

The resolution offered by the gentleman from West Virginia calls upon the President to address a trade imbalance in the area of imports. Specifically, the resolution calls upon the President to refrain from participation in certain international negotiations, to refrain from submitting certain agreements to the Congress, and to vigorously enforce the trade laws.

As the Chair stated on October 10, 1998, and earlier today, a resolution expressing the legislative sentiment that the President should take specific action to achieve a desired public policy end does not present a question affecting the rights of the House, collectively, its safety, dignity, or the integrity of its proceeding within the meanings of rule IX. In the opinion of the Chair, the resolution offered by the gentleman from West Virginia is purely a legislative proposition properly initiated by introduction through the hopper under clause 7, rule XII, to be subsequently considered under the normal rules of the House.

Accordingly, the resolution offered by the gentleman from West Virginia does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX, and may not be considered at this time.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair, and ask to be heard on the ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 201, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Crane
Archer	Bryant	Cubin
Armey	Burr	Cunningham
Bachus	Burton	Davis (VA)
Baker	Buyer	Deal
Ballenger	Callahan	DeLay
Barr	Calvert	DeMint
Barrett (NE)	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Campbell	Dickey
Barton	Canady	Doollittle
Bass	Cannon	Dreier
Bateman	Castle	Duncan
Biggart	Chabot	Dunn
Bilbray	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bilirakis	Coble	Ehrlich
Bliley	Coburn	Emerson
Blunt	Collins	English
Boehlert	Combest	Everett
Boehner	Cook	Ewing
Bonilla	Cooksey	Fletcher
Bono	Cox	Foley

Fossella	LaTourette
Fowler	Lazio
Franks (NJ)	Leach
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Gallegly	Lewis (KY)
Ganske	Linder
Gekas	LoBiondo
Gibbons	Lofgren
Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)
Gillmor	Manzullo
Gillman	McCollum
Goodlatte	McCrery
Goodling	McHugh
Goss	McInnis
Graham	McIntosh
Granger	McKeon
Green (WI)	Metcalfe
Greenwood	Mica
Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Hansen	Moran (KS)
Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)
Hayes	Morella
Hayworth	Myrick
Hefley	Nethercutt
Herger	Ney
Hill (MT)	Northup
Hilleary	Nussle
Hobson	Ose
Hoekstra	Oxley
Horn	Packard
Hostettler	Paul
Houghton	Pease
Hulshof	Peterson (PA)
Hunter	Petri
Hutchinson	Pickering
Hyde	Pitts
Isakson	Pombo
Jenkins	Portman
Johnson (CT)	Pryce (OH)
Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Jones (NC)	Radanovich
Kelly	Ramstad
King (NY)	Regula
Kingston	Reynolds
Knollenberg	Riley
Kolbe	Rogan
Kuykendall	Rogers
LaHood	Rohrabacher
Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Latham	Roukema

NOES—201

Abercrombie	Deutsch
Ackerman	Dicks
Allen	Dingell
Andrews	Dixon
Baird	Doggett
Baldacci	Dooley
Baldwin	Doyle
Barcia	Edwards
Barrett (WI)	Engel
Becerra	Eshoo
Bentsen	Etheridge
Berkley	Evans
Berman	Farr
Berry	Fattah
Bishop	Filner
Blagojevich	Forbes
Blumenauer	Ford
Bonior	Frank (MA)
Borski	Frost
Boswell	Gejdenson
Boucher	Gephardt
Boyd	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Goode
Brown (FL)	Gordon
Brown (OH)	Green (TX)
Capps	Gutierrez
Capuano	Hall (OH)
Cardin	Hastings (FL)
Carson	Hill (IN)
Clay	Hilliard
Clayton	Hinchee
Clement	Hinojosa
Clyburn	Hoeffel
Condit	Holden
Costello	Holt
Coyne	Hooley
Cramer	Hoyer
Crowley	Inslee
Cummings	Jackson (IL)
Danner	Jackson-Lee
Davis (FL)	(TX)
Davis (IL)	Jefferson
DeFazio	John
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Delahunt	Jones (OH)
DeLauro	Kaptur

