

defense deterrent. And as Taiwan has played a greater role in world affairs, the United States has adjusted the way in which it deals with Taiwan. United States cabinet-level officials in economic areas have visited Taiwan.

The point is that the United States shares important interests with China. Consequently, we should not ignore China's reaction on this issue. Right now, for example, the administration is engaged in sensitive negotiations with North Korea over what kind of reactor the North will accept in return for abandoning its nuclear weapons program. China reportedly is urging North Korea to accept a South Korean-model reactor and so defuse the current crisis. We need that kind of help. We also have an interest in peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. But I also hope that we can summon the creativity to manage this situation so that we may both express our historic friendship with Taiwan and, at the same time, preserve our interests. This visit should be truly nonpolitical in the way it is conducted. We should make clear to Beijing that a short visit by President Lee in no way changes the United States view of Taiwan's status. And I think it is clear that there needs to be some confidence-building between Beijing and Taipei so that neither side overreacts to the actions of the other.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 53, of which I am an original cosponsor.

Given the fact that President Lee Teng-hui is the freely elected leader of the Republic of China on Taiwan—a United States ally and important trading partner—it would seem self-evident that he would be welcome at any time for private visits to the United States. Yet this is not the case. Frankly, President Lee has been subjected to some rather shoddy treatment by the Clinton administration, which, of course, is the impetus behind this concurrent resolution.

I want to make it clear that President Lee is a reform-minded democrat who is offering just the kind of leadership the United States should wish to encourage in Asia. While I am certainly in favor of maintaining a constructive relationship with the People's Republic of China, I see no reason why the two policies should be mutually exclusive. Surely the situation calls for a degree of tact and diplomacy, two qualities which this administration has lacked in its dealings with President Lee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution, and I hope the administration will take note of the position of the House.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the decision to allow the elected leadership of Taiwan access to the United States was made when Taiwan decided to have free elections, a free press and pluralistic political systems. This isn't simply an issue to the people of Taiwan. As a matter of policy, the United States should never exclude the elected and legitimate leader of any nation seeking to come to our country. The views of nations with whom we have relations, and those nations that play a disproportionate role in world affairs, should always be heard by our Government. They can, however, never be controlling upon our Government.

The Government in Beijing has received all due deference. In the final analysis, it is the policy of the U.S. Government to allow all freely elected governments to come to this

country and be heard. The people of the United States do not need to be protected from the views of freely elected peoples.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to add that it would be an extraordinary statement that, after receiving in the last decade a range of leaders from Roberto D'Aubuisson, the leader of the death squads in El Salvador, to Deng Xiaoping, the leader of the world's largest totalitarian government, that any freely elected official is denied access to our country. I hope this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53 succeeds in convincing the administration of the strength of our bipartisan views. But I would remind the administration, if they do not after considerable negotiations, that I have a common resolution to amend the Taiwan Relations Act as a matter of law to allow access and visas to the United States. If discretion is not used properly by the administration, discretion will be lost by the administration. We will proceed with our amendment and change the law.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 53, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China to the United States. I was pleased to offer my strong support for this measure, and am delighted that the House of Representatives endorsed this important resolution.

This resolution is a sensible request. We should all recognize that the Republic of China is a full-fledged democracy, and its government policies conform to those of other democratic nations. Additionally, the Republic of China is one of the most important economic powers in the world. Specifically, the Republic of China has established a program of economic assistance to many underdeveloped nations, and has joined major international organizations such as the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] forum. The Republic of China has also been involved in international humanitarian relief efforts, such as helping the refugees of the Persian Gulf war. More importantly though, the Republic of China is willing to be a helpful partner in the international community.

While the United States does not want to jeopardize its relations with other governments, we should grant an exception to allow the President of the Republic of China to make a private visit to our country. The nature of the visit by President Lee Teng-hui, to receive an honorary degree from Cornell University, is a reasonable appeal, and should be so recognized by our government.

As Members of Congress, I would believe that we would want to maintain our relations with the Republic of China, and am pleased that the House passed this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's

prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 53.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT ON TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services;

The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities;

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and

The Committee on International Relations.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material, on H.R. 1158.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY
MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on H.R. 1158, be instructed to agree to the the Senate amendment numbered 1 except for Senate action under title IV deleting the "Deficit Reduction Lock-Box", Senate language rescinding \$100,000,000 from Veterans Administration medical care and construction and except for Senate action under chapter IV related to "Debt Relief for Jordan".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Let me simply say that the new Republican leadership in the House has forced us to carefully take a look at a number of spending items and take a look at a lot of programs that needed reducing. That is good.

