

money to finance the closing costs of the transaction do not constitute new money.

Fourth, the bill clarifies that loan servicers are not assignees for purposes of truth in lending liability if they only own legal title for servicing purposes.

Fifth, the bill raises the statutory damages for individual actions from \$1,000 to \$2,000. Section 130(a) of TILA allows a consumer to recover both actual and statutory damages in connection with TILA violations. However, statutory damages are provided in TILA because actual damages, which require proof that the borrower suffered a loss in reliance upon the inaccurate disclosure, are extremely difficult to establish. To recover actual damages, consumers must show that they suffered a loss because they relied on an inaccurate or incomplete disclosure. A number of lawsuits have been filed in which plaintiffs have claims as actual damages the amount of the fees or charges that have been misdisclosed. This is not the meaning of actual damages. The proper meaning of damages is discussed in *Adiel v. Chase Federal Savings & Loan Association*, 630 F. Supp. 131 (S.D. Fla. 1986), *aff'd* 810 F.2d 1051 (11th Cir. 1987).

Sixth, the bill preserves the consumer's 3-day rescission period for all refinance loans with different creditors. As currently set forth in the Truth in Lending Act, this cooling off period expires absolutely in 3 years, after consummation of the transaction or the consumer's sale of the property in cases where the TILA disclosures contained an error in a material disclosure or were not provided to the consumer. Contrary to some court decisions which have allowed this rescission period to extend for as long as 8 years after the loan was closed in the context of recoupment, the existing statutory language is clear, 3-years means 3 years and the time period shall not be extended except as explicitly provided in section 125(f). Section 8 of the bill, which deals with rescission in the context of recoupment, cross-references the 3 year limit set forth in section 125(f).

Moreover, as is currently set forth in the Federal Reserve regulations, when a borrower refinances an existing loan and takes out new money, only the new money is subject to rescission.

I am very proud to have achieved this legislation, which has support from both sides of the aisle, to rectify a serious problem, and preserve meaningful consumer disclosures in the future.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2399, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 743, TEAMWORK FOR EMPLOYEES AND MANAGERS ACT OF 1995

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 226 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 226

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 743) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(2)(B) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 226 is an open rule, providing for consideration of H.R. 743, the Teamwork for

Employees and Managers Act of 1995. The resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. The rule makes in order the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment, with each section considered as read. Further, the rule authorizes the Chair to give priority recognition to members who have had their amendment preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The rule also waives clause 2(1)(2)(B) of rule XI, which requires the publication of rollcall votes in committee reports. The Economic and Educational Opportunities Report 104-248 on H.R. 743 contains incorrect information on rollcall votes due to typographical errors during the printing process. The votes were correctly reported in the original report filed with the Clerk. However, a star print—report No. 99-006—has been issued which contains the correct rollcall information.

Mr. Speaker, the workplace model used to craft labor laws of the early 20th century no longer meet the needs and reality of the current marketplace and employer-employee relations. The TEAM Act recognizes that the most effective workplaces are those where employees and employers cooperatively work together, and makes the necessary changes to our labor laws to allow this new workplace dynamic to flourish.

The TEAM Act will help to promote greater employee involvement in the workplace by clarifying that it is not impermissible for an employer to establish or participate in any organization in which employees are involved to address workplace issues such as quality, productivity, and efficiency. These organizations will not have the authority to enter into or negotiate collective-bargaining agreements—all of those rights remain unchanged. The act also specifies that unionized workplaces will not be affected.

Greater employee involvement in the workplace has proven to be an effective tool to increase the job satisfaction each employee derives from the workplace, and brings greater value to the production process. The TEAM Act recognizes that employers and employees can work together based on cooperation, not confrontation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule for consideration of H.R. 743. This open rule provides for fair debate of the bill and permits Members to offer amendments for consideration by the full House.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following statistical information from the Committee on Rules establishing for the RECORD the openness of the rules process in the 104th Congress:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of September 26, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	50	75
Modified Closed ³	49	47	15	22
Closed ⁴	9	9	2	3
Totals:	104	100	67	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be pre-printed in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of September 26, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MC			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PO: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MO	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PO: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PO: 241-173; A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PO-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 743 and to rule which provides for its consideration. This bill is nothing more than a thinly disguised

attempt to return to the old days of company unions. Supporters of this bill represent it as a means of empowering employees in the 21st century workplace. But, I submit Mr. Speaker, that rather than looking forward, this bill represents a return to the early 20th century when employers controlled

both sides of a bargaining table, if indeed such a table existed.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation effectively repeals a worker protection that has been in place for 60 years. In 1935, when the Wagner Act was enacted, the Congress chose to extend a guarantee

of a fundamental principle of democracy to the workplace. That principle, in essence, is the freedom of association, the right of employees to choose their own independent representative to negotiate with an employer over wages, hours, or conditions of employment. Common sense and decency demand no less for the working men and women in this country, most especially as we enter the 21st century.

This democratic principle should serve as a moral compass as we, as a Nation, negotiate our place in the global economy. If we are indeed the greatest democratic Nation in the history of the planet, then how can we deny such a fundamental principle of democracy to our own workers, for are they not the backbone of our country and all it stands for?

Proponents of this legislation claim that in order for business to compete in the new century that new efficiencies must be implemented in the workplace, by establishing work teams or labor-management cooperation programs. They claim section 8(a)(2) precludes such labor-management association. But I would beg to differ. Mr. Speaker, innovations such as employee work teams are already flourishing in the shops, businesses, and factories of this country, in spite of the existence of section 8(a)(2).

In fact, the NLRB has already held, in General Foods, that the employer has the right to set up a method of production which delegated significant managerial responsibilities to employee work teams. And, in the Electromation case, the very case the proponents cite as a powerful example of the need for this change in the law, the court of appeals held that section 8(a)(2) does not foreclose appropriate employee involvement which focused solely on increasing company productivity, efficiency, and quality control.

If one examines the law, one can see that section 8(a)(2) does not prohibit employee involvement, it merely distinguishes between legitimate and illegitimate activity. Section 8(a)(2) prohibits only one form of employee involvement: The employee program which is dominated by the employer and which deals with employees' wages or other terms or conditions of employment. Section 8(a)(2) merely seeks to assure workers that they will have the right to determine who speaks for them and who will ultimately be responsible to them.

Mr. Speaker, if issues were left open by the Electromation case, then let us address those specific issues. If there was a chilling effect on existing employee involvement programs, then let us fix that problem. But H.R. 743 is not a fix: It is, instead, a fundamental change in the rights of working men and women. And it is a change that is unfair and unreasonable and I urge defeat of the bill.

□ 1300

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be adopted and we should move swiftly to enact the TEAM Act, because it is necessary for us to do that to enable modern business practices to be continued and expanded here in the United States.

We have come a long way since the World War I Henry Ford-style mass production, where you do what you are told and you show up. Henry Ford used to say "The only trouble I have with employees is that I am hiring their mind along with their hands." He just wanted people who would do what they were told and be as productive as possible and not bring all of their abilities to building quality into their product.

We have come a long way from that. To have a sophisticated modern economy, we need to involve employees' abilities as fully as possible in the workplace and in the enterprise in which they are active.

I had a meeting some years ago when we were worried about the Japanese threat, and one of the Japanese businessmen who was there said "Well, you know, we are going to beat you every time in the marketplace." I asked "Why is that?" He said "Because when we compete with an American corporation with 10,000 employees, we are only competing really with 10 or 15 brains. The rest are just doing what they are told. I have 5,000 Japanese employees, and all of their brains are actively working to maximize our quality and our cost effectiveness in the workplace."

We have changed that here in America. We have got to keep on changing that through employee involvement, employee circles, working to give everyone a greater say in how their jobs are operated and in the goods that they produce and the quality that is built into them. That is what employee involvement is all about.

Unfortunately, under some outdated—in this new world—labor legislation passed in other times, courts have held that employee involvement practices violate legal standards. For example, here is a case of the Donnelly Corp., whose employee involvement program really resulted in a classic catch-22 situation and would be in violation of law if we fail to pass the TEAM Act.

