

Towns	Wamp	Wolf
Traficant	Ward	Woolsey
Tucker	Watts (OK)	Wyden
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Wynn
Vento	Weldon (PA)	Yates
Visclosky	Weller	Young (AK)
Volkmer	White	Young (FL)
Vucanovich	Whitfield	Zeliff
Waldholtz	Wicker	Zimmer
Walker	Wilson	
Walsh	Wise	

NOES—46

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Rangel
Becerra	Gibbons	Sabo
Beilenson	Gonzalez	Sanders
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Sawyer
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Scott
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Stark
Clyburn	Johnston	Stokes
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Studds
Collins (MI)	Maloney	Thompson
Conyers	McDermott	Velazquez
Coyne	McKinney	Waters
Dellums	Meek	Watt (NC)
Dingell	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Fattah	Moran	Williams
Filner	Nadler	
Foglietta	Payne (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (NE)	McDade	Rush
Ford	Pelosi	Slaughter
McCollum	Reynolds	Torres

□ 1519

Messrs. FOGLIETTA, COYNE, BECERRA, and GONZALEZ, changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. MEEHAN, FAZIO of California, TOWNS, and MINETA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 285. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they amendments to section 2 of the bill?

Mr. DORNAN. They are to section 2, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DORNAN:

Page 2, line 7, strike "section 6" and insert "section 4".

Page 2, strike line 9 through line 12 and insert "person may not require or otherwise seek the response of a minor to a survey or questionnaire".

Page 3, line 5, strike "Any inquiry" and insert "Any individual inquiry".

Page 3, beginning at line 19, strike sections 3 and 4 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly.)

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California request unanimous consent that his amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I do, and this is merely timesaving.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, Mr.

Chairman, we do not have a copy of the amendments here.

We do now, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has a copy of the amendment at this time?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. Yes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, may I explain the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to consideration of the amendments en bloc?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not yet had an opportunity to read the amendments.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman like to engage in a colloquy to explain the unanimous part of my request?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman if the gentleman will yield, I am still reading this amendment, because it has just been given to us. We are just trying to see what it does here. I will be ready in just a second.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois has reserved the right to object, and the Chair wishes to wait.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I am at the gentlewoman's service for a colloquy. I will be glad to explain why I have asked unanimous consent to have all three of them together.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Yes; Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would do that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank my good friend. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, to the gentlewoman, the unanimous aspect here is a timesaver. I have this broken down into three separate parts. They are all at the desk, and we can take it one step at a time, but I, from my viewpoint, do not believe that would make sense, because although there will be a good, healthy discussion on this, if we take this unanimously en bloc, it is just all geared toward one objective, and that is to end these surveys completely. So the unanimous aspect merely means we get further into the issue and start off right away taking what I am trying to do all at once.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we have now had the time to look at this.

I withdraw my reservation of objection to the request that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, having fenced briefly in my youth, and it is an elegant sport, the one thing I do remember is the gentlemanly or ladylike challenge at the beginning, "En

garde," I would say to my friends in this House who want these surveys. This is simply an attempt to end the surveys at the Federal level totally. So I am saying, En garde, and I do want to get a vote on this and will proceed, I hope, to a good discussion under this open rule.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1271 just strengthened somewhat by two simple words, "Written consent," is still, I believe, not the way this newly constituted Congress as of November 8 wants go. Even with the written consent, it requires that Federal funds be spent on surveys aimed at several unique categories. We have strengthened parental consent somewhat. Parental political affiliations or beliefs, I do not believe that is what they are really after. Mental or psychological problems, not much drive to get these facts down. Sexual behavior or attitudes; that is the main impetus behind almost all of these surveys. Illegal, antisocial, or self-incriminating behavior, that really turns off an overwhelming majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

But that is not really what they are after.

Appraisals of other individuals with whom the minor has familial relationships, an uncle, aunt, siblings, brothers, sisters, all Members of extended families; that is offensive to be asking questions about those folks, but that only comes in as an ancillary to the sexual underpinnings of all of these surveys.