Royce	Olver
Ryan (WI)	Ortiz
Ryun (KS)	Owens
Salmon	Pallone
Sanford	Pascarella
Saxton	Pastor
Schaffer	Pelosi
Sensenbrenner	Peterson (MN)
Sessions	Phelps
Shadegg	Pickett
Shaw	Pomeroy
Sherwood	Price (NC)
Shimkus	Rahall
Shuster	Rangel
Simpson	Reyes
Skeen	Rivers
Smith (MI)	Rodriguez
Smith (NJ)	Roemer
Smith (TX)	Rothman
Souder	Roybal-Allard
Spence	Rush
Stearns	Sabo
Stump	
Sununu	
Sweeney	
Talent	
Tancredo	
Tauzin	
Taylor (NC)	
Terry	
Thomas	
Thornberry	
Thune	
Tiahrt	
Toomey	
Upton	
Vitter	
Walden	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Watkins	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Sanchez	Thompson (MS)
Sanders	Thurman
Sandlin	Tierney
Sawyer	Towns
Schakowsky	Traficant
Scott	Turner
Serrano	Udall (CO)
Sherman	Udall (NM)
Shows	Velazquez
Sisisky	Vento
Skelton	Visclosky
Slaughter	Waters
Smith (WA)	Watt (NC)
Snyder	Waxman
Spratt	Weiner
Stabenow	Wexler
Stenholm	Weygand
Strickland	Wise
Tanner	Woolsey
Tauscher	Wu
Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Thompson (CA)	

NOT VOTING—16

Bereuter	Larson	Scarborough
Chenoweth-Hage	Maloney (CT)	Shays
Conyers	Meek (FL)	Stark
Istook	Norwood	Stupak
Kanjorski	Payne	
Kasich	Porter	

□ 1432

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE— CALLING ON PRESIDENT TO AB- STAIN FROM RENEGOTIATING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS GOVERNING ANTIDUMPING LAWS AND COUNTERVAILING MEAS- URES

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a privileged resolution that I noticed pursuant to rule IX and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTION CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO ABSTAIN FROM RENEGOTIATING INTER- NATIONAL AGREEMENTS GOVERNING ANTI- DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES

Whereas under Art. I, Section 8 of the Constitution, the Congress has power and responsibility with regard to foreign commerce and the conduct of international trade negotiations;

Whereas the House of Representatives is deeply concerned that, in connection with the World Trade Organization, ("WTO") Ministerial meeting to be held in Seattle, Washington, and the multilateral trade negotiations expected to follow, a few countries are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiation topics and reopen debate over the WTO's antidumping and antisubsidy rules;

Whereas the built-in agenda for future WTO negotiations, which was set out in the Uruguay Round package ratified by Congress in 1994, includes agriculture trade, services trade, and intellectual property protection but does not include antidumping or antisubsidy rules;

Whereas the Congress has not approved new negotiations or antidumping or antisubsidy rules and has clearly, but so far informally, signaled its opposition to such negotiations;

Whereas strong antidumping and antisubsidy rules are a cornerstone of the liberal trade policy of the United States and are essential to the health of the manufacturing and farm sectors in the United States;

Whereas it has long been and remains the policy of the United States to support its antidumping and antisubsidy laws and to defend those laws in international negotiations;

Whereas an important part of Congress' participation in the formulation of trade policy is the enactment of official negotiating objectives against which completed agreements can be measured when presented for ratification;

Whereas the current absence of official negotiating objectives on the statute books must not be allowed to undermine the Congress' constitutional role in charting the direction of United States trade policy.

Whereas the WTO antidumping and antisubsidy rules concluded in the Uruguay Round have scarcely been tested since they entered into effect and certainly have not proved defective;

Whereas opening these rules to renegotiation could only lead to weakening them, which would in turn lead to even greater abuse of the world's open markets, particularly that of the United States;

Whereas conversely, avoiding another divisive fight over these rules is the best way to promote progress on the other, far more important, issues facing WTO members; and

Whereas it is therefore essential that renegotiations on these antidumping and antisubsidy matters not be reopened under the auspices of the WTO or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives calls upon the President—

(1) not to participate in any international negotiation in which antidumping or antisubsidy rules are part of the negotiating agenda;

(2) to refrain from submitting for congressional approval agreements that require changes to the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws and enforcement policies of the United States; and

(3) to enforce the antidumping and countervailing duty laws vigorously in all pending and future cases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The Chair will entertain a brief argument as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. Let me caution the Members, debate should be limited to the question of order, and may not go to the merits of the proposition being considered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has privilege because only the House has the authority to alter existing revenue provisions. Allowing the administration to negotiate antidumping and countervailing duty laws would further diminish the loss of the constitutional power the House has suffered over time. Under article 1, section 7 of the Constitution, the House of Representatives has the authority to originate revenue provisions, not the Senate, the administration or the U.S. trade representative. By not giving the administration the clear message that Congress has antidumping and countervailing duty laws, that those laws are not to be placed on the table for negotiations, we are essentially allowing the administration to act on authority it does not have.

Furthermore, section 702 of House rule IX entitled General Principles concludes that certain matters of busi-

ness arising under the Constitution, mandatory in nature, have been held to have a privilege which superseded the rules establishing the order of business. This is a question of the House's constitutional authority and is therefore privileged in nature. The WTO antidumping and antisubsidy rules concluded in the Uruguay Round have scarcely been tested since they entered into effect and certainly have not proved effective. Opening these rules to renegotiation could only lead to weakening them which in turn leads to even greater abuse of the world's open markets, particularly that of the United States.

There is a precedent, Mr. Speaker, for bringing H. Res. 298 out of committee and onto the House floor immediately. For instance, H. Con. Res. 190 was brought to the floor on October 26 under suspension of the rules because it concerned the upcoming Seattle Round. This measure had only 13 cosponsors, while H. Res. 298 has 228 cosponsors. The majority of the House should be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a privileged motion. I will not be offering mine nor asking for a vote. But I want to take 30 seconds with the Congress. The Congress is allowing trade practices to endanger America. Illegal trade cannot be tolerated, and the purpose of these exercises is to make sure the administration and Congress looks at those.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the resolution and to say that I would merely beg the leadership to allow this vote to occur, because over 228 of our Members have asked for it. I think to bottle this up and not allow a vote is truly not in the best spirit of this House when in fact the Constitution provides that trade-making authority rests in the House, in the Congress, and all revenue measures begin here in the House. With what is going to happen at the end of the month in Seattle and the beginning of December, we want to send a strong message to our trade negotiators, we do not want them opening up the antidumping and countervailing duty provisions of our trade laws.

No industry in this country has suffered more than the steel industry and been forced to restructure. It has the most modern production in the world. Yet we continue to lose thousands and thousands of jobs, even over this last year. It is absolutely essential that our negotiators hear this, and it is not the executive branch's responsibility, it is our responsibility to enforce the laws that we pass. And so we ask and beg of the leadership of this institution, please allow us to bring up this resolution which allows us to instruct our negotiators as the Constitution intended.

There are 228 Members of this institution that want to be allowed to be given voice and this resolution brought to the floor. I rise in strong support of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I also have a privileged resolution which I will not offer and will not ask for a vote on, but I do want to speak in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, denying a vote on this resolution denies the will of the majority of this House. A majority of Members on both side of the aisle, 228, are cosponsors of this legislation. This resolution is intended to respond to a negotiating ploy by Japan and a few other countries. These countries are trying to jump-start negotiations on the antidumping and countervailing duty laws mostly as a negotiating tactic.

□ 1445

Japan would like the world to forget about their closed telecommunications, financial services and agricultural markets by raising false issues about unfair trade remedies. Failing to pass this resolution supports the trade objectives of Japan and not the trade objectives of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of this privileged resolution, and ask that we be allowed to have a vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) wish to be heard on this issue?

Mr. KLINK. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I also have a privileged resolution, which I will not insist on calling up, instead speaking on behalf of this resolution instead.

