They want the public to believe that $270 billion in Medicare cuts will be pain-free and that seniors will be better off, maybe even have more freedom. Seniors have the freedom of choice right now. They can go to their own doctor. They can go to their own hospital. Let me reiterate to my Republican colleagues, this is free enterprise.

I think the public would be a little more confident in the Republican promises if the Medicare cuts were driven by a genuine health care concern instead of the balanced budget. Medicare is not bankrupt any more than the Defense Department is bankrupt. If you want to have senior citizen health care, you have to pay for it. You have to pay for it every year just like we have to pay for the Defense Department.

The Medicare system is not bankrupt. We just need to have the guts to pay for it.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 177

Resolved, That during further consideration of H.R. 1868 pursuant to House Resolution 170, consideration of the bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall proceed without intervening motion except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each of those amendments may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. Immediately after disposition of the amendments printed in the report, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think before we start the proceedings this morning that we all want to be reminded of the fact that our good friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MOAKLEY, is in the hospital. We wish him Godspeed and early return and all good health.

Mr. Speaker, in the week leading up to the Fourth of July break, we witnessed one of the longest campaigns of dilatory floor tactics in the recent history of the House of Representatives. That campaign continues. Yesterday's Roll Call quotes a minority leadership aide as saying, ''We are blowing up the House on Monday.'' Well, it is Tuesday and we are still here, and we are pleased about that.

The minority Members have made references to guerilla warfare. Mr. Speaker, these are not the sentiments of the people of the United States who are interested in working for the national interest. Unfortunately, it is clear that the minority has decided to hold the foreign operations bill and possibly other legislation hostage in order to grandstand on what is an extraneous issue and now one that I hope is behind us and resolved.

To anyone who still has questions about the matter of committee ratios, I simply urge them to look at the history of ratios in the House under Democratic rule. I think the evidence very clearly shows, as we pointed out in debate yesterday, that the Republicans indeed are more generous to the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means than we have experienced when it was the other way around. So let us end that discussion and get on with the business.

Mr. Speaker, the majority is here to do the people's business and today that business is the passage of the foreign operations appropriations bill. Reluctantly, I am here with a second rule, a rule that will enable us to finish this bill and continue the important work of considering appropriations bills. As we all know, we have many left to go before the August recess.

As Members are aware, under the rules of the House, limitation amendments to appropriation bills are subject to the majority leader's motion to rise. In fact, we could cut off all debate here and now and proceed to final passage. But at this point we choose not to do that. But it is an important point, so let me restate it. Under the rules, we could end the amending process right now. But we are not going to do that. Instead we have crafted a rule to ensure that the four pending amendments are protected and each one has adequate debate time.

To those who may rise to claim that this rule is not fair, I would point out the hours upon hours that this body has spent voting on unnecessary motions already on this appropriations bill, procedural motions, dilatory motions, time that could have been used to finish the bill under a completely open rule.

By calculations of the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if I have read his quotes right, so far 27 hours have been used in debate on this, which is 5 more than we used to debate Desert Storm in 1991, and that involved hostile open warfare.

This rule strikes an important balance between the rights of Members to offer amendments, most notably the three Democrat Members, I say the three Democrat Members who still have amendments pending are being provided for under this rule, and one other amendment as well, and the need to finish consideration of this legislation in a timely manner, which is our responsibility.

I think this is the right balance. It allows those who had amendments pending to complete the business of this bill. It does get the bill moving. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 177, the second rule on the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. Approximately 2 weeks ago, on June 22 when we were debating the first rule on this bill, I stood here and commended my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for reporting an essentially open rule. Now, after several days of full and fair debate on many important amendments under the 5 minute rule, we are suddenly closing down the process.

Under this new rule, only the four amendments specified in the accompanying rules report may be offered. These are amendments by Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. They are debatable for only 20 minutes each, equally divided between an opponent and proponent. Members will not be able to strike the last word and continue debating the merits of these amendments. No Member may offer any other amendment, regardless of how meritorious it may be.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to do business. I have stated before that some bills may require a structured rule, I have, in fact, supported structured rules on foreign operations appropriations bills in the past. However, if we are going to structure a rule, it

should be done from the beginning and in an upfront way. Changing the rules in the middle of the game is not fair to Members who may have been legitimately planning to draft amendments, but are now precluded from doing so. Early on we were promised an open rule on this bill and that promise should be kept.

In my opinion, we have seen some very good debate has taken place in this body over amendments which sometimes went for 2 or even 3 hours. I think that is good. I think our constituents want us to think about what we are doing with their money and to debate it fully before we act hastily. My own children's amendment to transfer $108 million in funds to the new Child Survival Fund and to include basic education activities for millions of poor children overseas was the subject of meaningful debate and drew support from both sides of the aisle. I regret that other Members may not have an equal opportunity to offer their ideas in amendment form.

I am also concerned that under this rule, Mr. FRANK will not be allowed to offer his amendment to withhold funds to Indonesia. The Frank amendment addresses a very severe human rights issue of repression against the people of East Timor. This is a subject that should certainly be addressed in the context of our country's foreign aid expenditures.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the debate on the American Overseas Interests Act, the International Affairs budget represents only 1.3 percent of total Federal spending. It has already been cut by 40 percent since 1985. As this bill was reported to the floor the fund for Africa absorbed a 21-percent cut, and another 40 percent was squeezed out of development aid. Funds in these areas go for self-help, preventive programs which actually save money down the road. This is a story we need to tell the American people. And to tell our story properly we should do it in a timely and deliberative manner.

I do plan to vote ''no'' on this rule and I urge my colleagues to join me to oppose it.

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

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) od rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	.....

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	.....

*Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. **All legislation, 64% restrictive; 36% open. ***Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. ****Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Sanibel, FL for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just spoke on the other side of the aisle is one of my best friends in this Congress because he is one of our most respected Members. But I just have to take some exception to a couple of things he said.

One of the things he said was that this is no way to do business. Well, he is right. This is no way to do business. I would just ask those that are watching and those in the gallery and those in the press to watch what happens when this rule comes to a vote. That is no way to do business, dilatory tactics.

The statement made by a very prominent Democrat late last week was that they would blow up this place on Monday. That is no way to do business. All of those dilatory tactic votes that we had all last week interrupting the people's business, that is no way to do business. So I get a little agitated when I hear statements like that.

Let me just say, to underscore some of the things that my good friend from Sanibel, FL has mentioned, that I really do regret things have to come to this juncture. We did something this year that has not been done in 8 years when the Democrats were in control, since 1987, and that is we put out a completely open rule on this foreign operations appropriation bill, a very controversial bill we put it out under an open rule so that any Member could offer amendments to this important piece of legislation.

I think that as a result of that, we did have some good debates on various amendments, like the one by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. That was a good amendment. We had a good substantial debate on it. We had some good interplay with second degree amendments along the way as well. And hopefully, the House was better able to make more informed and wise decisions.

But we also had some intentionally dilatory tactics that I have just mentioned, including votes on frivolous motions and prolonged and repetitive debates that normally would not have happened. If the majority had put out a structured rule, we would have allowed 15 or 20 minutes on 30 minutes on most of those amendments, and that would have been satisfactory in years past. But no, now the Democrats want to drag it out for several hours on relatively noncontroversial issues.

□ 1040

I do not think it can be said that these tactics were in protest of a completely open rule, Mr. Speaker. Some of it was in protest of the policy nature of a perfectly legitimate limitation amendment that was offered on Haiti. Some of it was completely unrelated to the foreign operations bill itself.

When we began the final stage of the amendment process dealing with limitation amendments, it was the right of the majority leader to move that the committee rise and report at any time. That is according to the rules of the House. Instead, we agree to allow for the further consideration of limitation amendments, and debate went on under the regular rules of the House with no end in sight.

Therefore, what the Appropriations Committee and our leadership recommended was to go back to the Committee on Rules and make in order the four limitation amendments that were pending when the Committee of the Whole last rose. We took them all, every amendment that was pending at that time and which was printed in the RECORD.

In order to allow for these extra amendments, we also had to deal with the prospect of more dilatory tactics. Consequently, we have a rule now that limits these four amendments to 20 minutes each, a concession we made to the minority after initially moving that each be debated for 10 minutes each.

Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Alabama, SONNY CALLAHAN, who will be the manager on this side of the aisle on this bill when the rule brings this to the floor, is going to agree to make a unanimous-consent request to lengthen that period of time, at the request of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY. We are going to cooperate in every way that we can, in spite of these dilatory tactics, which are upsetting me.

Mr. Speaker, we have also prevented any intervening motions of the kind that have continuously interrupted our work on this bill over the last month. We have allowed for the votes on the amendments to be postponed and to be clustered, which was done before under the Democrat leadership.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this is an eminently fair rule. It allows for more amendments to be considered than are required under a completely open rule. We have made in order three times as many Democrat amendments as Republicans' in this second rule, all that were requested and that had been preprinted in the RECORD. We have even protected them against points of order that would otherwise lie against some of them, which means they could have been knocked out without any debate on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has tried to be as fair as possible under the circumstances. We have bent over backward to allow for an open debate in an amendment process on a bill that has never had an open rule before. Yet, we have been met with demands for rollcall votes on the previous question to the rule, which will appear again here today in a few minutes, and on the adoption of a completely open rule.

The minority has not been content with open rules, it seems. Instead, it has demanded endless debates on amendments not in order under a regular open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to recognize that we had a full debate, a fair debate, and an open amendment process on this bill. We must bring it to a final vote, and the time to do it is right now. We will ultimately be judged not only on how fair and open we have been in arriving at a final passage on this bill, but on how well we have handled the responsibility that goes with that openness.

Let us now act like responsible legislators, the people expect us to do that, and conclude this debate and take a final vote. Members should not think that the American people are not watching out there, Mr. Speaker. They see these silly shenanigans that are going on here, and they resent it as much as I do.

Let us get on with the people's business. Let us put these amendments on the floor that were pending, all of them, and let us bring them to vote. Then let us go to final passage.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the home of Harry Truman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that at the time that the Committee rose, before we took off for the Fourth of July, that there was a fifth amendment, not the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, who is taking the fifth amendment around here?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, a fifth amendment was pending at the desk, at the Reading Clerk, that was not included and made in order by this rule. I would just like to, out of curiosity, know why the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] was not included in this rule. Do the Members have something against the gentleman from Massachusetts, or what is it?

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, we made amendments in order by the gentleman from Massachusetts many, many times when they were germane and to the point. That amendment was not pending. It had not been preprinted in the RECORD.

Mr. VOLKMER. It was not preprinted.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me to answer his question. Let me answer it and then he can respond, too.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in front of me something I cannot read. As a matter of fact, I even had it magnified. This is the amendment that somebody brought down to the desk just before we adjourned the other day. But I cannot even read the amendment.

Second, the amendment was not in order. It would have been subject to a point of order. Consequently, we took the three Democrat amendments and the one Republican amendment that had been preprinted in the RECORD, we made them in order, we waived points of order against them. Now they are going to be debated on this floor. That is fair, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, did the gentleman examine the RECORD of June 30, 1995?

Mr. SOLOMON. No.

Mr. VOLKMER. That amendment is included in that CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have the gentleman come over here and show it to me afterward.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, he can read it very easily: ''None of the funds made available in this act may be used for assistance for Indonesia.''

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, was that the day we adjourned?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it was not preprinted in advance in the RECORD. That is why we took all of those amendments that were preprinted in the RECORD. We went upstairs and made them in order. The gentleman evidently dropped it in just as we were closing that night, which did not qualify it, in my opinion.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield. I do appreciate the gentleman making this gentleman's amendment in order. I want to recognize that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a very respected Member of the House. The gentleman was diligent in filing his amendment several days before.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, the other thing I would like to ask of the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, just to perhaps, because the gentleman has the power, or the gentleman from Florida, to do this. They can do this. They can offer an amendment to the rule, amending it. I notice that if it is time that the gentleman is worried about, that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], who is now here, he is going to extend the time.

Mr. SOLOMON. The very distinguished gentleman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right, the very distinguished gentleman. He is going to give us 10 additional minutes on each amendment. That is a total of 40 more minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is right. He is very cooperative.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will yield further, what I was thinking of, Mr. Speaker, is rather than doing that, we can just take our minutes and add that other amendment in, and there is not any more time, and we can vote on the question of Indonesia.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, he really ought to speak to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. The gentleman from Wisconsin was the one requesting the additional time. Perhaps the gentleman could work that out over there. I appreciate the gentleman's point of view.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri. [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, even though the Committee on Rules in their generosity has made the amendment that I had printed in the RECORD in order, I still rise strongly in opposition to this rule. I do so because it is another case of not letting the House act on amendments that are normally in order but restricting amendments by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I think, again, it is a case of here we go again. When the Congress initially started, the day after, we were sworn in on the 4th of January, on the 5th the chairman of the Committee on Rules stood in that well, right at the podium on the Republican side, and talked about rules, and what we were going to do in rules, and how long it took for a bill to get out of committee, reports to be filed, and rules had to be done, and then the bill could come to the floor. It was very elaborate, very good, a very good education. Too bad there were not very many here to listen. This gentleman was, as the gentleman from New York knows.

However, at that time, Mr. Speaker, I and the gentlewoman from Colorado inquired of the gentleman and lo and behold, the gentleman said that by the time the year was over, we were going to have 70 percent of our rules that were going to be open rules, open rules on bills. Mr. Speaker, we are not even 40 percent now. Here we go again. This is not an open rule on this bill. It was an open rule, but it no longer is.

Mr. Speaker, the next time we see this bill, I dare say the next time will be when we are getting ready for the train wreck, when we get all the appropriation bills, we get the reconciliation bill, we get the tax bill, we get the debt limit bill, we get all of the farm bill, and all of these things will be stacked up in one big bill and sent to the President by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, when this occurs, everybody is going to be able to see what we on this side have been saying, and said it again this morning. It was denied again by the Gingrich Republican majority. That is that at that time, we are going to see the cuts in Medicare coming down the road. Where is the money going? We are going to see it in the tax bill. It is all going to be in one bill. We are going to see these big tax breaks for the wealthy. We are going to see our senior citizens in my district, where we have no HMO's, we have no HMO's, we are going to see them have to pay by the year 2002, or supposedly when this balanced budget is coming down the pike, that they are going to be paying over two to three times more for Medicare out of their meager Social Security check, so the wealthy at the same time are getting that $20,000 a year tax break. That is the next time Members are going to see this bill.

I daresay that I think we had better recognize that this bill, along with all the other appropriation bills, and the big spending bills, like the defense spending bill, and at the same time the

reconciliation bill, which is the one that cuts my farm programs, is going to cut my senior citizens programs, going to cut the school lunches for the kids, it is going to do all of that, and at the same time in that bill we are going to have a big tax break bill for the wealthy. That is the next time we see this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I am not only not going to vote for this rule, I am not even going to vote for the bill, because I think this bill is a lousy bill. I think that we ought to just send it back to committee and get rid of it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], chairman of the subcommittee in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind and generous allotment of time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in total support of the rule. I want to tell all the Members on both sides of the aisle that throughout the entire 27 hours of debate on this issue, I have tried diligently to work with both sides. I have tried to work and have worked with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. I have tried and have worked with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I have assented to just about every request that they have made within my realm of possibility.

Therefore, I am not going to support the four amendments that are offered, but, in the spirit of working together toward a resolution to this issue, we are going to give people the opportunity to debate them. I am going to ask for unanimous consent to give them even more time. I think we have come as far as we can come on this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I realize the dilatory tactics that are taking place. I realize why they are doing it. However, at the same time I think we have dilly-dallied long enough on this bill. I think we ought to go ahead and accept this rule today as it is written, so we can get on with the passage of this bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama, has certainly been as accommodating as he possibly could. His leadership has been exemplary, and I think in a couple of cases when we were going through the very difficult times the week before last in certain cases, it was only his cool temperament that held things together. I would just like to make that note.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague and the distinguished gentleman from greater San Dimas, CA [Mr. DREIER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and the Budget Process, which I understand is at this moment taking testimony over in the Rayburn Building, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it saddens me that we have come to the point where we have to have this rule. We have tried desperately to enhance the level of deliberation in this institution. On January 24 when we put into place the opening day reforms, that was one of the major guides we had, to make this a deliberative body, and one might claim that staying up around the clock, as we did the week before last, was part of the deliberative process. Nothing could be further from the truth. We all know that the dilatory tactics that came from some of our very, very, very distinguished colleagues jeopardized the ability to deliberate over this very important piece of legislation.