Another point, relationships that are legally recognized as privileged, including relationships with lawyers or physicians or members of the clergy. With four or five medial doctors now serving in the Congress and almost a halfway point with lawyers, I do not think that is really what a lot of these surveys want to get in the face of the U.S. Congress about.

Now, what my Dornan amendment would do, the three lines are really all dovetailed together, it would prohibit the funding of all of these type surveys, period, end of report. The language specifically strikes this entire paragraph that we have just slightly made tougher, the parental-consent provision, and it leaves the remaining text which prohibits these surveys, period.

And I only have three simple points, and we will get on with the debate. Point No. 1, the Federal Government has no business subsidizing government social engineers or people who want this detailed information. What is the overwhelming evidence mandating that these types of surveys take place? Who is it really that wants children to answer questions within these very sensitive subject areas?

H.R. 1271, as now drafted, would indemnify in law a whole new industry of busybodies feeding on familial dysfunction and divisiveness.

No. 2, is this bill really aimed at surveys of sexual attitudes and behaviors? I have just made the point it is. Very

few surveys aimed at schoolchildren address all of those other categories I mentioned. It really is the sexual attitudes and behaviors that we are going after.

This has happened out here in Fairfax County just recently. They withdrew one of these surveys. I will bet it was mentioned in the prior debate which I missed because I was chairing another committee.

We definitely know some people within the Federal Government are dying to ask questions about sexual attitudes and behavior. We have been through this for several years now. First, it was the adult sex survey in 1989. Then 1 year later we had to put a stop to a sex survey for teenagers and preteens, and even still, Centers for Disease Control, six centers that generally have my respect, in the name of AIDS research, they just keep pressing for more and more information in areas that still should remain sensitive without influencing at all what the specific six Centers for Disease Control are trying to do.

And I repeat, Fairfax County again last week.

□ 1530

No. 3, no one collects numbers unless they are going to do something with those survey numbers. Surveys based on personal and intimate subjects should not end up being the basis for public policy. Such basis is a prescription for failure.

Not only do we not have the right to intrude into the personal lives of schoolchildren, often asking that they snitch on this, but we add insult to injury when we gather the information regarding dysfunctions and then turn right around and indemnify these dysfunctions in public policies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DORNAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORNAN. AIDS education is a perfect example, the results of the survey on sexual behavior end up becoming the basis to teach schoolchildren about homosexual sex; surveys revealing not enough knowledge about sex encourage the sexperts to develop new programs, and surveys revealing that children know a lot about sex encourage the same sexperts to develop more programs to handle the flow of information and traditional families lose either way.

Point No. 4: The House has had to squelch controversial sex studies of both adults and youths at least 3 times over the past 5 years. If we pass this bill as it stands, we will encourage the attitude that these controversial subjects are going to be addressed year after year. Let us vote right now to end this problem. The majority will decide this. Let us see where the 104th Congress stands on this first clean-cut social-issues debate of 1995.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I reluctantly rise in opposition to the gentleman from California's amendment. We just enacted an amendment introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], the objective of which was to do what we have provided in this legislation with the procedures that are followed by the Department of Education in terms of these surveys, which I think places the responsibility and the requirement on those who would seek to conduct surveys to get the written consent of the parents before that survey can go forward. Mr. Chairman, I think this provisions goes way beyond anything that exists in the law relating to the Department of Education and certainly way beyond what we have provided in this bill. I believe parents should have the right, they should have the ultimate right to choose to have their children participate or not participate in surveys. That is what we have provided. We have strengthened the requirement that parents be directly involved in making those determinations. Government should not decide in advance for the parents, which is what the gentleman from California's amendment would do. In effect, it would put the government in a position of saying, no, we are never going to be able to survey, we are going to ban any survey whatever.

I sympathize with the gentleman from California's concern about Federal busybodies sticking their noses into parental business. But I think he goes sort of off the deep end when he says we will never allow any surveys to be conducted in these areas, even though there may be very meritorious reasons why we should be conducting these surveys, to gather vital information with regard to a vast array of things. It is not just in regard to sexual behavior or sexual activity that we are talking about.