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the Members the rules of the House of Representatives, which says the privileges of the House as distinguished from that of the individual Member include questions relating to its constitutional prerogatives in respect to revenue legislation and appropriations, and it goes on to other sorts of things.

Furthermore, in Section 664 of rule IX, entitled "General Principles," as to the precedent of question of privilege, it states "as the business of the House began to increase, it was found necessary to give certain important matters a precedent by rule. Such matters were called privileged questions."

Section 664 goes on saying, "certain matters of business arising under the constitutional mandatory in nature have been held to have privilege, which has superseded the rules established in the regular order of business."

I would say, Mr. Speaker, if you read the Constitution, under article 1, section 7, all bills for raising revenues shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Clearly what we are talking about with this trade and the countervailing duties and the antidumping is that there are tariffs that are levied. That is the raising of revenue. That is the privilege of the House of Representatives, not of the Senate, not of the administration, not of the trade ambassador; but it is the privilege of this House of Representatives.

When these dump products are levied, a tariff is put on them, those tariffs are revenue raisers, they are paid directly to the U.S. Treasury; and by us allowing negotiations to be weakened and our trade laws weakened to let in more dump product, the House would be turning over the power to the executive branch given exclusively to us under the Constitution.

Now, this resolution has privilege because only the House has the authority to alter existing revenue provisions. Allowing the administration to negotiate these issues is the House giving that constitutional duty up.

In addition, I would recommend as great reading to the Members article I, section 8 of the Constitution. "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposes and excises shall be uniform throughout the Nation. The Congress also shall regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states and with the Indian tribes."

What we are talking about here is not only the revenue that is taken, but it is trade policy. An important part of Congress' participation in the formulation of trade policy is the enactment of official negotiating objectives against which completed agreements can then be measured for their ratification.

Congress exercised that power back in 1994 when we ratified the agenda for the Seattle WTO Ministerial, which included agricultural trade; it included services trade and intellectual property protection. The agenda, specifically enacted into Federal law as Public Law 103-465, did not include anti-dumping or antisubsidy rules.

Congress is concerned that a few countries are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiated topics and reopen debate over the WTO's anti-dumping and antisubsidy rules. The current absence of official negotiating objectives on the statute books must not be allowed to undermine what is the House of Representatives' constitutional district. We have a constitutional role, and it is, under the rules of this House, our extraordinary power to step in and make sure that is not taken away from us by the administration, by the trade representatives, or by anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not a point of privilege of this House, then none exists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does anyone else wish to be heard on this issue?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. Because the arguments raised here were addressed in the Chair's ruling of October 10, 1998, for the reasons stated in the Chair's previous rulings, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX and may not be considered at this time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair, and ask to be heard on the appeal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 204, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

AYES—214

- | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Dickey | Jenkins |
| Archer | Doolittle | Johnson (CT) |
| Armey | Dreier | Johnson, Sam |
| Bachus | Duncan | Jones (NC) |
| Baker | Dunn | Kasich |
| Ballenger | Ehlers | Kelly |
| Barr | Ehrlich | King (NY) |
| Bartlett | Emerson | Kingston |
| Barton | English | Knollenberg |
| Bass | Everett | Kolbe |
| Bateman | Ewing | Kuykendall |
| Biggert | Fletcher | LaHood |
| Bilbray | Foley | Largent |
| Bilirakis | Fossella | Latham |
| Bliley | Fowler | LaTourette |
| Blunt | Franks (NJ) | Lazio |
| Boehlert | Frelinghuysen | Leach |
| Boehner | Galleghy | Lewis (CA) |
| Bonilla | Ganske | Lewis (KY) |
| Bono | Gekas | Linder |
| Brady (TX) | Gibbons | LoBiondo |
| Bryant | Gilchrest | Lucas (OK) |
| Burr | Gillmor | Manzullo |
| Burton | Gillman | McCollum |
| Buyer | Goodlatte | McCrery |
| Callahan | Goodling | McHugh |
| Calvert | Graham | McInnis |
| Camp | Granger | McIntosh |
| Campbell | Green (WI) | McKeon |
| Canady | Greenwood | Mica |
| Cannon | Gutknecht | Miller (FL) |
| Castle | Hall (TX) | Miller, Gary |
| Chabot | Hansen | Moran (KS) |
| Chambliss | Hastings (WA) | Morella |
| Chenoweth-Hage | Hayes | Myrick |
| Coble | Hayworth | Nethercutt |
| Coburn | Hefley | Ney |
| Collins | Herger | Northup |
| Combest | Hill (MT) | Nussle |
| Cook | Hillery | Ose |
| Cooksey | Hobson | Oxley |
| Cox | Hoekstra | Packard |
| Crane | Horn | Paul |
| Cubin | Hostettler | Pease |
| Cunningham | Houghton | Peterson (PA) |
| Davis (VA) | Hulshof | Petri |
| Deal | Hutchinson | Pickering |
| DeLay | Hyde | Pitts |
| DeMint | Isakson | Pombo |
| Diaz-Balart | Istook | Porter |