That company had a program which was lauded by the U.S. Department of Labor for its innovations in worker-management relations. But, ironically, as a result of Donnelly's testimony before the Dunlop Commission on the future of worker-management relations as they worked to try to improve our competitiveness and the fulfilling nature of employment in our country, their program is regarded as in jeopardy.

The National Labor Relations Board is challenging the program of the Donnelly Corp. as a violation of section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act. Donnelly's program, as I said, was praised for its reliance on the principle that workers, when given the opportunity, make an invaluable contribution to the success of their companies. They do not have to be told what to do. They can decide for themselves. The development of the Donnelly program was directly intended to empower employees and push decisionmaking authority down to the shop floor. Unfortunately, a single labor law professor who heard their innovative story decided to punish them and their employer for the sake of preserving the 1930 style of collective bargaining.

So the TEAM Act would ensure that proceedings like that now involving the Donnelly Corp. before the National Labor Relations Board could not be brought because it would clarify the law and make it clear that employee involvement would not violate section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act.

For that reason I would urge adoption of this rule and the passage of the TEAM Act.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule on H.R. 743, the so-called TEAM Act. This bill would be a flagrant violation of the rights of workers and is in absolute disregard of the democratic values of this country.

Sixty years ago, this Nation enacted laws to protect its workers by ensuring their right to have an independent voice in the conditions of their workplaces. Workers were permitted and guaranteed by law the right to have a separate negotiating body on which they could rely in effectively representing their interests. As a result of the efforts of these organized employee representative bodies, or unions, for the first time substantial protection of workers' rights were achieved in this country, and many unfair labor practices and unsafe working environments were addressed and improved, not to mention improvements in wages and hours.

This bill, however, ironically in the name of teamwork, would rob workers of that independent voice and thwart organizing efforts, leaving employees vulnerable to abuse by employers. This bill would give the management under certain circumstances the exclusive authority to set conditions of employment, wages and hours, sole authority to deal with labor disputes and grievances under certain circumstances, authority to select and appoint members of workplace teams, and the authority in some cases to set the agenda and even terminate employees at will. By dictating to workers who will represent

them in discussions concerning the conditions of their workplaces, it strips workers of their basic rights to organize and to be represented independently. This kind of so-called cooperation between employees and employers would put workers in the most compromising position, in effect back where they were before the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935.

This bill is not about teamwork. What it really is about is employer domination and destruction of the rights of workers. This bill fosters the exploitation of workers and denies them a democratic voice in their workplace. The so-called TEAM Act is destructive of the democratic progress this Nation has made, as have been so many of the Republican bills that have come to this floor in this session.

For the sake of fairness and for the preservation of the basic rights of workers, I urge my colleagues to oppose this very reactionary and very misguided legislation.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 743, the TEAM Act. Today, an employer who works together with employees to improve work safety, boost productivity or address employee morale, is violating the law. I have got union groups in my particular district. Labor works with management, management works with labor, and it is as it should be. But in all circumstances it does not work that smooth. As a matter of fact, these individuals sit down and they plan the goals, plan how much work is to be done, and the group, labor and management, actually sits down and determines if they want to shut down because they cannot reach their goal or if it is good for business, because they are smart enough to realize it is better to be working than not working, and they work very closely together.

But for management to be able to sit down with workers and organize as far as what is good for that company and be in violation of the law, it is just not good common sense.

Mr. Speaker, the labor unions represent less than 12 percent of the work force in this country. The rest of the work force, over 82 percent, is made up of small and large business in private industry, and the opposite side of the aisle say they constantly represent the worker. If that was the case, they would represent 82 percent of the private enterprise and the unions. But that is not the direction they want to go.

The TEAM Act says simply that an employer can work with employees, period. It does not permit illegal employer unions. It does not affect union shops at all. It does not intrude on collective bargaining. It simply allows employers and employees to work together. That is good common sense.

Unfortunately, that does not exist in this body many times.

The TEAM Act has a broad range of support, because happy employees who are involved in their work are unlikely to join labor unions and pay union dues. The TEAM Act is opposed, of course, by organized labor.