But if other Members heard what I did in my district the last 3 weeks, the public is concerned that in some cases this House is going too fast and going too far. They are concerned that while they voted Republican in the last election, they are worried that this body is producing legislation which is too extreme, that it is doing things that are not well-advised, not well thought out, and not fairly targeted.

I know that a lot of my Republican colleagues have responded by saying that they favor a more moderate course, and that they expect that the Senate will modify much of what the House has done to make it more moderate.

□ 1200

This motion would give those colleagues a chance to put their votes where their words are, by supporting not a Democratic solution, but a modern Republican solution to the rescissions issues before us, moderate Republican position fashioned in the Senate that both parties can work from.

I think the problem with the House bill is, as it left the House, well, there are a number of problems. First of all, as the bill left the House, despite the fact that it contained the Brewster amendment, which required that the dollars which are saved be used for deficit reduction, the House Republican leadership nonetheless said these cuts would be used to help finance their tax bill. That tax bill, among other things, provides benefits for people making up to \$200,000 a year, and it finances those tax reductions by eliminating help that we give low-income seniors to pay their home heating bills, and it also pays for those tax reductions for people making \$199,000 a year by cutting back on in-

vestments on our kids' education and training.

That tax bill would also take us back to the good old days during which 47 of the largest corporations in this country paid not one dime in Federal taxes despite the fact that they made millions of dollars in profits. The House Republican leadership also insisted on continuing to allow the provision in the tax code which allows billionaires to escape taxation by renouncing their American citizenship.

This motion simply suggests that we accept the Senate priorities in the conference with roughly three exceptions. First, we would require that the conference stick to the Brewster amendment, which requires every dollar in this package to be used for deficit reduction rather than being used for another purpose.

Second, it would say absolutely no way will be accept the \$100 million reduction in veterans' health care benefits which the Senate provided. We would insist on fully funding those programs.

And, third, this proposal would not buy into automatically the Senate provision of aid to Jordan. We would leave that issue up to the conference.

In essence, the Senate bill, fashioned in a bipartisan way, in a Republican-controlled body, is harder, much harder on pork than was the bill that left the House, and it is much kinder and gentler on kids and seniors.

So in essence I would simply say this: The bottom line on this motion to instruct is simple. If Members do not want to guarantee true deficit reduction through the Brewster lockbox, vote against it. If Members do not want to protect veterans' programs, vote against it. If they want to cut kids and seniors instead of pork, vote against it. But if Members think that we ought to do those three things, then join us in being tougher on pork and easier on seniors and kids. Join us in supporting and insisting that we fully fund veterans' health programs, and most of all, join us in insisting that every dime of budget cuts that are produced in conference actually will go to deficit reduction rather than going to finance that turkey of a tax bill which the House passed just before we recessed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully rise to oppose the gentleman's motion. I am concerned that the gentleman seems to overlook the fact that this House spent 2 days debating this rescissions bill and then passed it. The House version of this bill provides for the American taxpayer roughly \$12 billion in savings in 1995 appropriations by making \$17 billion in cuts and \$5.3 billion in additional spending for disaster assistance, \$50 million for Jordanian relief, and miscellaneous items totaling an additional reduction of \$361 million.

The point is that the House had an opportunity to debate the issues exten-

sively. We voted on any number of amendments to the bill, and the bill ended up passing with relative ease, expressing the House's point of view that the rescission bill was a good one.

We heard arguments from the minority saying it doesn't do any good to take this bill up in committee because after all, it will never pass the House. Then when we got it passed through the House, and then the arguments were of course it doesn't do any good to pass the House because the Senate will not take it up. Now of course the bill is passed in substantial conformance to the House's measure, and the argument is well, it doesn't do any good to send it to conference because the President will not sign it.

But a conference is based on compromise between this body and the other one. What the gentleman proposes is no compromise; it is a total abdication of what we passed in the House. The motion to instruct basically recommends that we recede on virtually every issue and every position taken by the Senate with the exception of the lockbox, the VA rescission, and the Jordanian aid.

My view of a compromise is not simply to throw up our hands after we have done the lion's share of the work and say OK, the other body came in relatively well, but they did it differently from us, so we will just take their position. No, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House would be better represented if we would reject the gentleman's motion and in fact just stick to our guns and reach a genuine compromise with the other body.

The fact is, that it is ironic that the very three things that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] exempts are three likely areas where we would look favorably on the Senate position. So we may end up getting some agreement on the very things he does not want us to agree with them on.