- Portman
- Pryce (OH)
- Quinn
- Ramstad
- Regula
- Reynolds
- Riley
- Rogan
- Rogers
- Rohrabacher
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Roukema
- Royce
- Ryan (WI)
- Ryun (KS)
- Salmon
- Sanford
- Saxton
- Schaffer
- Sensenbrenner
- Sessions
- Shadegg

- Shaw
- Shays
- Sherwood
- Shimkus
- Shuster
- Simpson
- Skeen
- Smith (MI)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (TX)
- Souder
- Spence
- Stearns
- Stump
- Sununu
- Sweeney
- Talent
- Tancredo
- Tauzin
- Taylor (NC)
- Terry
- Thomas

- Thornberry
- Thune
- Tiahrt
- Toomey
- Upton
- Vitter
- Walden
- Walsh
- Wamp
- Watkins
- Watts (OK)
- Weldon (FL)
- Weldon (PA)
- Weller
- Whitfield
- Wicker
- Wilson
- Wolf
- Young (AK)
- Young (FL)

NOES—204

- Abercrombie
- Ackerman
- Allen
- Andrews
- Baird
- Baldacci
- Baldwin
- Barcia
- Barrett (WI)
- Becerra
- Bentsen
- Berkley
- Berman
- Berry
- Bishop
- Blagojevich
- Blumenauer
- Bonior
- Borski
- Boswell
- Boyd
- Brady (PA)
- Brown (FL)
- Brown (OH)
- Capps
- Capuano
- Cardin
- Carson
- Clay
- Clayton
- Clement
- Clyburn
- Condit
- Conyers
- Costello
- Coyne
- Cramer
- Crowley
- Cummings
- Danner
- Davis (FL)
- Davis (IL)
- DeFazio
- DeGette
- Delahunt
- DeLauro
- Deutsch
- Dicks
- Dingell
- Doggett
- Dooley
- Doyle
- Edwards
- Engel
- Eshoo
- Etheridge
- Evans
- Farr
- Fattah
- Filner
- Forbes
- Ford
- Frank (MA)
- Frost
- Gejdenson
- Gephardt
- Gonzalez
- Goode
- Gordon

- Green (TX)
- Gutierrez
- Hall (OH)
- Hastings (FL)
- Hill (IN)
- Hilliard
- Hinchee
- Hinojosa
- Hoefel
- Holden
- Holt
- Hoolley
- Hoyer
- Insee
- Jackson (IL)
- Jackson-Lee
- Jefferson
- John
- Johnson, E. B.
- Jones (OH)
- Kaptur
- Kennedy
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick
- Kind (WI)
- Kleczka
- Klink
- Kucinich
- LaFalce
- Lampson
- Lantos
- Lee
- Levin
- Lewis (GA)
- Lipinski
- Lofgren
- Lowey
- Lucas (KY)
- Luther
- Maloney (CT)
- Maloney (NY)
- Markey
- Martinez
- Mascara
- Matsui
- McCarthy (MO)
- McCarthy (NY)
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McIntyre
- McKinney
- McNulty
- Meehan
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Menendez
- Millender
- McDonald
- Miller, George
- Minge
- Mink
- Moakley
- Mollohan
- Moore
- Moran (VA)
- Murtha
- Nadler
- Napolitano