We desperately want to have every single rule open. Some have claimed that we have had many, many closed rules. Sixty-two percent of the legislation has come up under an open amendment process, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has just said. We want more and more open rules. We have done it so far.

However, when people are standing in the way of our responsibility to meet the appropriations deadlines, we have little choice other than to move ahead with some sort of structure with the rule. To me, as one who has worked and continues to this day to work on reform of the institution, I am very sorry that we have to in fact move forward with this kind of structure to the rule.

I hope that when we go ahead with the remaining appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to work in a bipartisan way to implement the kind of legislation that the American people said last year they wanted us to proceed with, and that I believe with a majority of this institution wants us to implement.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of this rule, because we have no alternative, unfortunately. I hope we will be able to finally bring a successful conclusion to this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we see a continuation of the pattern here that when amendments are inconvenient, they are simply prevented from being offered. I gather there was some reference to my handwriting, which I will concede is not much better than my diction, but what happened was I have been interested in the issue of Indonesia and its mistreatment to the people of East Timor for some time.

There are currently negotiations going on now between the Portuguese and Indonesian Governments in which the Portuguese Government is trying to bring some help to these beleaguered people. Having us debate this and perhaps adopt an amendment could be very helpful.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, during the original debate, someone on the other side was going to offer an amendment and decided not to. When I learned that, I came to the floor and offered one. I had one that was in fact offered and it was at the desk that first night. We then adjourned. I later learned earlier the next day, or later the next day, that there was a rule that was coming and we had to submit, so I hastily, it is true, wrote it and submitted it. However, in fact I had had an amendment at the desk the night before. I submitted one the next day when I was told, with very little notice that it was required to do that.

The question is this: Should we be allowed to debate Indonesia? When we talked about Haiti there was great concern for democracy on the other side. Indonesia now is engaging in East Timor in the worst repression I believe that is going on in the world, a repression that is as bad as any going on in the world. However, Indonesia will be sheltered by the Republican Party from an amendment which would put some pressure on them to stop the systematic denial of the rights of the people of East Timor.

As I said, negotiations are now going on trying to deal with that, but the Republican Party is going to use its majority to keep that from even being debated. having done that, Mr. Speaker, when they then talk about their concern for human rights and democracy elsewhere, it will seem hollow indeed, because one of the worst cases, the Indonesian repression in East Timor, will go unnoticed in this actual debate.

I would repeat, there was an amendment that was to be offered. When that was withdrawn, I hastily tried to make up for it, and they are going to repress this and protect the Indonesian autocracy.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker. I would simply like to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], that I appreciate all the turmoil and tribulation that he has had to go through on this bill. This is a very difficult bill, it always is, and he has been accommodating. He has been a gentleman, working with both sides of the aisle very, very well. I appreciate that.

We disagree on a portion of the bill, because it has been cut severely, in my opinion. Since 1985 there has been a 40-

percent cut. We are cutting it, of course, even much further this year.

□ 1100

I am going to support the bill. I am going to support the bill because of the way the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] protected the children's programs relative to immunization and relative to ORT, oral rehydration therapy, and UNICEF and the kinds of programs that really affect children.

I offered an amendment that was accepted. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], of course, did not like it. We debated it, but I believe that it really adds to the bill.

I hope someday that maybe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and I can maybe travel to some of these Third World nations together and see some of these programs, some of the immunization programs and some of the basic education programs and how they really help children and families develop.

I appreciate what the gentleman has tried to do. He has had a very difficult task. I praise him certainly for the children's portion of this bill. I realize it is a difficult bill.