But let the House do its work. Let us go ahead and name the conferees, go to conference, let the conference pound out the differences between both positions in the House and the Senate, not tie its hands, not bind it in any significant degree, not adopt the gentleman's motion. Let's find out what the conference can produce, and presumably I think that what we will find is that what it does produce will be passable in both the House and the Senate, and ultimately will be signed by the President of the United States because, in fact, what we will do jointly with the other body is going to be a very good bill, and it is going to mean that the American taxpayer, for the first time in many many years, is going to reap a savings of anywhere from \$8 billion to \$12 billion of prior years appropriations, which I think is terribly significant.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to say that I am somewhat startled by the comment I just heard from my good friend from Louisiana. He indicated that the House would be most likely to accept the three Senate provisions that I have indicated we would not insist on supporting. Did the gentleman really mean that we are inclined to accept a \$100 million reduction in appropriations for veterans' health care? Did he really mean that the House is inclined to accept the Senate language which guts the Brewster amendment which attempts to guarantee that the money would be used for deficit reduction rather than used to finance the tax package?

If that is the case, then I think the gentleman outlines most clearly why we do need to support and vote for this recommittal motion, because I know very few Members certainly on this side of the aisle who would be comfortable with admitting ahead of time that they want the House to acquiesce in the Senate gutting of the Brewster amendment. And I certainly do not think I would, and for instance acquiesce in the reductions that were made in veterans' health care. So I think that outlines all the more reason to support the recommittal motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I am prepared to let the conference work its will on all of these issues without prejudging it. I was using the statements that the gentleman referred to simply as examples of where we could possibly end up, but the fact is, please do not bind or prejudice the outcome of this conference at all. We are going to have a lot of good Members who are going to be participating in this conference, and they have all got individual views on how the conference should come out.

I was very, very, pleased by the product of the conference between the House and the Senate on the last rescission bill when we provided the military with \$3 billion in additional funds for their readiness shortfall, and at the same time paid for that readiness shortfall with rescissions that were half out of defense and half out of nondefense appropriations. So we have done a good job already. We have a track record established by the last conference, and I think that all indications are that we can have a very fruitful and successful conference hopefully that will not take too extremely long and come back to the House with something that a majority, and I stress a majority of the Members, hopefully a good, sizable combination of both Republicans and Democrats can indeed support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will take just 1 minute, and then I am happy to yield back. I would simply say that I think we need to understand that what the

Senate was able to do under moderate Republican leadership, what the Senate was able to do, is to reduce the cuts that were made in programs to seniors and programs for kids by making deeper reductions in pork items in the budget. It seems to me that moderate Republicans in the Senate have demonstrated they can produce a more civilized and more balanced bill and we ought to go along with that, with the exception of the three items I have laid out.

And so I would urge adoption of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker I oppose the gentleman's amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 187, nays 207, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie	Edwards	Kennedy (MA)
Andrews	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Barcia	Eshoo	Kennelly
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Kildee
Beilenson	Everett	Kleczka
Bentsen	Farr	Klink
Berman	Fattah	LaFalce
Bevill	Fazio	Lantos
Bishop	Fields (LA)	Levin
Bonior	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Flake	Lincoln
Boucher	Foglietta	Lipinski
Brewster	Foley	Lofgren
Brown (CA)	Ford	Lowey
Brown (FL)	Fox	Luther
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Bryant (TX)	Frost	Manton
Cardin	Furse	Markey
Chapman	Gephardt	Mascara
Clayton	Gibbons	Matsui
Clement	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Clyburn	Gordon	McDermott
Coleman	Gunderson	McHale
Collins (IL)	Gutierrez	McKinney
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Condit	Hall (TX)	Meehan
Costello	Hamilton	Meek
Coyne	Harman	Mfume
Danner	Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)
de la Garza	Hayes	Mineta
Deal	Hefner	Minge
DeFazio	Hinchev	Mink
DeLauro	Holden	Mollohan
Deutsch	Hoyer	Montgomery
Dicks	Jackson-Lee	Moran
Dingell	Jefferson	Morella
Dixon	Johnson (SD)	Murtha
Doggett	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
Dooley	Johnston	Neal
Doyle	Kanjorski	Oberstar
Durbin	Kaptur	Obey

Olver	Sabo	Thurman
Ortiz	Sanders	Torkildsen
Orton	Sawyer	Torres
Pallone	Scarborough	Towns
Pastor	Schroeder	Trafficant
Payne (VA)	Schumer	Velazquez
Pelosi	Scott	Vento
Peterson (FL)	Serrano	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Volkmer
Pickett	Sisisky	Ward
Pomeroy	Skaggs	Waters
Poshard	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Rahall	Slaughter	Watts (OK)
Rangel	Spratt	Waxman
Reed	Stark	Williams
Reynolds	Stenholm	Wilson
Richardson	Studds	Woolsey
Rivers	Stupak	Wyden
Roemer	Tanner	Wynn
Rose	Taylor (MS)	Yates
Roybal-Allard	Tejeda	
Rush	Thornton	

NAYS—207

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Molinari
Archer	Frisa	Moorhead
Armey	Funderburk	Myers
Bachus	Ganske	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Nethercutt
Baker (LA)	Gilchrest	Neumann
Ballenger	Gillmor	Norwood
Barr	Gilman	Nussle
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bartlett	Goodling	Packard
Bass	Goss	Paxon
Bateman	Graham	Petri
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Porter
Bilbray	Hancock	Portman
Bliley	Hansen	Pryce
Blute	Hastert	Quillen
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boehner	Hayworth	Ramstad
Bonilla	Hefley	Regula
Bono	Heineman	Riggs
Brownback	Herger	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hobson	Roth
Bunning	Hoekstra	Royce
Burr	Hoke	Salmon
Burton	Horn	Sanford
Callahan	Hostettler	Schaefer
Calvert	Houghton	Schiff
Camp	Hunter	Seastrand
Canady	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Hyde	Shadegg
Chabot	Inglis	Shaw
Chambliss	Istook	Shuster
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Skeen
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Smith (MI)
Chrysler	Jones	Smith (NJ)
Clinger	Kasich	Smith (TX)
Coble	Kelly	Smith (WA)
Coburn	Kim	Solomon
Collins (GA)	King	Souder
Combest	Kingston	Spence
Cooley	Klug	Stearns
Cox	Knollenberg	Stockman
Crane	Kolbe	Stokes
Crapo	LaHood	Stump
Creameans	Largent	Talent
Cubin	Latham	Tate
Cunningham	LaTourette	Tauzin
Davis	Lazio	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Leach	Thomas
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Thornberry
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Tiahrt
Dornan	Lightfoot	Torricelli
Dreier	Livingston	Upton
Duncan	LoBiondo	Vucanovich
Dunn	Longley	Walker
Ehlers	Lucas	Walsh
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Wamp
Emerson	Martini	Weldon (FL)
English	McCollum	Weldon (PA)
Ensign	McCrary	Weller
Ewing	McDade	White
Fawell	McHugh	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Wicker
Flanagan	McIntosh	Wolf
Forbes	McKeon	Young (AK)
Fowler	Meyers	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Mica	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Becerra	Clay
Baessler	Bilirakis	Conyers
Baldacci	Browder	Cramer
Barton	Buyer	Dellums

Diaz-Balart	Martinez	Rogers
Gallegly	Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen
Gejdenson	Metcalf	Roukema
Geren	Moakley	Saxton
Green	Ney	Thompson
Greenwood	Owens	Tucker
Hilliard	Parker	Waldholtz
Jacobs	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Laughlin	Pombo	
Linder	Quinn	

□ 1230

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Barton against.

Mr. BONO and Mr. COOLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PASTOR, CONDIT, and EVERETT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 303, I am inadvertently recorded as an "aye" vote, and I should have been recorded as a "no." So I would like to have that noted for the RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 303 due to an inoperative light calling us to vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained in flying back to Washington from Houston and missed rollcall vote No. 303. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 1158: Messrs. LIVINGSTON, MYERS of Indiana, REGULA, LEWIS of California, PORTER, ROGERS, SKEEN, WOLF, and DELAY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Messrs. LIGHTFOOT, CALLAHAN, OBEY, YATES, STOKES, BEVILL, FAZIO of California, HOYER, DURBIN, COLEMAN, and MOLLOHAN.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING A VISIT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE-REUTER], that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent reso-

lution, House Concurrent Resolution 53, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie	Doggett	Istook
Ackerman	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	Doolittle	Jefferson
Archer	Dornan	Johnson (CT)
Armey	Doyle	Johnson (SD)
Bachus	Dreier	Johnson, E.B.
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Baker (LA)	Dunn	Johnston
Ballenger	Durbin	Jones
Barcia	Edwards	Kanjorski
Barr	Ehlers	Kaptur
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	Kasich
Barrett (WI)	Emerson	Kelly
Bartlett	Engel	Kennedy (MA)
Bass	English	Kennedy (RI)
Bateman	Ensign	Kennelly
Beilenson	Eshoo	Kildee
Bentsen	Evans	Kim
Bereuter	Everett	King
Berman	Ewing	Kingston
Bevill	Farr	Klecaska
Bilbray	Fawell	Klink
Bishop	Fazio	Klug
Bliley	Fields (LA)	Knollenberg
Blute	Fields (TX)	Kolbe
Boehlert	Filner	LaFalce
Bonilla	Flake	LaHood
Bonior	Flanagan	Lantos
Bono	Foglietta	Latham
Borski	Foley	LaTourette
Boucher	Forbes	Laughlin
Brewster	Ford	Lazio
Brown (CA)	Fowler	Leach
Brown (FL)	Fox	Levin
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)
Brownback	Franks (CT)	Lewis (GA)
Bryant (TN)	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Bryant (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lightfoot
Bunn	Frisa	Lincoln
Bunning	Frost	Lipinski
Burr	Funderburk	Livingston
Burton	Furse	LoBiondo
Buyer	Ganske	Lofgren
Callahan	Gekas	Longley
Calvert	Gephardt	Lowey
Camp	Geren	Lucas
Canady	Gibbons	Luther
Cardin	Gilchrest	Maloney
Castle	Gillmor	Manton
Chabot	Gilman	Manzullo
Chambliss	Gonzalez	Markey
Chapman	Goodlatte	Martini
Chenoweth	Goodling	Mascara
Christensen	Gordon	Matsui
Chrysler	Goss	McCarthy
Clayton	Graham	McCollum
Clement	Green	McCrery
Clinger	Gunderson	McDade
Clyburn	Gutierrez	McDermott
Coble	Gutknecht	McHale
Coburn	Hall (OH)	McHugh
Coleman	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Collins (GA)	Hamilton	McIntosh
Collins (IL)	Hancock	McKeon
Collins (MI)	Hansen	McKinney
Combest	Harman	McNulty
Condit	Hastert	Meehan
Cooley	Hastings (FL)	Meek
Costello	Hastings (WA)	Metcalf
Cox	Hayes	Meyers
Coyne	Hayworth	Mfume
Cramer	Hefley	Mica
Crane	Hefner	Miller (FL)
Crapo	Heineman	Mineta
Creameans	Herger	Minge
Cunningham	Hillery	Mink
Danner	Hinchee	Molinari
Davis	Hobson	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hoekstra	Montgomery
Deal	Hoke	Moorhead
DeFazio	Holden	Moran
DeLauro	Horn	Myers
DeLay	Hostettler	Myrick
Dellums	Houghton	Nadler
Deutsch	Hoyer	Neal
Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Nethercutt
Dickey	Hutchinson	Neumann
Dicks	Hyde	Ney
Dixon	Inglis	Norwood

Nussle	Sabo	Taylor (NC)
Oberstar	Salmon	Tejeda
Obey	Sanders	Thomas
Olver	Sanford	Thornberry
Ortiz	Sawyer	Thornton
Orton	Scarborough	Thurman
Owens	Schaefer	Tiahrt
Oxley	Schiff	Torkildsen
Packard	Schroeder	Torres
Pallone	Schumer	Torricelli
Pastor	Scott	Towns
Paxon	Seastrand	Trafficant
Payne (NJ)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Payne (VA)	Serrano	Velazquez
Pelosi	Shadegg	Vento
Peterson (FL)	Shaw	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Volkmer
Petri	Shuster	Vucanovich
Pickett	Sisisky	Waldholtz
Pombo	Skaggs	Walker
Pomeroy	Skeen	Walsh
Porter	Skelton	Wamp
Portman	Slaughter	Ward
Poshard	Smith (MI)	Waters
Pryce	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Quillen	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Radanovich	Smith (WA)	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Solomon	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Souder	Weller
Reed	Spence	White
Regula	Spratt	Whitfield
Reynolds	Stark	Wicker
Richardson	Stearns	Williams
Riggs	Stenholm	Wilson
Rivers	Stockman	Wolf
Roberts	Studds	Woolsey
Roemer	Stump	Wyden
Rohrabacher	Stupak	Wynn
Rose	Talent	Yates
Roth	Tanner	Young (AK)
Roybal-Allard	Tate	Young (FL)
Royce	Tauzin	Zeliff
Rush	Taylor (MS)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—38

Allard	Gallegly	Parker
Baessler	Gejdenson	Quinn
Baldacci	Greenwood	Rangel
Barton	Hilliard	Rogers
Becerra	Jacobs	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Largent	Roukema
Boehner	Linder	Saxton
Browder	Martinez	Stokes
Clay	Menendez	Thompson
Conyers	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Cubin	Moakley	Waxman
Dingell	Morella	Wise
Fattah	Murtha	

□ 1250

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 370 AND H.R. 97

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of two bills, H.R. 370 and H.R. 97.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COMBEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated in the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.