- Neal
- Oberstar
- Obey
- Olver
- Ortiz
- Owens
- Pallone
- Pascrell
- Pastor
- Pelosi
- Peterson (MN)
- Phelps
- Pickett
- Pomeroy
- Price (NC)
- Rahall
- Rangel
- Reyes
- Rivers
- Rodriguez
- Roemer
- Rothman
- Roybal-Allard
- Rush
- Sanchez
- Sanders
- Sandlin
- Sawyer
- Schakowsky
- Scott
- Serrano
- Sherman
- Shows
- Sisisky
- Skelton
- Slaughter
- Smith (WA)
- Snyder
- Spratt
- Stabenow
- Stark
- Stenholm
- Strickland
- Stupak
- Tanner
- Tauscher
- Taylor (MS)
- Thompson (CA)
- Thompson (MS)
- Thurman
- Tierney
- Towns
- Trafigant
- Turner
- Udall (NM)
- Velazquez
- Vento
- Visclosky
- Waters
- Watt (NC)
- Waxman
- Weiner
- Wexler
- Weygand
- Wise
- Woolsey
- Wu
- Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

- Barrett (NE)
- Bereuter
- Boucher

- Dixon
- Goss
- Hunter
- Kanjorski
- Larson
- Metcalf

Norwood
PayneRadanovich
SabóScarborough
Udall (CO)

□ 1510

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in my district yesterday, I missed four votes.

Had I been available and here yesterday, I would have voted aye on roll call 559, no on roll call 560, no on roll call 561, and no on roll call 562.

LAYING ON TABLE HOUSE RESOLUTION 358 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 360

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Without objection, House Resolutions 358 and 360 are laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1940

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 900) "An Act to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 976. An act to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to focus the authority of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration on community-based services for children and adolescents, to enhance flexibility and accountability, to establish programs for youth treatment, and to respond to crises, especially those related to children and violence.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 4, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 4, 1999 at 5:50 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.J. Res. 75.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 3073, FATHERS COUNT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, a dear colleague letter will be delivered to each Member's office today notifying them of the Committee on Rules plan to meet the week of November 8 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 3073, the "Fathers Count Act of 1999."

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 3 p.m., on Monday, November 8, to the Committee on Rules, in room H-312 in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) which will be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1. The text of the amendment will also be available on the website of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, as well as the website of the Committee on Ways and Means.

This amendment in the nature of a substitute combines the Welfare to Work provisions reported by the Education and Workforce Committee with H.R. 3073. It is the intention of the Committee on Rules to make in order the amendment by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) as the base text for the purpose of further amendment.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 900, GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 355 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 355

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 900) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1945

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, 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.

Madam Speaker, the legislation before us is the rule providing for consideration of the conference report S. 900, the Financial Services Act of 1999. S. 900 is better known to Members of the House as H.R. 10, which was passed on July 1 of this year by a margin of 343 to 86.

Should the House pass this rule, it would hold its place in history as being one of the final steps in the long and hard-fought effort to repeal Depression era rules that govern our Nation's modern financial services industry.

The rule before us waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Madam Speaker, this rule deserves strong bipartisan support. The House passed the underlying legislation with broad support from both parties. The Financial Services Act was only made better in the conference to reconcile differences between the Senate and the House versions.

Madam Speaker, 65 years ago, on the heels of the Great Depression, the Glass-Steagall Act was passed prohibiting affiliation between commercial banking, insurance and securities. However, merely 2 years after the passage, the first attempt at repealing Glass-Steagall was instituted by Senator Carter Glass, one of the original sponsors of the legislation. He recognized then that changes in the world and in the market place called for more effective legislation.

Two generations later the need to modernize our financial laws is more apparent than ever.

There is no doubt about it. Reexamination of regulations in the financial services industry in America is a complicated matter. Congress recognizes