

fund do not have any knowledge about how to fix the program. Perhaps the gentleman, in his wisdom, forgot that one of the trustees was the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin. Perhaps he forgot one of the trustees was the Secretary of Health and Human Services who oversees the entire Medicare program. She is one of the trustees. Perhaps the gentleman, in his rhetorical splendor, forgot that Shirley F. Chater, Commissioner of Social Security, is one of the trustees. Those are all President Clinton's appointees who are charged with running the program, besides statutorily being trustees of the trust fund. They have responsibility.

In their report they suggested in a general way legislative changes. Read the conclusion of the trustees' report. They said generally we should take programs that are in effect and extend them to other areas. What H.R. 1590 asks is to be specific in the recommendations that those trustees made, including the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

In addition, there has been great weight placed on linking fixing Medicare with tax cuts and arguing that our attempt to fix Medicare is because we want to spend it on taxes. Where were you folks a couple of months ago when the House of Representatives voted out tax cuts that were fully funded? Was a piece of Medicare funding used for those tax cuts? Yes. What was it? The only Medicare cuts suggested by President Clinton in his fiscal year 1996 budget. They totaled a munificent \$10 billion, and they were extenders of current limitations. That is all the Democrats have offered from the Clinton administration. We accepted those and included them in the fully funded tax cuts.

What is in front of us is the bankruptcy of Medicare. Listen carefully: "Today Medicaid and Medicare are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation. Today Medicare beneficiaries get \$4,700. In 2002, we propose \$6,300." That is going up, that is not going down. Who said, "Today Medicaid and Medicare are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation?" President Clinton 2 years ago.

How interesting when you see an opportunity to make political hay with seniors. You refuse to give responsible suggestions for change.

H.R. 1590 is a responsible suggestion for change, and we urge its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1590.

The question was taken.

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 247, nays 170, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—247

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

NAYS—170

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Bentsen
Andrews	Becerra	Bevill
Baldacci	Beilonson	Bishop

Bonior	Hinchey	Pallone
Borski	Holden	Pastor
Boucher	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Browder	Jackson-Lee	Payne (VA)
Brown (CA)	Jacobs	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Pickett
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Cardin	Johnston	Poshard
Clay	Kanjorski	Rahall
Clayton	Kaptur	Rangel
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Reed
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Richardson
Coleman	Kennelly	Rivers
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Roemer
Conyers	Klink	Rose
Costello	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Lantos	Rush
Danner	Levin	Sabo
de la Garza	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
DeFazio	Lincoln	Sawyer
DeLauro	Lofgren	Schroeder
Dellums	Lowe	Schumer
Deutsch	Luther	Scott
Dicks	Maloney	Serrano
Dingell	Manton	Skaggs
Dixon	Markey	Skelton
Doggett	Martinez	Slaughter
Dooley	Mascara	Spratt
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Durbin	McCarthy	Stokes
Edwards	McDermott	Studds
Engel	McHale	Stupak
Eshoo	McKinney	Tanner
Evans	McNulty	Tejeda
Farr	Meehan	Thompson
Fattah	Meek	Thornton
Fazio	Menendez	Thurman
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Towns
Filner	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Vento
Frost	Minge	Volkmer
Furse	Mink	Ward
Gejdenson	Moakley	Waters
Gephardt	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Gibbons	Montgomery	Waxman
Gonzalez	Moran	Williams
Gutierrez	Nadler	Wilson
Hall (OH)	Neal	Wise
Hamilton	Oberstar	Woolsey
Harman	Obey	Wyden
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Wynn
Hefner	Ortiz	Yates
Hilliard	Owens	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Foglietta	Peterson (FL)
Barcia	Ford	Reynolds
Berman	Hobson	Rogers
Collins (IL)	Istook	Torres
Coyne	Klecza	Tucker
Flake	Lipinski	

□ 1148

Mr. KANJORSKI changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 995

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR ALL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY AND BALANCE OF THE WEEK DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves, pursuant to clause 2 of rule XI, that all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House be permitted to sit today and the balance of the week while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONIOR. May I inquire as to whether the minority will get the customary 30 minutes under this motion that we have historically been entitled to and have received?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair indicates that this is the prerogative of the majority leader.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we have important work that we are trying to finish on the floor today. It has taken us longer than many of us thought would be necessary because we have tried to be as accommodating as we can to so many Members that have been interested in the Clean Water Act.

Nevertheless, it is necessary for this motion to be voted on, and I really do not think it is all that controversial a matter.

Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion may not be all that controversial on the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. ARMEY] side of the Chamber, but it certainly is controversial on our side. Let me just make this point. No. 1, I would have hoped we would have gotten the customary 30 minutes for debate, half of the time that is allotted under the motion that the gentleman from Texas makes. But given that we are not, let me make some points with respect to what the majority is trying to do to the minority.

Mr. Speaker, for the first few months of this Congress, we have had a process of consultation between the majority and the minority with respect to the issue of committee meetings during the 5-minute rule. And in almost every case, with few exceptions, we have been able to agree on this issue. But today the Republicans have gone too far. Today they are proposing a blanket waiver of the rule for an entire week, the very week that this House will be debating an historic budget resolution on this floor.

Under this motion, Mr. Speaker, Members will be tied up in committees, they will be voting on unrelated bills while the budget is being considered on the floor of the House. Why are they

doing this? Why are they taking Members away from the action of the year, this budget, and placing them in committees to listen to hearings, to mark up other bills when the most important piece of legislation we could be doing this year will be on the floor?

Well, I guess, Mr. Speaker, if I were defending this budget resolution, which by the way in a poll in the Washington post today we saw 60 percent of the American people indicated they were opposed to this resolution, a resolution that devastates Medicare and Medicaid and education and the proper investments we need in this country, I would not want a lot of debate either. I would not want a lot of debate either.

We just finished a resolution that deals with the question of Medicare, \$300 billion cuts in Medicare in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest few in our society. The point here is that every Member in this body should be available on the floor to participate in this historic debate.

That is why they want Members to be tied up in committee, Mr. Speaker, because they are concerned that the membership will rebel against what is clearly in the eyes of the American people and those who have watched this process one-sided, one-sided on behalf of the wealthiest people in our society; tax breaks, if you make \$230,000 a year, get a \$20,000 tax break. If you are a senior who is struggling, like Iris Doyle who I represent in my district, who lives under Social Security, and a small pension she has, if you are living on a small pension, on Social Security, you are going to be paying an extra \$1,000 by the year 2002 under this proposal.

We want to speak out on that, and we want to speak out with all our voices. We do not want one, two, or three, or four people on the floor while we debate this bill. We think every Member of this institution ought to be here. This is an historic bill.

I was here in 1981 when we did the budget and we did the tax cuts. This is every bit, probably more significant in the impact it will have on Americans. There is a provision in here that is going to cost my students in Michigan an extra \$4,000 a year to go to college because of what they are doing to student loans, not to speak of all the other educational cuts.

Every Member on this floor ought to be here.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot hide the facts from the American people, and this heavy-handed motion that is before us today to take Members away from this institution, this floor, will not help.

Now, the first problem is occurring today in the Committee on Commerce, and I am going to yield in a second to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to outline that problem, but it is not just the Committee on Commerce. This motion allows all House committees to hold markups for the rest of the week as I pointed out. On Wednesday

we begin voting on this budget. On Thursday we hopefully will finish it and vote on it.

Why can we not allow Members to be in one place at one time to focus in on one issue, in fact the most important issue we will have to deal with probably in this session, debating this, in my view, an outrageous Republican budget resolution?

I think we know why: because it is indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the House is going to make a decision on the budget for 7 years. