with people coming back and forth. There is some bipartisan legislation that we hope to move under this kind of a procedure. Adequate provision for notice to the minority are provided, as has been the case in the past.

Mr. Speaker, in the furtherance of our target adjournment date, this rule also addresses the dilatory tactics and abuse of the House rules we have seen in recent weeks on the floor. As the House is well aware, certain Members have utilized the procedure under House rule IX, questions of the privilege of the House, to force debate and votes on the contested election in the 46th Congressional District in California. Under that rule, Members may give notice of their intention to raise a question of privilege of the House and the Speaker then sets an appropriate time within 2 legislative days for the consideration of the question of the privilege. Certain minority Members' repeated and dilatory use of these questions of privilege to filibuster the legislative process I believe creates a privilege in itself, and that is why we are here today with this rule.

The disposal of these near identical notices under rule IX consumes precious hours as well as requiring an astounding number of votes. The use of the rule relating to the questions of the privilege of the House in a frivolous and political manner is unbecoming, I think, to this institution, and that certainly is verified by the literally hundreds of phone calls that I have received because people know that I am chairman of the Committee on Rules, calls from all over the country, wanting to know why we are wasting our time with these repeated repetitious requests for questions of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, for several weeks the majority and the minority leadership have attempted to reach an accommodation regarding these dilatory questions of privilege. On October 23, the distinguished minority leader, who I have great respect for, rose to a question of privilege on this issue. Instead of simply tabling the matter with no debate, the House considered the resolution, debated it for an hour and defeated it, under regular order of this House. The majority leadership allowed it to be debated out of deference to the minority leader and voted on it. The House worked its will and defeated that resolution.

In exchange for allowing this issue to be debated and voted on, the minority provided the following: October 29, one question of privilege tabled. October 30, eight questions of privilege tabled. October 31, 21 questions of privilege noticed. November 4, 7 questions of privilege noticed, and yesterday, November 5, another 13 questions of privilege were noticed, delaying us bringing up very important matters dealing with the United States-China relationship by about an hour and a half, another hour and a half that we were delayed from working the will of this House.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, in efforts to mollify the situation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, allowed yet another question of privilege on the same subject to be separately debated and voted on. It was a good debate, I think from both sides of the aisle, whether one agrees with it or does not. A unanimous-consent request was then propounded which would have considered the question of privileges as read and would have shortened the voting time on each, again in an effort to try to accommodate the minority. This reasonable request was objected to.

Mr. Speaker, in still another example of good faith, the Committee on Rules reported two rules last night, the rule I have just called up and we are debating now, which contains this limitation on questions of privilege, and another without this provision.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, the committee's intention was to empower the very serious legislators on both sides of the aisle and to marginalize the partisan obstructions. This has not happened, and

that is why I was forced today to rise with this unfortunate rule today.

I do not like to bring this rule before the House. I said so last night during the debate exchange in the Committee on Rules. But, Mr. Speaker, many Members on both sides of the aisle with a very strong interest in getting legislation considered by the House before we adjourn have approached me and asked for the Committee on Rules to intervene and to restore order on this floor, so we can expedite these very, very serious measures that we have to deal with before this Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, because the rule suffering such abuse has been rule IX, I have been reluctant, again, to intervene. The deliberate use of this fundamental House rule for a flagrant political and dilatory purpose has forced the majority to assert its right to set the legislative schedule.

On behalf of the overwhelming majority of both parties who are interested in serious legislating, we must insist that our friends will not filibuster the people's House with an abuse of these rules.

Having said that, I hope we can pass this rule and get on with the people's business. There is precious little time between now and Sunday to find the windows of opportunity on this floor to deal with the measures that are so important to Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as the other body, and as well as President Clinton himself, who has a number of requests pending before this body.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this tyrranical rule. For the first time in the 218-year history of the House of Representatives, we will be voting to deprive all but two Members of this body the right to assert their constitutional prerogatives as Representatives elected by their constituents. House rule IX gives each and every Member of this House the right to raise before the whole body questions of privilege affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

The House adopted rule IX in 1880, defining what had been long established in the practice of the House before then. Thomas Jefferson begins his Manual on Parliamentary Procedure, which has governed the House procedures since 1837, with section 1, titled ''The Importance of Adhering to Rules.'' It quotes a former Speaker of the House of Commons' views on the neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding.

I quote:

> That these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power.

Jefferson then continues:

> As it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed by their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which they have adopted as they have found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses, which these forms were intended to check, which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

Mr. Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, surely would have opposed the wantonness of power displayed by the majority in offering this rule. Rule IX is the heart of Members' individual rights within our rules. It guarantees that each Member has the right to move to guarantee the integrity of House proceedings. That right is so central to our idea of representative government and liberty itself that in all of the 104 Congresses before today, the House has never voted to suspend this paramount right.