I have said before that I have favored structured rules and I have supported them and handled them when we were in the majority. But the other side said that this was going to be an open rule, and I praised the process of an open rule, but now we are closing it down.

There are a couple of amendments that wanted to be offered that cannot be offered. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] was going to offer, in my opinion, a wonderful amendment.

I have been, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and even before, a proponent of taking money away from Indonesia because of the whole situation with the island of East Timor, which used to be a Portuguese colony and was taken over by Indonesia when the Portuguese left. Out of 700,000 people that live on the island, 200,000 people have been killed, in my opinion by the Indonesian Government and it is something that really ought to be debated.

People ask me why do we mess around with East Timor. Nobody knows about it. There is no constituency in this country. It is because of the Nation of who we are. And if we are going to give taxpayers' moneys to a country that oppresses its people, then I think we ought to take a second look at it and have a tremendous debate and we were not able to really vote on this issue.

I hope during this whole process, before the possibility of the previous question being defeated, maybe we could bring this up. Certainly I will attempt to do that, but maybe in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would urge a no vote on the previous question and if defeated, I would offer an amendment which would increase the debate time for consideration of amendments and would permit consideration of the Frank amendment, prohibiting funds to Indonesia.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have just been speaking to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman tells me that someone wondered where he was and the gentleman would like it reported that where he is is in the Committee on Appropriations. Because under the way this House is now functioning, the Committee on Appropriations is meeting and the gentleman's presence is required there while the rule is being debated.

The gentleman would like to be here to object to this unfair rule, but he has been tied down by the need to be at his committee; an example of how the House is not functioning very well these days.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the amendment that I would offer to the rule, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 177

On page 2, line 2 insert before the period ''and the amendment described in Section 2 of this resolution''

''On page 2, line 5, strike ''twenty'' and insert ''thirty''

After the period on page 2, line 24, insert the following:

''Section 2. The amendment numbered 86 printed pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII shall be considered as the printed amendment numbered 5 in the report accompanying this resolution to be offered by Representative Frank or his designee.''

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will be the closing speaker and I just have a few cleanup remarks I would like to make. Much of the commentary we have heard has been the subject of other debate and there is no point in hashing it over at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are about 80 minutes away from ending a debate that has so far consumed 27 hours, which I point out has been some 5 hours more than the House spent debating Desert Storm back in 1991. That was probably the most important vote that I have made since I have been a Member of Congress and I am sure many other Members would feel that way.

Regarding some other points that have been made about open rules and so forth, I think it is fair to go back and we can put into the procedure, if necessary, the amendment process under the special rules by our Committee on Rules, and comparing the 103d and 104th Congress. And yes, we argue about definitions, I know. But according to, I think, a fair and reasonable judgment, we have, indeed, had many more open rules or modified open rules in the 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, even I think our colleagues on the Committee on Rules on the other side have admitted that, although they feel maybe we are not doing quite as well as we hoped we would do. I think that is a subject of some debate, but I do not think it is debatable that we have not had more open rules. I think we definitely have.

With regard to the opportunity for more amendments here, I think there are probably an endless array of amendments that could come up under the foreign operations appropriation. I certainly had a couple of more Haiti amendments I was ready to bring out, but I think probably everybody is relieved that that has not happened, since we have already spent 6 hours on Haiti and that is probably more than enough.

With regard to East Timor, I had understood that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], had all discussed this amongst themselves and had discussed this somewhat in the past and the fact that if there was a casualty on East Timor on this matter, that it is truly a casualty of the dilatory debate tactics. Because had it not been for the dilatory debate, I suspect that would have happened.

But for the record I must state that the Committee on Rules met on the 29th and filed the rule on the 29th. The rule was filed. So a day late and a dollar short, it seems to be the situation with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. I am sorry that it happened.

I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] should talk to the leadership in the Democratic Party and the minority party about the use of dilatory tactics.

The other point, and my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], with whom I serve very happily and proudly on the Committee on Rules, has said that we began with an open rule, and I am sorry we did not stay with an open rule. I feel exactly the same way. We did not begin with an understanding that we were going to have dilatory tactics on an entirely extraneous matter.