Vote "yes" on the TEAM Act and oppose weakening amendments and support a strong labor force, both private and union.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the Teamwork for Employers and Managers Act is a euphemism. It perverts the notion that labor and management are on the same team, when only the management gets to call the plays.

In my State of Rhode Island, we would call this bill the Waybosset bill. If anybody has even been to Providence, RI, and driven down Waybosset Street, they would know that I mean. It is a one-way street.

That is what we are calling for in this bill, the TEAM Act. It is saying management can choose who they are going to bargain with. That does not sound fair to me. That perverts the whole idea of bargaining. How is labor going to have representation at the table if they cannot even choose their own representatives? This bill says that management is going to decide who represents labor.

My colleagues, just think of what we have already done this session. The Republicans have dismantled OSHA. They have also said that when it comes to worker health and safety, that is voluntary. That is like saying stoplights should be voluntary. How often do you think a manager is going to go into their own workplace and say "This is unsafe for the workers," when in essence they would be criticizing themselves? Managers do not even have to keep track of or records now of their own inspections.

Mr. Speaker, no one should be fooled by the rhetoric here. This TEAM Act is a euphemism. It is nothing more than a one-way street for management to call the plays and expect labor to run their own plays.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the TEAM Act.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will agree with one thing my colleague just said, that we ought not to believe the rhetoric that people are saying about this bill. Let me describe what the bill does and why we need it. One of the really important developments, Mr. Speaker, of the last 10 to 15 years in particular has been the development of something called employee involvement or employee teams. There are millions of Americans famil-

iar with it because they are participating in them.

These are a very flexible, diverse kind of way to get employees involved in making decisions which otherwise would have to be made entirely by management. It can cover everything from scheduling decisions to safety to productivity. It can be as formal as a regular safety committee, or as informal as people getting together for a few days to talk about scheduling or talk about how we deal with this problem on the production line. It increases employee satisfaction, it increases productivity, it has made American industry more competitive internationally. It is a good thing, and we have dozens and dozens and dozens of people come and testify and tell us that. And these were employees.

I have been out in shops and touring places in my district, and they all wanted to be able to do this. And the problem is that that form of employee involvement is quite probably illegal under the National Labor Relations Act, because 60 years ago, Congress quite properly outlawed company unions, and the National Labor Relations Board has interpreted these things as to be in effect company unions. Now we need to be able to provide relief to these millions of Americans who are doing something they want to do and helping the economy at the same time.

□ 1315

Now, the arguments against this that we have heard made and are going to be made by the other side is this will hurt union shops, it will circumvent workplaces that are collectively bargained and the proper role of the collective bargaining agent.

The answer to that, the bill exempts workshops that are organized by unions. It does not apply there. We will hear argued that the bill permits company unions. The truth is the bill explicitly prohibits company unions because it says if one of these employee entities has or claims the right to bargain collectively, and that is the essence of a union, an entity that claims the right to bargain collectively, is not covered by the bill. It is not protected by the proviso.

We will hear it is not needed; that, in fact, there is nothing wrong out there; that people are doing this now and are not under threat. Mr. Speaker, there are dozens of cases pending before the National Labor Relations Board in which these arguments are being challenged now, and I do not think the board is wrong in doing that, because under the bipolar world of the National Labor Relations Act as it was passed in 1935, employee relations had to be necessarily adversarial. Either management and labor eyed each other across the bargaining table in an adversarial fashion or the only other model was employers ramming it down the throat of employees. They did not anticipate what would happen 45 or 50 years later

when people would work together and cooperate.

These things are foreign to the scheme of the NLRA as it was passed 60 years ago. That is why we need to update it. Do we really think there is no problem? Well, here is what this Congress said last year when it was controlled by the other side in a committee report on an OSHA bill. "Substantial uncertainty exists over the impact of the Electromation and DuPont decisions", and those are the decisions we are talking about, "on joint safety and health committees".