Even in the depths of the Depression and in the struggles against the tyranny of Nazi Germany, when the House's legislative decisions might truly have changed the course of the Nation and the world, they did not suspend this prerogative of the individual Member.

Yet, in this era of relative prosperity and world stability, the majority proposes to suspend this fundamental right guaranteed in our rules. This majority would give itself the power for the rest of this session to not recognize any Member except the majority or minority leader to offer a motion affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

What is the national crisis that has brought about this unprecedented attempt by the majority to usurp Members' powers to protect the integrity of this House? Are we at war and a defense funding bill is urgent? Is there mob violence in the streets? Are we in the throes of a great economic depression? No. The interest this unprecedented attack on one of the fundamental checks and balances built into our House rules is getting Members out of town a day or two early.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say, shame. At last night's Committee on Rules, the chairman of the committee did indeed state that he hoped this rule would not come to the floor, and I joined him in that hope. I am appalled and saddened that this majority would seek to suspend this bulwark of Members' abilities to ensure full representation to their constituents.

What kind of issues are raised under rule IX, the rule that will be effectively suspended? The Annotated House Rules gives us examples of the fundamental nature of issues that are raised under the rule. They are questions relating to the House's constitutional prerogatives in respect to revenue legislation and appropriations; impeachments; the constitutional prerogatives of this House with respect to bills pocket-vetoed during an intersession of adjournment; the House's power to punish for contempt, whether of its own Members, of witnesses who are summoned to give information, or of other purposes; questions relating to the House's organization and the title of its Members to their seats; questions relating to the conduct of officers and employees, in addition to that of Members; questions relating to the integrity of its proceedings, including the processes by which bills are considered.

Clearly, the rule IX procedure for making motions regarding the privileges of this House is the keystone of a Member's ability to bring to the House's attention the most serious and fundamental matters affecting the integrity of this House. Yet this rule, proposed by the majority for the first time in the House of Representatives' 218-year history, squelched that right, and for what historic, precedent-worthy reason? So that we might leave Washington a couple of days early.

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet touched on the second infamous and again unprecedented clause in this rule. It would allow the Speaker to postpone indefinitely the full House consideration of any question of the privileges of this House that he had deigned to allow.

Currently, rule IX gives the Speaker the authority to schedule consideration within the next 2 legislative days. I was responsible myself for drafting this rule change in the 103d Congress. It was done to ensure that privileged resolutions could not disrupt consideration of time-sensitive legislation, such as continuing resolutions. Prior to that rule change, a resolution raising questions of the privileges of this House had immediate precedence over all other questions except motions to adjourn. However, it was never within the contemplation of that rules change to prevent any Member from having the chance for the full House to vote on a privileged resolution.

As drafted, this part of the rule we are debating would essentially give the Speaker carte blanche to continue to indefinitely postpone consideration of any motion regarding privileges of the House until the end of the session. Unfortunately, last night we got a taste of the real world consequences of such postponements. The majority could merely move to adjourn sine die, and thereby prevent consideration of these fundamental motions to protect the House's safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, these two rules changes are a despotic attack on Members' constitutional rights to protect their constituents. This may be one of the most

important votes that we take as Members of Congress. As I mentioned earlier, Thomas Jefferson, who defined through the Declaration of Independence our notions of freedom and liberty, put the rules' protection against the tyranny of the majority as the very first section of Jefferson's rules which govern us today in the House of Representatives.

I will be ashamed for the House and afraid for its integrity should this misbegotten rule be adopted. The danger of this precedent cannot be overstated. I urge in the strongest possible terms that this attempt to restrict the fundamental rights and liberties of House Members be defeated.

In addition, I will urge Members to defeat the previous question, and if it is defeated, I will offer an amendment to strike the provisions of the rule pertaining to the privileged resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment will appear in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from San Diego, CA, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us heard about the harassment at the voter polls in California for the first time last night. At the time I was flying fighters for the U.S. Navy. I thought, if this is true, it is truly un-American for anyone to harass any ethnic group or any American or non-American at the polls, if they are here legally.

So I checked last night. Individuals wore brown shirts, INS shirts, at the polls carrying signs saying, noncitizens cannot vote here. The wearing of the brown shirts, I agree, would be mean-spirited, and they were fined for that. That should not be tolerated. But I agree with the idea that noncitizens should not vote.