I do not know what the problem really was. I do not know whether it was a question of Democratic unity or whether it was a question of a Medicaid speech or whether it was a question of really the committee statistics, the standings of the committees and the Ways and Means issue. I do not know what the issue was, but it clearly was not related to the foreign operations appropriation. It was extraneous, it was dilatory, and that is a matter of record.

The fact that we have had a casualty here and had to close down I think is regrettable. I think that it is very clear where that came from and what the problem with it is.

Having said all that, I think we have done our very best to make sure that

all the amendments we did know about at the time that we filed were taken care of, that were timely filed and that we felt had been discussed one way or the other. I think we have done a very fair and reasonable job.

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that to say that you are sorry that the East Timor situation is a victim of dilatory tactics seems to me an example of the kind of disproportion we can get into. We are talking about repression. Hurt feelings between ourselves should not get in the way of our being able to deal with repression.

The amendment that I offered, I came to the floor during the first period of debate, found to my disappointment that people who I thought were going to offer that amendment had not offered it. I then offered it, I submitted it. It had been in fact at the desk. This is not something that just happened the morning after. As soon as I found out that that was not being submitted, I submitted it. The next day when I was told there was a rule, I submitted it again.

As far as dilatory tactics, you are only doing 20 minutes of amendments, so we could hardly have been prolonging it. I submitted it, you come out with a rule that only does 20 minutes per amendment. I do not think another 20 minutes to allow us to deal with the horrible situation of repression in East Timor would have been a problem. To say to them, ''Sorry, you don't count because we're mad about dilatory tactics and we can't spare you 20 minutes,'' I think degrades the process.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, I would assure the gentleman I do not believe that was the situation. I believe the Committee on Rules dealt with what they felt they knew were amendments that had been timely filed with us. We did not know what other amendments might have been out there. If there had been other amendments that might have been on the same basis as yours at the time we met, what would we have done?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield further, I filed it the night before. As soon as I was told that there was a requirement for putting an amendment in, I scribbled it out and put it in. It was not written well, but it was submitted to the committee before the committee voted. It had been submitted the night before and it was submitted again before the committee voted. I cannot do any more than that.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, I think that the gentleman was in fact a victim of process which was derailed by dilatory tactics.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It was the people of East Timor who were the victims.

Mr. GOSS. The people of East Timor have been the victims for a long time. I agree it is a serious problem. I recognize the gentleman represents people from Portugal in his district. I understand his sensitivity. I also know that other Members of this body have dealt with the East Timor situation and reached the conclusion not to offer the amendment.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the whole thing about not knowing of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am a little fuzzy on that. I just cannot figure this out.

The gentleman from New York stands up here and shows us a big sign that has the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts as it was written, has now been enlarged into a sign. I assume that means that he had that at the time.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, the chairman did not have that big sign at the time. I think the only reason he had it is it has become sort of a cause celebre.

Mr. VOLKMER. The other thing I would like to ask the gentleman about, the gentleman mentioned on the subject of Indonesia that the gentlewoman from New York, the gentleman from Missouri, and the gentleman from Virginia had discussed it. Was the gentleman when you are talking about Missouri, were you talking about this gentleman?

Mr. GOSS. I was told that they had coordinated with you. If that is not true, then I am misinformed. In any even the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] apparently did have such an amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. We had discussed it. I just wanted to make sure you were talking about this gentleman and not someone else from Missouri. But I also had an amendment on Indonesia that I had planned to offer. I did not, as a result of a discussion that I had with the chairman of the subcommittee, but that should not preclude any other Members if they wished to offer it.

Mr. GOSS. I agree. I think what happened clearly was there was the thought, the expectation, that others were going to offer the amendment, and it did not happen and we got into this dilatory process.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I thank my friend the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close by saying that we did really have a discussion on the Frank amendment. As a matter of fact, it was offered in committee, we had a vote on it, the vote was 6 to 3, I think it was the last vote that we took, and all 6 Republicans voted against it and the 3 Democrats voted for it. So there was a discussion. It was not something that we did not have a chance to really talk about. We discussed it and we voted on it.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely right, of course. The concern we have is there were other Republicans who also said, ''Look, we have got things we want to put in there, too.'' I just said that I had another Haiti amendment.