In other words, Mr. Speaker, these committees may be illegal under the law. Mr. William Gould, who is the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, said exactly what I said a minute ago. He said, "The difficulty here is that Federal labor law, because it is still rooted in the Great Depression reaction to company unions through which employers controlled labor organizations, prohibits financial assistance by employers to any labor organization". That is his quote, and he meant including any kind of employee involvement. He suggested amendments to the NLRA that allowed for cooperative relationships.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible to have win-win kinds of legislation. It is possible to have legislation which empowers people to do good things. That is what we are trying to do here. I urge the House to consider this dispassionately, to discount the rhetoric against this kind of thing. This is something that people really want. Let us do something people really want rather than allowing them to be bound by the concepts and the laws on those concepts of 60 years ago when the world was a very, very different place than it is now.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me confess at the outset that I come from a union family. My mother, father, two brothers and I all worked for a railroad. We were all proud members of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and that is part of my core value. I believe in unionism.

I believe that labor organizations have an important place in the American economy, but let me tell Members a story; 2 or maybe 3 years ago the Democratic Caucus had a meeting, and we invited in the head manager and the top union representative from the Saturn plant in Tennessee. We have seen all the ads about their teamwork there. These two men came to the stage both wearing khaki pants and a white button-down shirt and a red cardigan sweater. They sat down and started talking about their team concept in building cars, and for the first 10 minutes, I swear, I could not tell which was on the management side and which was on the labor side. It was clearly the best of all possible worlds. Here was a workplace situation where work-

ers were being treated with dignity, brought into the decision process. The kind of team approach which we all hope will become part of American business and the American labor experience.

Mr. Speaker, I can say with some certitude, because I have heard it from those who support this TEAM Act, that this is not an exception at the Saturn plant. In fact, what we are told is that 80 percent of the largest companies in the United States are already doing this; that some 30,000 workplaces across the country have tried these concepts where the workers and the management sit down and work together and it works. The productivity of the workers is shown in the wages and in the quality of the product and the profits for the company, and that is certainly what we all want.

So the obvious question, if this is taking place in so many businesses across the United States, why do we need this law? If Congress is going to spend its time passing laws to enact things that already exist, we are going to have a pretty busy schedule, and there are a lot of things we should be spending our time on and problems that need to be solved.

Well, when we open up the lid and look inside the TEAM Act, we find it is much more than I just described and much more than we heard from the Republicans who are supporting it. It is not a question of employee and employer cooperation. We all want that. What they are trying to do is twofold. First, they have three companies that have gone over the line and pushed it too far. They have cases ending before the National Labor Relations Board. These companies, these special interests, are pushing for this legislation to get them off the hook.

Second, many companies think if they can create this kind of a company union, they can break efforts to organize plants and businesses across the United States by labor organizations. They will come in and say, do not sign up with the international union, we will create our little company union here and, therefore, you will not have to do business with them. It is a way to break down an effort to organize a plant.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is a good thing for us to see in this country. The single biggest problem we face in our economy is that working families, middle-class families, are working harder, putting in more hours, going to work, husbands and wives both playing by the rules and beating their heads against the wall. The productivity is up, corporate profits are up, and wages are not up.

Wages are stagnant and people are frustrated and angry and they should be. It is no coincidence we have seen a decline in the size and quality of the middle class in America as we have seen a decline in the size of labor unionism, because those workers no longer have a place at the table in col-

lective bargaining. The TEAM Act is an effort to keep those workers away from the table, put them in little company unions where they can be controlled.

What we need in this country is an honest approach. Collective bargaining. Hard work should be rewarded. People should get a decent paycheck. That is part of the American dream, and it is a darned good reason to vote against the TEAM Act.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING,] the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] who talked about the beautiful operation going on in union settings between labor and management, and that is true, and that is what we want to do for the rest of the people in the United States. At the present time that cannot happen if you are not a unionized plant. Either management dictates everything or employees dictate everything. They cannot work together as they do in a union setting. That is why the necessity for the legislation that is on the floor today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the bill.

The most important reason workers organize or join a union at their workplace is so that they have some collective clout. Every employee knows that without a union, the employer makes all the rules—pay, hours, overtime, working conditions. The employer owns the job and workers can be fired without cause.