Why did they carry those signs? It is because individual liberal activist Democrats were taking illegals to that particular precinct to vote. It was not an allegation; they were charged, they were arrested, and they were sent to jail. My colleagues do not tell us about that on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, who were these mean-spirited Republicans that wrote the signs in Spanish? Two Hispanic Americans, Carlos Rodriguez and Thomas Fuentes. What did they say? They said, we are proud of our ethnic backgrounds, and we are proud to be Americans, and we reject the blatant intentional abuse by Democrats to take away our basic rights that we worked hard for as American citizens and immigrants: first, our American citizenship, and then the right to vote as an American citizen.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side to spend one-tenth of the time looking at violations of voter fraud. It must be sad for them, after 3 years, because they have got nothing else to stymie and delay tactics on the House floor.

They fought against, many of them, the liberal Democrats, against a balanced budget, and we are now talking about a surplus in the deficit. They fought against tax relief for working families. They fought to save Medicare, and the President signed the same Medicare that they demonized in this balanced budget. They fought against welfare reform, when the average was 16 years, and they fought against anticrime measures.

It must really be sad that this is all they have left. It must be sad that the President said Americans are selfish for not wanting to pay taxes, and that a Member of the Senate said Americans are not paying enough taxes.

Over 400 Democrats have switched over to become Republicans. Do Members want to look at the future? Look at the races in Virginia. In Democratic districts, a clean sweep in New Jersey for Governor in a Democrat district; a clean sweep in New York, a targeted Democrat district; and now we have VITO FOSSELLA as a Member of Congress in the Molinari seat.

It must be really bad for them that the signs did not say, for some liberal Democrats, noncitizens vote here, and vote for me, or else they would be out there working just as hard to fight against illegal voting.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me commend the gentlewoman from New York for her fine statement and history of the rule that we are about, unfortunately, to overturn.

I just used the word ''unfortunately.'' I think it fits my view, although that word that I take from my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, is too mild and too soft to really be used with any degree of accuracy in this situation.

□ 1145

I rise today to protest this rule, a rule which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the committee, referred to as an unfortunate rule. Indeed, this is nothing less than a bold attempt by the Republican majority to silence, to muzzle, the elected representatives who speak for literally millions of people in this country. This is a gag rule. It is a rule that effectively denies every Member of Congress their right to free speech.

Over my right shoulder, etched above a door just to my right above the gallery, is ensconced the image of Thomas Jefferson, and which the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] eloquently quoted in her remarks earlier this morning. He must be looking down upon the Republican majority with displeasure this morning, because what they are indeed about to do is squelch the free expression of Members of this House on issues of privilege for the first time in this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has one goal, to silence the criticism, the Republicans ugly campaign for harassment and intimidation against our colleague, the honorable gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

This gag rule is part of a pattern. It began when the Republicans decided they did not like the choice of the Orange County voters, many of them women and Hispanic, the choice that they made in electing the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] over Bob Dornan.

First they tried to silence these voters to deny them their choice. They did this by making wild allegations and launching into an 11-month investigation, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, that has turned up no evidence to suggest that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] is anything but a duly elected Congresswoman.

Last night, the Republicans voted to adjourn specifically to vitiate, to kill, the privileged resolutions of 21 Members, all of whom were women or Hispanics, who are exercising their rights as the elected voice of their constituents. To silence the voice of their constituents, these 21 women who were denied the ability to speak about something that is not frivolous, as the majority referred to earlier in this debate, but is serious, it is about the election of a representative for 600,000 people.

In the House of Representatives, a body that is America's principal forum for debate, Republicans are trampling on the freedom of speech. I ask them, what are they afraid of? Are they afraid of free and open debate? Are they afraid of people who disagree with them? Are they afraid of the truth?

This gag rule effectively silences millions of Americans, and it runs against the very spirit of the Constitution that we were sworn to uphold. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Ronald Reagan used to say, ''Well, here we go again.'' Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman and the minority whip have made a point that this procedure has never been used before. And they are correct. But I would point out that no other small group of Members have ever, ever in the history of this Congress, ever abused the system by using rule IX.

The truth is, the group using these dilatory tactics admit that the repetitious offering, and I have got a whole list of them here, some 47 or 45, and I can assure my colleagues that the viewing audience agrees with us, because they are calling in and complaining about these repetitious offerings of the same resolution over and over, even to the point that one gentlewoman on the other side of the aisle

has now two pending, two of the same resolution. That is dilatory, my colleagues.

The truth is that this group using the dilatory tactics admit that these repetitious offerings of the same motions are dilatory and, in effect, are doing it to force their will on the House by using this repetitious system, which interrupts all of the other proceedings of the House.

Let me just read my colleagues the beginning of rule IX. And they ought to get it out, because they quoted Jefferson and Jefferson's Manual. Rule IX says, No. 1, ''Questions of privilege shall be first those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety,'' and here comes the two important words, ''its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.''