This amendment which we adopted just a moment ago, the gentleman from Indiana's amendment, I think strikes the right balance between the rights of the parents which should be paramount here and the interests—the very legitimate interests—of having very valuable information. Obviously, if it is a prurient interest, if it is an interest where they are sticking their noses into where they clearly do not belong, clearly the parental consent would not be forthcoming. But to take away any kind of a survey, the ability of the Federal Government to gather data, vital data, I think would be a mistake. I think it becomes a matter really of public policy: Are we going to totally close the ability of the Federal Government to gather information which may be useful in setting important matters of public policy? I would hope not.

I would respectfully and reluctantly ask that the gentleman's amendment be defeated.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for recognizing me.

I think the problem is not that the last amendment was not a good amendment. I supported that. It was a step in the right direction. But I believe we need to go further. Listen to some of the things that are being asked of kids right now. Should we be involving these things in the curriculum or in the educational system? They are asking political affiliations or beliefs. What right does an educational system have to ask that question? They ask about mental or psychological problems. They ask about sexual behavior and attitudes, they ask about illegal, antisocial and self-incriminating behavior, they ask about appraisals of other individuals with whom the minor had a family relationship or a family-type relationship. They ask about relationships that are legally recognized as privileged, including those with lawyers, physicians, and members of the clergy. They ask about religious affiliations and religious beliefs. I do not believe those questions have any business in the educational system.

Let me give you a couple of questions that were actually on a questionnaire put out by a school district. I do not remember the school district. I believe it was in Virginia here.

It says in question number 11, "Have you ever been in a physical fight in which we you were hurt and had to be treated by a doctor? Yes or no."

Then it says that sometimes people feel so sad and unhappy that they may think about attempting suicide or killing themselves. The next three questions ask about attempted suicide. That puts thoughts in kids' minds that should not be there, in my view.

Here is another question, question number 34: The next four questions ask about sexual intercourse. Have you ever had sexual intercourse? How old were you the first time this occurred? What business does the educational system have in asking these questions of young people? And it makes absolutely no sense to me. I cannot understand why Federal tax dollars should directly or indirectly be involved in these types of questions.

I believe that the amendment that just passed that said parents have to give parental consent before they can give or ask these questions is a step in the right direction. However, many people are very busy, many parents do not pay attention to all the things being put in front of their kids. They have confidence in the educational system, so they do not really look into them as thoroughly as they should. So I believe many of these questionnaires will be approved by parents when the parents really would rather those children not participate in answering those types of questions.

So the best way to make sure that the educational systems of this country do not infringe upon the rights of individual parents and families, do not stick their noses into areas where they should not, is to make absolutely sure that they cannot do it by not allowing Federal funding for these kinds of projects.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with great interest to the gentleman. Are any of the surveys and questions that the question mentioned funded by Federal moneys?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I believe, indirectly.

Mr. HORN. Indirectly?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Indirectly.

Mr. HORN. They either are or they are not.

Mr. DORNAN. Directly, directly.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. They were?

Mr. DORNAN. Some directly.

Mr. HORN. Which agencies did this?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. DORNAN. CDC, the Centers for Disease Control.

Mr. HORN. The Centers for Disease Control?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Centers for Disease Control.

In addition to that, we all know there is Federal aid in the way of block grants and other ways, and that money then goes down to the school districts and school corporations through various distribution formulas and they do use Federal moneys. We do not believe Federal moneys should be used for these kinds of questionnaires.

Mr. HORN. If the gentleman from California's proposal is adopted, I say to the gentleman, it will not affect the money given by the Department of Education one iota, because the gentleman has left in the exemption here which says in section 6, "This Act does not apply to any program or activity which is subject to the General Education Provisions Act." That is the so-called Grassley amendment. That law is already on the books. The Secretary of Education cannot have questionnaires that cover the seven areas that we have blocked out. This is designed to apply to other Federal agencies such as the Centers for Disease Control which is not in the Department of Education, which might ask those questions.

Let me move to another question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But those questions are asked of children in the schools in the education system.

Mr. HORN. When the gentleman says "children," I do not know what he means by "children." But I feel we are talking about 5 and 6 and these questions are generally asked of juniors and seniors in high school.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I may reclaim my time, the gentleman is saying, generally they are asked of juniors and seniors in high school, but that is not exclusively the case. Many times they are asked of children in primary and secondary education, way down below the senior high school level.

Mr. DORNAN. The gentleman has just been reading from a middle school survey, not seniors in high school but a middle school, not seniors or juniors or even sophomores in middle school.

And CDC usually funds about 95, 96, 97, 98 percent of this. So if there is some other loophole we will look at that later.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does the job.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me reclaim my time once again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me read once again, since the gentleman said that this was mostly high school seniors, these were middle school students, we are talking about children in the 10, 11, 12-year-old age range.

Listen to this question. It is very important: This is of 10, 11, 12-year-old kids: How old were you when you first had sexual intercourse for the first time? Many of these kids are still in puberty, and you are asking them when they had their first sexual experience. And the answers are "Never had sexual intercourse." "I was 9 years old." Or younger. Do you believe that they have a right to ask that kind of a question in that kind of a situation in school? And many of the parents are working parents and they will not read these questionnaires.

Mr. HORN. If the gentleman will yield, if that was administered under the GEPA, that is the proposal that is the law of the land, then they had to have parental consent, if that was federally funded. That applies to every single questionnaire of the Department of Education.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I may recall my time, we are talking about more than just the Grassley amendment. Does the gentleman from California have any more comments he would like to make?

Mr. DORNAN. No, except I think we have debated this so many times over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the opinions of my good colleague from the adjoining district, to the west of me, Mr. HORN, and I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLINGER's opinion. Obviously, it is tearing his heart apart, and I appreciate his putting it in that context. But I think it is about time we just voted on this and saw how this entire Congress feels about this. Right now controversial surveys are an iffy proposition at best.

This bill will successfully ensure that these surveys are not allowed. If we go the other way they will flourish, I predict that. Common sense tells us that.

I will repeat one thing I said early: Why do they want the information? To act upon it. This is more of the social engineering that I think the American majority rejected on November 8th last.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me ask the author of this amendment, if I might: How does the gentleman feel about a survey on drugs given to high school students? Does he think those should be given or not given on use of drugs?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is going for my Achilles heel, because I feel that there is a war going on in narcotics and it is all on the side of the cocaine cowboys, and we have never mobilized our country on the side of the good guys to fight a drug war. But asking kids about "Are they drug users," so totally different and so far removed from the intimacy of asking about parental sex habits, those of their older brother or younger sisters' sex habits or their parents' political affiliation. I would resent a political affiliation question tied to a survey on drugs, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. HORN. I would ask the gentleman, does he favor surveys on drugs among high school students, yes or no?

Mr. DORNAN. I think at the State level, I have never seen one proposed at the Federal level, and I would have to make a judgment on that when it is presented to me.

Mr. HORN. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, I can recall numerous situations in the 1960's where scholars and people with real ability in developing questionnaires surveyed classes in California high schools and California junior high schools and found extensive drug use. When they brought those surveys to the superintendent of schools' attention and the school boards' attention, great denial set in, "Oh, we don't have a drug problem. Those data must be wrong." That happened in Long Beach, that happened in San Diego. They closed their eyes to what was going on about them.

All I can say is, if the gentleman's language is adopted, it says here that you could have no questionnaire that had any questions about illegal, anti-social or self-incriminating behavior. And all that is doing is tying reality's hand behind one's back. So you cannot develop the DARE Programs and you cannot have solid evidence for, "Let's say no to drugs." All of that grew out of the fact that social scientists and school counselors who knew what was going on, when the parents did not know what was going on—with all due

respect—but regardless of whether the parents did or did not, they would have absolute control whether their child, their son, their daughter would be able to answer that question under this legislation.

□ 1545

So, I suggest that we vote down the gentleman's amendment because all I see is mischief where the thing that is being turned loose is types of illicit behavior that are not discovered, and we cannot develop programs to cope with them, and they need to be coped with, not simply at home, because for some students there is not much home. They need to be coped with in the school system whether we like it or not. There is no question. Society has dumped on the school systems of America many of the problems that society has not been able to handle in the home, in the churches, in the community organizations. Like it or not, that is reality.

I live in a world of reality. I suggest we vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 291, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—131

Allard	Flanagan	Orton
Archer	Forbes	Packard
Army	Fox	Parker
Bachus	Frisa	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Funderburk	Peterson (MN)
Ballenger	Gekas	Petri
Barr	Goss	Pombo
Bartlett	Graham	Poshard
Barton	Gutknecht	Quillen
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Roberts
Bevill	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hansen	Roth
Browder	Hastings (WA)	Royce
Bryant (TN)	Hayes	Salmon
Bunning	Hayworth	Sanford
Burton	Hefley	Scarborough
Buyer	Herger	Schaefer
Callahan	Hilleary	Seastrand
Canady	Hoke	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Hostettler	Shadegg
Chambliss	Hunter	Skelton
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Smith (TX)
Christensen	Hyde	Smith (WA)
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Solomon
Combest	Istook	Spence
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Stearns
Cooley	Jones	Stenholm
Costello	King	Stockman
Cox	Kingston	Stump
Cramer	Laughlin	Talent
Crane	Lewis (KY)	Tanner
Crapo	Lightfoot	Tate
Cubin	Linder	Tauzin
Cunningham	Lucas	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	McInnis	Tiahrt
Dickey	McKeon	Wamp
Doolittle	Metcalfe	Watts (OK)
Dornan	Montgomery	Weldon (FL)
Dreier	Moorhead	Weller
Duncan	Myers	Wicker
Emerson	Myrick	Wolf
Everett	Nethercutt	Young (AK)
Fields (TX)	Neumann	

NOES—291

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Neal
Ackerman	Gilchrist	Ney
Andrews	Gillmor	Norwood
Baessler	Gilman	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Baldacci	Goodlatte	Olver
Barcia	Goodling	Ortiz
Barrett (NE)	Gordon	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Green	Oxley
Bass	Greenwood	Pallone
Becerra	Gunderson	Pastor
Beilenson	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Bereuter	Hamilton	Pelosi
Berman	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Bilbray	Hastert	Pickett
Bilirakis	Hastings (FL)	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hefner	Porter
Bliley	Heineman	Portman
Blute	Hilliard	Pryce
Boehlert	Hinchee	Quinn
Boehner	Hobson	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rahall
Bonior	Holden	Ramstad
Borski	Horn	Rangel
Boucher	Houghton	Reed
Brewster	Hoyer	Regula
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Riggs
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rivers
Brownback	Johnson (CT)	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rogers
Bunn	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Johnson	Rose
Calvert	Kanjorski	Roukema
Camp	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Kasich	Sabo
Castle	Kelly	Sanders
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Chrysler	Kennedy (RI)	Saxton
Clay	Kennelly	Schiff
Clayton	Kildee	Schroeder
Clement	Kim	Schumer
Clinger	Kleczka	Scott
Clyburn	Klink	Serrano
Coble	Klug	Shaw
Coleman	Knollenberg	Shays
Collins (IL)	Kolbe	Shuster
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Sisisky
Conyers	LaHood	Skaggs
Coyne	Lantos	Skeen
Creameans	Latham	Slaughter
Danner	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Davis	Leach	Smith (NJ)
de la Garza	Levin	Souder
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Spratt
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Stark
DeLauro	Lincoln	Stokes
Dellums	Lipinski	Studds
Deutsch	Livingston	Stupak
Dicks	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Dixon	Lofgren	Tejeda
Doggett	Longley	Thomas
Dooley	Lowey	Thompson
Doyle	Luther	Thornton
Dunn	Maloney	Thurman
Durbin	Manton	Torkildsen
Edwards	Markey	Torricelli
Ehlers	Martinez	Towns
Ehrlich	Martini	Traficant
Engel	Mascara	Tucker
English	Matsui	Upton
Ensign	McCarthy	Velazquez
Eshoo	McCrery	Vento
Evans	McDermott	Visclosky
Ewing	McHale	Volkmer
Farr	McHugh	Vucanovich
Fattah	McIntosh	Waldholtz
Fawell	McKinney	Walker
Fazio	McNulty	Walsh
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Ward
Flner	Meek	Waters
Flake	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Meyers	Waxman
Foley	Mfume	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Mica	White
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Williams
Franks (NJ)	Mineta	Wilson
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Wise
Frost	Moakley	Woolsey
Furse	Molinari	Wyden
Galleghy	Mollohan	Wynn
Ganske	Moran	Yates
Gedden	Morella	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Murtha	Zeliff
Geren	Nadler	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Coburn	LaTourette	Obey
Dingell	McCollum	Reynolds
Ford	McDade	Rush
Largent	Minge	Torres

□ 1605

Messrs. SKEEN, CHRYSLER, and KIM changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. McINNIS, ROBERTS, STOCKMAN, SKELTON, WAMP, ORTON, WELLER, CRAMER, BROWDER, WICKER, HEFLEY, CRANE, SMITH of Texas, Mrs. SEASTRAND, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to section 2?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES.

The head of any Federal department or agency which provides funds for any program or activity involving the seeking of any response from a minor to any survey or questionnaire shall establish procedures by which the department, agency, or its grantees shall notify minors and their parents of protections provided under this Act. The procedures shall also provide for advance public availability of each questionnaire or survey to which a response from a minor is sought.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE.

The head of each Federal department or agency shall establish such procedures as are necessary to ensure compliance with this Act and the privacy of information obtained pursuant to this Act by the department or agency and its grantees; Nothing in this Act shall be construed to foreclose any individual from obtaining judicial relief if requested monetary damages are not in excess of \$500.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. MINOR DEFINED.

In this Act, the terms "minor" and "emancipated minor" will be defined under the laws of the State in which the individual resides.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. APPLICATION.

This Act does not apply to any program or activity which is subject to the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 7?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1271) to provide protection for family privacy, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 7, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—418

Ackerman	Bonilla	Clement
Allard	Bonior	Clinger
Andrews	Bono	Clyburn
Archer	Borski	Coble
Army	Boucher	Coburn
Baesler	Brewster	Coleman
Baker (CA)	Browder	Collins (GA)
Baker (LA)	Brown (CA)	Collins (MI)
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Combust
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Condit
Barcia	Brownback	Cooley
Barr	Bryant (TN)	Costello
Barrett (NE)	Bryant (TX)	Cox
Barrett (WI)	Bunn	Coyne
Bartlett	Bunning	Cramer
Barton	Burr	Crane
Bass	Burton	Crapo
Bateman	Callahan	Creameans
Becerra	Calvert	Cubin
Bellenson	Camp	Cunningham
Bentsen	Canady	Danner
Bereuter	Cardin	Davis
Berman	Castle	de la Garza
Bevill	Chabot	Deal
Bilbray	Chambliss	DeFazio
Billirakis	Chapman	DeLauro
Bishop	Chenoweth	DeLay
Bliley	Christensen	Dellums
Blute	Chrysler	Deutsch
Boehlert	Clay	Diaz-Balart
Boehner	Clayton	Dickey

Dicks	Johnson (CT)	Oxley
Dingell	Johnson (SD)	Packard
Dixon	Johnson, E.B.	Pallone
Doggett	Johnson, Sam	Parker
Dooley	Johnston	Pastor
Doolittle	Jones	Paxon
Dornan	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
Doyle	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Dreier	Kasich	Pelosi
Duncan	Kelly	Peterson (FL)
Dunn	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (MN)
Durbin	Kennedy (RI)	Petri
Edwards	Kennelly	Pickett
Ehlers	Kildee	Pombo
Ehrlich	Kim	Pomeroy
Emerson	King	Porter
Engel	Kingston	Portman
English	Kleczka	Poshard
Ensign	Klink	Pryce
Eshoo	Klug	Quillen
Evans	Knollenberg	Quinn
Everett	Kolbe	Radanovich
Ewing	LaFalce	Rahall
Farr	LaHood	Ramstad
Fattah	Lantos	Rangel
Fawell	Largent	Reed
Fazio	Latham	Regula
Fields (LA)	LaTourette	Richardson
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Riggs
Filner	Lazio	Rivers
Flake	Leach	Roberts
Flanagan	Levin	Roemer
Foglietta	Lewis (CA)	Rogers
Foley	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fowler	Lightfoot	Rose
Fox	Lincoln	Roth
Frank (MA)	Linder	Roukema
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Royce
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Sabo
Frisa	Lofgren	Salmon
Frost	Longley	Sanders
Funderburk	Lowe	Sanford
Furse	Lucas	Sawyer
Gallegly	Luther	Saxton
Ganske	Maloney	Scarborough
Gedjenson	Manton	Schaefer
Gekas	Manzullo	Schiff
Gephardt	Markey	Schroeder
Geren	Martinez	Schumer
Gibbons	Martini	Seastrand
Gilchrist	Mascara	Sensenbrenner
Gillmor	Matsui	Serrano
Gilman	McCarthy	Shadegg
Gonzalez	McCrery	Shaw
Goodlatte	McDermott	Shays
Goodling	McHale	Shuster
Gordon	McHugh	Sisisky
Goss	McInnis	Skaggs
Graham	McIntosh	Skeen
Green	McKeon	Skelton
Greenwood	McKinney	Slaughter
Gunderson	McNulty	Smith (MI)
Gutierrez	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Gutknecht	Meek	Smith (TX)
Hall (OH)	Menendez	Smith (WA)
Hall (TX)	Metcalfe	Solomon
Hamilton	Meyers	Souder
Hancock	Mfume	Spence
Hansen	Mica	Spratt
Harman	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hastings (WA)	Mineta	Stenholm
Hayes	Minge	Stockman
Hayworth	Mink	Stokes
Hefley	Moakley	Studds
Hefner	Molinari	Stump
Heineman	Mollohan	Stupak
Hergert	Montgomery	Talent
Hilleary	Moorhead	Tanner
Hilliard	Moran	Tate
Hinchey	Morella	Tauzin
Hobson	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Hoekstra	Myers	Taylor (NC)
Hoke	Myrick	Tejeda
Holden	Nadler	Thomas
Horn	Neal	Thompson
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Houghton	Neumann	Thornton
Hoyer	Ney	Thurman
Hunter	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hutchinson	Nussle	Torkildsen
Hyde	Oberstar	Torricelli
Inglis	Obey	Towns
Istook	Olver	Trafigant
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Tucker
Jacobs	Orton	Upton
Jefferson	Owens	Vento

Visclosky	Watts (OK)	Woolsey
Volkmer	Waxman	Wyden
Vucanovich	Weldon (FL)	Wynn
Waldholtz	Weldon (PA)	Yates
Walker	Weller	Young (AK)
Walsh	White	Young (FL)
Wamp	Whitfield	Zeliff
Ward	Wicker	Zimmer
Waters	Wise	
Watt (NC)	Wolf	

NOES—7

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Wilson
Collins (IL)	Scott	
Conyers	Williams	

NOT VOTING—9

Bachus	McCollum	Rush
Buyer	McDade	Torres
Ford	Reynolds	Velazquez

□ 1615

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3913, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, April 4, 1995, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR THE HOUSE TO CONSIDER A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO RETURN H.R. 831 AND PROVIDING FOR ITS RE-ENROLLMENT

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to now take up a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the enrolled bill, H.R. 831, and providing for its re-enrollment without the targeted tax benefits contained therein. Specifically, those are the benefits that have been reported in the press as \$63 million being given to Mr. Rupert Murdoch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The request is denied. Under the Speakers' guidelines shown in section 757 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The request has not been cleared with the floor and the committee leaderships on both sides.