Only the legal protection of the National Labor Relations Act and its 8(a)(2) provision, ensures that people have the right to elect representatives of their own choosing to negotiate on the employees behalf. If we change this critical protection in the law, then democracy fails.

Employers understand this very well. It is no accident that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers support this bill. If these business representatives—who were not chosen by the employees—were interested in employee participation, as they claim, then let them prove it by supporting union organizing efforts by unions of the employees choice. Democracy succeeds when the rights of workers are respected—not eliminated.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this dangerous bill.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point about the impact of this bill on union organizing. An employer cannot use a team or committee to interfere with employees' ability to organize or engage in other concerted activities for mutual aid or protection. The law which makes it an unfair labor practice for employers to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights, guaranteed by section 7 of the NLRA, to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing—remains untouched by the TEAM Act. In a recent case, it was found that an employer's promise, the day before a union election, to establish a communications committee to deal with employee grievances was a violation of section 8(a)(1) because it was used as an inducement to persuade employees to vote against the union. This case remains good law even after passage of the TEAM Act.

The bill specifically states that "it shall not constitute or be evidence of a violation under this paragraph for an employer" to establish and participate in an employee involvement structure. H.R. 743 also specifically provides in section four that "Nothing in this Act shall affect employee rights and responsibilities contained in provisions other than section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

Thus, the other protections in section 8(a) of the NLRA which prohibit employer conduct that interferes with the right of employees to freely choose independent representation remain in full force. If employee involvement structures do not prove to be an effective means for employees to have input into the production and management policies that impact them, those employees have every right, and every reason, to formally organize.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are not here to try to undercut unions. On the other hand, I do not want somebody that is elected by a union to come and talk common sense, and you know this TEAM Act is probably one of the most commonsense pieces of labor legislation that this House has ever seen.

The TEAM Act will allow employers and employees to come together and discuss how they as a team, as the bill says, can make their workplace safer, more efficient, and produce a higher quality product, all without the threat of union legal battles. The aim of the legislation is to allow companies to bring their employees into the planning process by giving them a hand in formulating their work policy.

Mr. Speaker, we all know big labor will paint this as detrimental to the American worker. It is simply false.

The bill makes it clear that employer-employee organizations may not enter into or negotiate collective bargaining agreements or amend existing collective bargaining agreements.

The real reason that unions are screaming is they are afraid of losing power by allowing employees to work with their employers to solve basic problems without the heavy hand of union interference.

As we prepare our work force for the 21st century, we cannot continue to hold on to obsolete rules that stifle creative solutions to challenges in the workplace, and unions need to change, too. Both employees and employers want the ability to improve their performance and working conditions. The TEAM Act does that while still protecting the rights of the employees.

Do what is right for American workers, support teamwork. Let us vote for this rule and the TEAM Act.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] on putting this act together. This will revolutionize the way we do business in America, and unfortunately there is some case law out there that stands in the way of businesses being competitive in the 21st century.

□ 1330

The Third District of South Carolina has transformed itself in the last 30 or 40 years from being a district dominated by the textile industry.

When I was growing up, there was a paternalistic society where people were not asked to give their ideas. They were told what to do and when to be there and they were treated like children.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen that industry itself change where now business leaders are looking at their employees as assets and they are asking them: How can we make our product better? They are talking to them about safety in the workplace and about benefit packages.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill that prevents people from organizing unions, if they want to. What we are trying to do is to make sure that when employees and employers want to, they can sit down and discuss how to run a business; how to make it better for the employer and better for the employee.

Unless we pass this legislation, there is a legal ruling that will stand in the way of that from happening. If that cannot happen in the Third Congressional District of South Carolina, we are going to be left behind, because employees are assets that have good minds and good hearts. They want to give back to the company. They want to be asked how to do business. They want to be a part of the process.

Mr. Speaker, as I go through my district touring plants, I am now shown the plant by team leaders. They take a lot of pride in what they do. There is dignity in the workplace. This is an absolute, essential piece of legislation to allow American businesses to grow. If we do not pass this, we are going to go back to the time when workers were treated like children and the only people who could talk were unions, and that is not fair.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge defeat of the rule and defeat of the TEAM Act.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing assault on the American worker by this Congress continues today with the consideration of the TEAM Act. I strongly urge the defeat of this proposal.