Now, we are charged under the Constitution of the United States to operate under our rules. And this is the last thing we would want to do, but it is being forced on the vast majority of this body. We just had more Democrats vote to stay in session and work and deal with the proceedings of this House with the measures that are pending before this body than we did Democrats voting yes to adjourn. I think that speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I do not want to use up all our time over on this side of the aisle, but there is very important legislation which is pending before this body. We must get on with it. The majority leader has made every effort to recognize on any given day the right of any one of my colleagues, including the minority leader, to offer this resolution that they are interested in. But that is not satisfactory. They want to do it over and over and over again. And that just cannot be allowed, because we cannot accomplish the work of this House if we do that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, if I might just take a moment to address my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON.

It is the integrity of this House that we are fighting this morning to uphold. I believe that the majority of Americans would want us to do just that and that their elected representatives, sent here in their behalf, would have the opportunity to speak as they are given under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, to my dear friend from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, who was obviously not here in the era of Mr. Bauman from Maryland, when he used every delaying tactic that we can imagine to call for votes and this sort of thing. But this is a right for any Member in this House. And I have been here longer than all the leadership in this House, both Republican and Democrat, and I represent 500 people in my district.

I have not offered a privileged resolution, but I have that right to offer that privileged resolution.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], I wish he could have been here, because he made a point that some of the folks that were carrying these banners were Rodriguez and these sorts of names. But yet, on their investigation, they are assuming that all the bad votes and all the illegal votes are Hispanics.

Obviously, some of these people were Mr. Dornan's supporters over the years when the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] was not even running for office. Local people that were running for office got some of the same votes that she got, but they are not being contested.

But this is a gag rule. And it is unfair to me, as an American citizen and a representative of the people's House in the sovereign State of North Carolina, to say to me that the leadership of this House, both Democrat and Republican, can tell me that I am not allowed, under the privileges and the rules of this House, to offer a resolution.

That is against my privilege as a Member of this House, and I highly resent it. I would think that Members on this side that call themselves very conservative would resent this, also.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for yielding me the time. I rise to oppose this intent to create martial law in the greatest democratic institution in the world.

Yesterday, unfortunately, history was made in a negative sense when the House, using the majority party's power to adjourn, ended all of the rights of those individuals of the Women's Caucus to seek to provoke a debate through privileged resolutions rising to the dignity and integrity of the House, and their rights were extinguished by having a motion to adjourn.

I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, that the dignity and the integrity of the proceedings of the House are in question when they permit to spend hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars for an investigation that has yielded absolutely no fruit.

And 1 year later, democracy in this House is not protected unless the rights of the minority are protected. And what Republicans are doing today is nothing less than turning their back on this principle by denying the minority an important tool we have to represent our communities and our constituents.

The procedural tools of the House are not there to be used only so long as they are convenient for the majority's scheduling goals or that they benefit the majority's agenda. They are there to be used when they benefit the minority as well.

The rights of Members are not here to be parcelled out and then abolished at the majority's whim. Make no mistake, by denying us justice and fairness today by taking away the protections afforded to the minority, my colleagues put in peril their own protections in the future.

This is an unprecedented denial of privileged resolutions by Members of the House, and that is outrageous. Several of the resolutions, I know my own that I introduced yesterday, are materially different, they have different aspects to it. And maybe my colleagues did not read them. But mine is materially different.

It is interesting to note, who do my colleagues seek to abolish the rights of, who presented the privileged resolutions yesterday? The members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. Is that not just a coincidence?

Those of us whose families fled from persecution, from dictatorship, view this as nothing more than gestapo tactics. When we take away the right to oppose those in power, when we abolish the rights of the minority, when we take away those protections, that is the beginning of tyranny. And when no one in the majority speaks up to defend them, that is when they put their own rights at risk.

Democracy is only safe when all views have a right to be heard. That is what the rules of the House are designed to allow. And they do not want any more privileged resolutions on the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. But what they are doing in the rule is, they are extinguishing the right of any Member to bring up a privileged resolution on any other matter, and that is outrageous.

If I had the incident with Mr. Dornan that this House voted to suspend his rights to be able to come in here, if that happened during this time period, I would not be able to introduce that privileged resolution because they have extinguished my right to do so. And that would be wrong.

My colleagues, do not turn your backs on the tradition of fairness, on the traditions of this institution, because you may find yourselves some day in the minority again. You are not just taking away a procedural tool, you are turning your back on a cherished principle of fairness. And while you may think you are just taking away our voices today, you are disenfranchising the voices of tens of millions of American citizens we represent.

This, if it is permitted, would be a shameful day for the House and a shameful day for your party.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to go get the previous speaker to tell us the significant difference between his two resolutions. But he did not want to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me this time.

Let me say that I am one who will acknowledge that that rule is clearly an extreme response. And it is an extreme response, unfortunately, for a very, very good reason. We have witnessed what I believe to be unprecedented and outrageous tactics over the last several weeks, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said, jeopardizing the ability for this institution to do its work.