The line was drawn and said, what we have got is what is in; if we start opening up, then you are going to find all kinds of little notes all over this place. People have said, ''I had intended to do that, had I only known.'' You have to draw the line somewhere. I think we drew it fairly. I think we tried to give fair treatment to the four that we have provided for in here.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wanted to point out that there are some alarming things going on. I read the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], in the New York Times as saying about these dilatory tactics that ''We're going to keep this up until we get justice.'' I would say that you want to be careful about justice. Sometimes when you pray for it, you get it.

I think when you look at some of the ways that we are trying to accommodate the minority, that we are doing better than in fact was the case when we were in the minority. It is something we are all aware of. We are determined to try to do better and be fairer.

If we are abused by dilatory tactics, obviously we are going to have to take appropriate countermeasures because we have the Nation's business to attend to. I read this morning in Congress Daily, I was unhappy to read it, a statement by the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], that says, ''We continue to be deeply concerned about the Republican leadership's attempt to stack the Ways and Means Committee.''

We disposed of that yesterday. I suppose I should say I am astonished, shocked, dismayed, incredulous about the minority leader's statement, but I am not speechless about it. The fact is that the Committee on Ways and Means minority is getting better treatment under this majority than the other way around, on a percentage basis.

Mr. VOLKMER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is not speaking on the rule.

Mr. GOSS. In fact I am speaking on the rule, Mr. Speaker, because what I am talking about is the rule that we have had to put in place is exactly because we have run into problems that we did not anticipate and I am sorry that we have. I am saying that the Committee on Rules will be forced to consider shutting down some of the openness of debate that we strive for and want to have to get the Nation's business done if we are subjected to meaningless, wasteful, dilatory tactics. That is just the fact.

I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). 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.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the minimum time for electronic voting on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, will be reduced to 5 minutes.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 162, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—236

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

NAYS—162

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clement
Coleman
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews
Bishop
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Fattah
Flake
Ford
Frost
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
McKinney
Mfume
Moakley
Nadler
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (MN)
Rangel
Reynolds
Rose
Rush
Scott
Stokes
Towns
Tucker
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Wynn
Yates

☐ 1135

Mr. SALMON and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 478, I was meeting with constituents and inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 15-minute vote followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 167, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—235

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula

Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—167

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clement
Coleman
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews
Bishop
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Fattah
Flake
Ford
Frost
Goodling
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
McIntosh
McKinney
Moakley
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Reynolds
Rush
Scott
Stokes
Towns
Tucker
Watt (NC)
Wynn
Yates

□ 1154

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). 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. HALL of Ohio. Mr 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 246, noes 156, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

AYES—246

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

NOES—156

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clement
Coleman
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews
Bishop
Browder
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Fattah
Flake
Frost
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
McKinney
Moakley
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Reynolds
Rush
Scott
Serrano
Stokes
Towns
Tucker
Watt (NC)
Wynn
Yates

□ 1203

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOSS moves to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 153, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

AYES—248

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—153

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clement
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Costello
Coyne
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOT VOTING—33

Andrews
Bishop
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Danner
Fattah
Flake
Frost
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
McKinney
Moakley
Morella
Myrick
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Reynolds
Roberts
Rush
Scott
Stokes
Towns
Tucker
Watt (NC)
Yates

□ 1222

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 478, 479, 480, and 481 on H.R. 1868, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on all. I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 481.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my votes on rollcall votes 478, 479, 480, and 481 be shown in the RECORD at the appropriate places as "no."

I was unavoidably detained.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1868, in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolutions 170 and 177, each of the amendments printed in House Report 104–167 be debatable for 30 minutes rather than 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1868, the bill about to be considered, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, July 10, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken the following order: H.R. 1642 denovo; H.R. 1643 denovo; H.R. 1141, denovo; and S.523, denovo.

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

EXTENDING MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO CAMBODIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1642.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1642.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.