This bill, in my opinion, creates more problems than it solves. The so-called TEAM Act has nothing to do with teamwork, with workplace cooperation, or with empowering employees.

Under the guise of empowering employees, H.R. 743 guts section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act, allowing an employer to create an organization of employees, determine its procedures, and select the organization's leaders. The bill would reestablish company unions, because employers could negotiate the terms and conditions of employment with this new organization, so long as the employer does not enter into a new contract.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating the basic right of employees to be represented by their own independent representatives in collective bargaining will not improve the situations of employers or employees. The TEAM Act would turn existing cooperative labor-management groups into adversarial relationships. Undermining the basic rights of employees is not teamwork, but is an attack on basic rights of workers to have independent representation.

The assault on the workers continues in this Congress. It must be stopped. The very first thing we saw at the start of this Congress with the Education and Labor Committee was the elimination of the word "labor" in the name of the new committee.

Then we saw an assault on the minimum wage. Not only has the majority refused to raise the minimum wage; they want to eliminate the minimum wage totally. We see the OSHA laws, the safety of the American worker which is so important, they want to undermine it and eliminate it and scrap it. That continues to march on.

The National Labor Relations Board, we saw in the funding bills, they want to eliminate a lot of moneys to fund that. That is supposed to monitor unfair labor practices.

We talk about Davis-Bacon which is supposed to provide construction workers with a prevailing wage. They want to repeal Davis-Bacon.

Mr. Speaker, this TEAM Act is just another in a set of measures by the majority Republicans in this Congress to try to undermine the well-being of the American worker, to try to assault the American worker. It really ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the rule and defeat of this bill. This is a terrible piece of legislation. My colleagues have heard the speakers on our side. It would change 60 years of settled law in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disappointed to hear my colleague from Texas urging defeat of this rule, as this is a completely open rule. This rule allows any Member of this House to come forward with any amendment that they feel needs to be discussed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are no preprinting requirements. There are no time limitations. This is an open rule. This is the best way to bring debate to this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support adoption of this rule, despite whatever misgivings they may have to the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, Mr. Speaker.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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 267, nays 149, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 686]

YEAS—267

Allard	Blute	Chenoweth
Archer	Boehlert	Christensen
Army	Boehner	Chrysler
Bachus	Bonilla	Clement
Baker (CA)	Bono	Clinger
Baker (LA)	Boucher	Coble
Ballenger	Brewster	Coburn
Barr	Brownback	Collins (GA)
Barrett (NE)	Bunn	Combest
Bartlett	Bunning	Condit
Barton	Burr	Cooley
Bass	Burton	Cox
Bateman	Buyer	Crane
Bellenson	Calvert	Crapo
Bereuter	Camp	Cremeans
Bilbray	Canady	Cubin
Bilirakis	Castle	Cunningham
Bishop	Chabot	Davis
Bliley	Chambliss	Deal

DeLauro	Istook
DeLay	Johnson (CT)
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Dickey	Jones
Dicks	Kasich
Doggett	Kelly
Dooley	Kim
Doolittle	King
Dornan	Kingston
Dreier	Klug
Duncan	Knollenberg
Dunn	Kolbe
Ehlers	LaHood
Ehrlich	Largent
Emerson	Latham
English	LaTourrette
Ensign	Laughlin
Everett	Lazio
Ewing	Leach
Fawell	Lewis (CA)
Fields (TX)	Lewis (KY)
Flanagan	Lightfoot
Foley	Lincoln
Forbes	Linder
Ford	Livingston
Fowler	LoBiondo
Fox	Longley
Franks (CT)	Lowe
Franks (NJ)	Lucas
Frelinghuysen	Luther
Frisa	Manzullo
Funderburk	Martini
Galleghy	McCarthy
Ganske	McCollum
Gekas	McCrery
Geran	McDade
Gilchrest	McHugh
Gillmor	McInnis
Gilman	McIntosh
Goodlatte	McKeon
Goodling	Metcalfe
Gordon	Meyers
Goss	Mica
Graham	Molinari
Greenwood	Montgomery
Gunderson	Moorhead
Gutknecht	Moran
Hall (TX)	Morella
Hamilton	Myers
Hancock	Myrick
Hansen	Nethercutt
Hastert	Neumann
Hastings (WA)	Ney
Hayes	Norwood
Hayworth	Nussle
Hefley	Olver
Hefner	Orton
Heineman	Oxley
Herger	Packard
Hilleary	Parker
Hobson	Paxon
Hoekstra	Payne (VA)
Hoke	Petrey
Horn	Pickett
Hostettler	Pombo
Houghton	Porter
Hunter	Portman
Hutchinson	Pryce
Hyde	Quillen
Inglis	Quinn