Clearly, what we want to do is, we want to bring about a resolution to this struggle that exists over who actually was elected, and we are trying to recognize the very precious franchise that every American citizen has, and that is the right to vote.

So, as we look at this, we have to look also at the pattern of elections that have been disputed over the past couple of decades, not one. Not one investigation that has taken place over the past couple of decades lasted less than 12 months. In fact, the average of those was 14 months.

□ 1200

But the precedent that has been set here is constantly the attempt to bottle up the work of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at what we are trying to do here, we know that we all have rights. The rights of the minority are something that I happen to treasure because I spent 14 years here as a member of the minority party. And in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I do our darnedest to recognize the rights of the minority. But something that we learned as members of the minority is that with rights come responsibility. We have a responsibility to do the work of the American people. Because of this dispute, which clearly, based on the arguments that were provided here last night, could be settled, and I think it could be settled reasonably and agreeably, but because there is disagreement among a very few extremists in the Democratic Party, and the reason I say that is that I have had more than one Democrat say to me, ''My gosh, I wish that we would back off, let's get this thing over and done with, let's get it behind us.'' People do not like the idea of holding up the work of this institution. So with rights come responsibility. We are trying to recognize that, and we have been left with no alternative other than to pursue this rule. And so I urge strong support of it, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker here from California identified as Tom Fuentes a person dressed in a brown shirt holding up signs in Spanish to intimidate voters. I think it is important for the record to show that Tom Fuentes is the chair of the Orange County, California Republican Party, and his party paid a $400,000 fine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW].

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this House in January to get things done for my constituents. I have seen us when we worked together and respected the democratic process get positive things done. We have balanced the budget, we have provided tax relief, we have done positive work together. But we have done that respecting the democratic process and our rights to speak on behalf of our constituents.

I also came here believing that I had a right as a Member to present privileged resolutions to this House. One of the resolutions under question is one that I introduced. I know that my constituents expect that I have the right to speak and to offer privileged resolutions and to have them debated with respect. What we have today is an effort to take away the democratic process. We have a proposal in this rule for martial law. I would suggest what we need instead is a Marshall plan, a plan that respects democracy, allows us to work together to solve these issues and move forward in a way that respects everyone's rights. Martial law does not work in a democracy. The Marshall plan worked in its time. I would suggest to Members, we would be better off working in that direction, rather than taking away the rights of those of us who came understanding that we had the full rights and privileges of every Member of this House to speak on behalf of our constituents. I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have another new Member here. He comes from the State of a man I used to admire. I was a Marine guard when Harry Truman was President of the United States, and he was a good President. President Truman would not put up with these shenanigans either. He said, ''The buck stops here,'' and he would stop the buck from these dilatory tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Strafford, MO [Mr. BLUNT].

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be yielded time by the distinguished gentleman and to speak after he referred to Harry Truman, a Missouri President who understood responsibility. The responsibility of the House today and tomorrow and however many days it takes is to get our job done. The responsibility of the House is to do the work of the people of the country. We have heard these motions over and over again.

I heard this morning that what the rule proposes to do is squelch the free expression of the Members of the House. I advance the idea that the free expression of the Members of the House is more squelched by consistently delaying the process of the real debate that needs to go on here. As the former chief election official of our State, I have looked at some of these motions that have been filed, and I think any reasonable person would be hard-pressed to argue that we are not debating and reading and seeing introduced the same motion over and over again while the real work of the country stands undone.

This week should not be about dilatory tactics. This week should not be about motions to adjourn. This week should be about doing the job we need to do to direct the foreign policy of America, to have a defense bill that puts our defense in place, to decide the debate on national testing that 295 Members of the House said they did not want in the Labor-HHS bill.

Certainly there was a motion last night at 11 o'clock to adjourn. The people in my district and I daresay the people all over America understand that there is a difference in 11 o'clock at night motions to adjourn and two motions to adjourn before 11 o'clock this morning.

We need to do the work of the people of the country. It needs to happen. Obviously it is going to take this rule to make it happen. The people that sent me here sent me here to solve the big issues of the country, not to slow down the progress and change that is being made here.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I must say I was a little surprised to hear my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, say that one of the reasons we have to do this is that it makes for bad television. He said we have people calling up and complaining. I can think of some reasons to change the rules of the House, but ratings is not one of them. It does seem to me a grave error to say that because people are calling up and complaining that this has gotten boring, that we should change things.

I also have to reject the notion that this is necessary because we cannot get the business of the House done. The House has been working at a very leisurely pace. We took off a week in the middle of October, an unscheduled recess, unscheduled from the beginning. We have on the majority side a preference for about a 2-day workweek as far as the House is concerned. We come in on Tuesday night and we go home on Thursday night. There are other things besides being in session that count, but the fact is we have run things at a very slow pace. We have adjourned early for Republican fundraisers.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will yield if the gentleman promises to be

good television, because I do not want to be responsible for driving away the viewers.

Mr. SOLOMON. I want to expand on the gentleman's statement. Yes, we have, and we have adjourned for Democratic fundraisers, too.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for helping. This shows how dedicated we are to getting the work done. Under the Republican leadership control of the schedule, we have adjourned early for Republican fundraisers, we have adjourned early for Democratic fundraisers. We adjourned early, according to one leadership Member, for a Rolling Stones concert. And of course those are separate because, as everyone knows, the Rolling Stones gather no cash. But what we have here is on the one hand an argument that, ''Oh, my God, you've got to stop these privileged motions, we're not getting our work done.'' But if we had not adjourned for Democratic fundraisers and if we had not adjourned for Republican fundraisers and if we had not adjourned for the Rolling Stones concert and we had not taken a week off in October and if we worked on Tuesdays during the day and if we worked a little on Monday, we would not be in this spot.

The point I want to make is that the assertion that we do not have time to get our work done is nonsensical. The reason for shutting off the privileged resolutions is that the majority understandably does not want to discuss what is being done to LORETTA SANCHEZ. I want to say that cutting off the privileged resolutions is clearly not necessary. The rule is not necessary to get the House business done.

By the way, there is no rule that says we have to adjourn this weekend. We could go another week or two. The notion that we are running out of time when we have time to adjourn for fundraisers, concerts and other things obviously does not wash. What you are trying to do is divert attention from the Loretta Sanchez issue. Yes, they are repetitive privileged motions. They are, however, aiming at one of the most fundamental privileges of the House, a partisan decision by the majority to impeach election results without having a basis to do so. There has been a year in which all of the resources have been available to show that there was a problem. You have not been able to show that.

Of course people should investigate. People have said, ''Don't you want to know if people who voted were illegal?'' I would love to know that. I also want to know why after a year of investigating you have not been able to come up with enough numbers to invalidate the election. No one has stopped you from investigating it. That is the phoniest of all arguments, that someone is trying to stop you from finding out if people voted illegally. Of course no one tried to stop that. No one tried to stop it when it was initiated. But a year after the election, if you have not come up with enough evidence, the time has come to stop.

I want to say, I know there are partisan pressures here. In 1985, and people keep talking about the 1985 election that was brought up the other day when a Republican was unseated, I disagreed with my party in that regard. I thought it was impossible to tell after they counted. I voted for the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Frenzel, to declare a new election. I did not vote to seat the Democrat and I did not vote to seat the Republican. I did not think you could tell. I was in the minority. I was asked how did the Speaker respond; I told people the Speaker was mad at me until I explained my position. Then he got furious.

Yes, I understand partisan pressures. I think it is unworthy of Members to give in to them. I understand the impulse to say, OK, there is reason to look at this, even though a 984 majority is the largest majority I could ever remember being called into question. But after a year, after a year, give it up. After a year of using all of your powers to try to find a basis for overturning the election, you ought to give it up. You do not want to have that acknowledged, so that is why you are bringing in this rule.

This rule is not necessary, this cutting off of privileged resolutions, to have the House function. Again, we have adjourned for all kinds of reasons. We have not worked very hard. We have taken October breaks for a week. We are going to get out earlier than anyone expected. The reason you are doing this is you do not want to have to try to defend in public what is happening to LORETTA SANCHEZ. I think there is a dilemma. There is a wing of the Republican Party graphically represented by Mr. Dornan that says to you, ''Don't you dare let loose of this.'' It is a very important wing of the party. They do not want this dismissed. So there is a dilemma. Obviously, you do not have the evidence to overturn the election or you would have done it. On the other hand, there is not the political will to dismiss the challenge and let the elected Representative of the people serve. And then given this dilemma, you do not want it discussed. So that is what we are talking about today, a change in the rules of the House striking at a fundamental issue, a question of privilege, not just on LORETTA SANCHEZ but in general because you do not want attention called to the fact that you are playing political games with an election. You do not want attention called to the fact that there is a challenge going on to an election that you have been unable to sustain after a year, a 984 majority. Yet you do not have the political will to dismiss.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule is defeated so we can continue to discuss the Sanchez election.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], another valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, two points here. Point No. 1, already by 10 o'clock this morning your side put up two motions to adjourn. I realize that there are some tempers that have gotten high over there because they do not get to take the day off to go attend those events that you wanted to go to. Folks, we have got to do work. I am sorry you had to cancel your golf game, I am sorry you could not go to the event. We have work to do here. People expect us to work. It is Thursday, not Saturday. It is Thursday. Let us do the work. Quit giving those motions to adjourn. You are not going to get the day off.