NAYS—149

Abercrombie	Costello
Ackerman	Coyne
Andrews	Cramer
Baessler	Danner
Baldacci	de la Garza
Barcia	DeFazio
Barrett (WI)	Dellums
Becerra	Deutsch
Bentsen	Dingell
Berman	Dixon
Bevill	Doyle
Bonior	Durbin
Borski	Edwards
Browder	Engel
Brown (CA)	Eshoo
Brown (FL)	Evans
Brown (OH)	Farr
Bryant (TX)	Fattah
Cardin	Fazio
Chapman	Fields (LA)
Clay	Filner
Clayton	Flake
Clyburn	Foglietta
Coleman	Frank (MA)
Collins (IL)	Frost
Collins (MI)	Furse
Conyers	Gejdenson

Radanovich	Lofgren	Obeys	Slaughter
Ramstad	Maloney	Ortiz	Spratt
Reed	Manton	Owens	Stark
Regula	Markey	Pallone	Stokes
Riggs	Martinez	Pastor	Studds
Roberts	Mascara	Payne (NJ)	Stupak
Roemer	Matsui	Pelosi	Thompson
Rogers	McDermott	Peterson (FL)	Thornton
Rohrabacher	McHale	Peterson (MN)	Thurman
Ros-Lehtinen	McKinney	Pomeroy	Torres
Rose	McNulty	Poshard	Velazquez
Roth	Meehan	Rahall	Vento
Roukema	Meek	Rangel	Visclosky
Royce	Menendez	Richardson	Waters
Salmon	Mfume	Rivers	Waxman
Sanford	Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Williams
Sawyer	Minge	Rush	Wilson
Saxton	Mink	Sabo	Wise
Scarborough	Mollohan	Sanders	Woolsey
Schaefer	Murtha	Schroeder	Wyden
Schiff	Nadler	Schumer	Wynn
Seastrand	Neal	Scott	Yates
Sensenbrenner	Oberstar	Serrano	

NOT VOTING—18

Bryant (TN)	Miller (CA)	Towns
Callahan	Miller (FL)	Tucker
Jacobs	Moakley	Volkmer
Jefferson	Reynolds	Watts (OK)
Johnston	Tejeda	Young (AK)
Kanjorski	Torricelli	Young (FL)

□ 1356

Mr. BEVILL and Mr. RICHARDSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. SKAGGS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 66, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 687]

AYES—344

Allard	Bishop	Christensen
Andrews	Bliley	Chrysler
Archer	Blute	Clayton
Armey	Boehlert	Clement
Bachus	Bonilla	Clinger
Baessler	Bono	Coble
Baker (CA)	Boucher	Coburn
Baker (LA)	Brewster	Coleman
Baldacci	Browder	Collins (GA)
Ballenger	Brownback	Combest
Barcia	Bryant (TX)	Condit
Barr	Bunn	Cooley
Barrett (NE)	Bunning	Cox
Barrett (WI)	Burr	Coyne
Bartlett	Burton	Cramer
Barton	Buyer	Crapo
Bass	Calvert	Cremeans
Bateman	Camp	Cubin
Beilenson	Canady	Cunningham
Bentsen	Cardin	Danner
Bereuter	Castle	Davis
Berman	Chabot	de la Garza
Bevill	Chambliss	Deal
Bilbray	Chapman	DeFazio
Bilirakis	Chenoweth	DeLauro