Point No. 2. Somebody says it is within our rules for us to be heard, the minority. You are absolutely correct. The minority has the right to be heard but the majority has the obligation to rule. We have an obligation to move this House forward. What we are doing today is within the rules, and it is. Well, quit trying to do your stall tactics. Read the rules. My guess is that most of you have not even opened this book. I can point out those rules for you. You have been heard and heard and heard, and that is fine. I think you bring up, sometimes, some valid points. But the point has been made. Let us move on with our business.

□ 1215

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], a gentleman that came with me to this body almost 20 years ago and is one of its most respected Members.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for the time, and I would like to spend a portion of the time to briefly respond to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] because I do enjoy not only the content but the delivery of the information that he provides us, and I would like to point out just a couple of items within that delivery. He repeated several times that what we are doing is cutting off people in this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the resolution is that it focuses, it in channels; that is, it does not cut off the right to offer privileged resolutions, it focuses the opportunity to offer a privileged resolution. And as a matter of fact, the focal point for the minority would be the minority leader. As I recall the debate on the contested election in California's 46th District, the first resolution that was fully debated for an hour and voted on, was offered by the minority leader.

I understand, and I was not on the floor, but it has been represented to me, that there has been some criticism over this rule because we are attempting to cut off females and minorities from offering privileged resolutions. I find it interesting that the gentleman from Massachusetts is able to divine

the motives of those on this side who want to perpetuate the contested election, as he divines, somehow based upon pressure from people who are supportive of the candidate who lost, and that we are not pursuing trying to get to the bottom line, but carrying out some other group's motives which are not of the highest intentions. I find it interesting he is able to divine those motives, but made no comment whatsoever about people who have picked particular people to offer those resolutions so that it would have the appearance of cutting off female Members and minorities.

It seems to me that motives ought to go to both sides, and that if he is able to divine the motives on this side, yet unable to divine the motives on the other side that he is creating a false issue, that this somehow involves race or gender, I would tell the gentleman that there is either an overabundance of motives or an underabundance of motives on both sides, and I will yield to the gentleman with the final comment that it is not this gentleman who voted for a white male to be the minority leader.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would simply differ when he said why did I not talk about our decision to pick certain people to offer these resolutions. I must tell the gentleman people do not pick people on this side. When the women or members of the Hispanic Caucus decided those resolutions, I must tell him that that was their own voluntary choice. No one had to tell them to get angry at what was happening to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Mr. THOMAS. I would guess then the gentleman would also say that the minority leader was not picked or was not self-chosen to begin the process, and I would end only by saying no one is cut off totally. The leadership is focused. It is the majority's responsibility to govern.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. If my colleagues do not mind, Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak from this side of the aisle. It seems to me sometimes we spend more time talking to those that agree with us than those that disagree with us. Let me just make two points in my 1 minute as a new Member here.

First of all, last night when the privileged resolution came up and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] said it is an opportunity to present proof, I came down here in the front row to see the proof. I did not see proof. What I saw was accusations, heartfelt accusations, but there were numbers on a chart. I thought we were going to see blowups of voter registration cards; that is why I came down close.

Seeing a number, 1,000 or 4,000 or 305, is not proof, and we need to be laying out in these resolutions proof that we can look at, the L.A. Times can look at, the people of the 46th District can look at and not just have a card with Magic Marker ink on it and say, this is proof; that was an accusation.

Now, last point I would like to make, the reason we are so intent on bringing this to an end, it is Campaign 1998 is well underway. Mr. Dornan has announced for reelection, he is raising money for reelection, and the fear of us on this side of the aisle, on that side of the aisle, is that this whole process becomes part of the campaign, and that is wrong.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman like a little more time? I will yield the gentleman from North Carolina 15 seconds as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. HEFNER. Wow. I thank the gentleman from New York very much for the time; I am indebted to him.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], my good friend, I guess it was a slip of the tongue, he said the gentleman who lost, so they know who lost the election there.

But as my colleagues know, I got a letter a couple of weeks ago from the Speaker, and he sent me a card that I could wear. It is called Friends of NEWT GINGRICH, and since they are going to try to put a damper on our ability to offer these motions, I just may not send my check in now. And, of course, I do appreciate them addressing it to W.G. Hefner, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC, but I am just going to reconsider sending in my contribution since they are going to offer this kind of gag legislation. But I certainly want the Speaker to know that I have considered it very sincerely, but right now I am leaning toward not sending the check.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, two issues. First of all, to those who said we want to work from this side of the aisle, some of the previous speakers, we want to work, too. The trouble is we have not been working all the way up to here. Today's Wall Street Journal opinion by Al Hunt: A mediocre congressional session; points out that if this Congress adjourns this weekend, it will be the earliest in 32 years.

The schedule that the Republican Party has just released to the Democrats for next year, all the ones in type are no votes. That means that the House does not come back until January 26 of next year, takes a week off in February, seems to work pretty much through March. We take this amount of period, about 2½ weeks, off in April; skip through to July, where the House then takes off from the 1st to the 13th, one of the longest Fourth of July breaks I have seen; does take the traditional August 3-week period, that is traditional; and then takes another week and a half in September.

So not a whole lot of work is being scheduled, and this House is adjourning this weekend without doing campaign finance reform, without doing a major highway bill and without doing a lot of significant legislation.

Second point. I was one of the five who is still a remaining Democrat who also voted not to seat the Democrat in the McIntyre-McCloskey contest. It was the longest, most painful period in my legislative history. It was no fun, and so let me speak, Mr. Speaker, to those Republicans who are in trouble right now, too. They have got to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, what is right is to bring this contest to a close because it has been a year, the investigation has proven nothing, and it was not much fun back in the days of McIntyre-McCloskey for those of us who said we should go ahead and hold another election, and I know it is not much fun for them, but they have to do what is right.

And let me say in that case there was four votes difference, not 984 votes, and because of that uncertainty, a number of us said we should proceed with a special election. That is not the case in this election.

I urge my Members to do what we had to do a few years ago, do what is right.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just urge Members to defeat the previous question, and if it is defeated, I will offer an amendment to strike the provisions in the rule pertaining to the privileged resolutions, and if the rule is adopted, it will strip the fundamental constitutional rights of each Member with regard to the integrity, the proceedings of the House, and I urge Members to vote no on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

Text of Previous Question Amendment to H. Res. 305: Strike section 3 of the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time and would just recall several notes I made during the debate.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] complains that we are too accommodating to groups of Members by adjusting the evening schedule. He complained about it. But as my colleagues know, all speakers, whether they be Democrat or Republican, have always tried to be accommodating. This Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH, in the past 3 years has tried to accommodate the Women's Caucus for a dinner that they had, the Hispanic Caucus, the Black Caucus and any number of different caucuses. So I would just hope

he would not protest too much on that subject.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] have also said give it up, give it up, give up this investigation. Well, my colleagues, if we had given up over the years, we would still have Tammany Hall rigging elections in New York City, we would still have dead people voting and rigging elections in Chicago. If we gave it up, my colleagues, this democratic electoral process would literally fall apart.

As my colleagues know, we have such important legislation. There is a conference report that deals with the education of our children; it deals with labor issues, with health issues, with human services issues. That bill is out there. We have come to an agreement with the President of the United States. We want to bring the bill to the floor, but we cannot when these dilatory tactics continue here.

As my colleagues know, it is about time we got on with the business of the House. The gentlewoman had said defeat the previous question, and that would actually repeal section 3 of this bill. Well, I have heard people stand up here and talk about a martial law rule. That would not repeal this so-called martial rule law. The other part, section 1 and 2, deal with the expedited procedures to allow that very important conference report on our children to come to this floor on this same day. So the gentlewoman does not repeal the martial law part, she repeals section 3.

Now, having said that, let me tell my colleagues what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said so many times on this floor. He says, no man's life, liberty or property are safe when this legislature is in session. Well, I plagiarized that. That was said 1866 by someone, and nobody in this room knows who it was. My colleagues probably think it was Patrick Henry or Thomas Jefferson. Do my colleagues know who it was? A good New Yorker. He was not very famous, he was just a simple man. He was a surrogate by the name of Gideon Tucker, believe it or not. We all thought that was somebody really important; that is who said that. So I like plagiarizing him.

Let us get out of here and do the people's business.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 198, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

YEAS—224

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Carson
Cubin
Dellums
Forbes
Gonzalez
McKinney
Mica
Moran (VA)
Portman
Riley
Schiff

□ 1252

Mr. WISE and Mr. GUTKNECHT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] to reconsider the vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 200, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Carson
Cubin
Forbes
Gonzalez
McKinney
Meehan
Mica
Moran (VA)
Portman
Riley
Schiff

□ 1309

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 195, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No.589]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee

Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—19

Baldacci
Brown (CA)
Carson
Conyers
Cubin
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Gonzalez
Leach
McKinney
Mica
Moran (VA)
Oxley
Portman
Riley
Schiff
Skaggs
Watkins

□ 1321

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Riley for, with Ms. McKinney against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 589, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted, "aye."

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] to reconsider the vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—14

Archer
Carson
Coburn
Cubin
Forbes
Gonzalez
Leach
McKinney
Mica
Portman
Riley
Schiff
Smith, Adam
Watts (OK)

□ 1339

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2198

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2198.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 333, not voting 21, as follows: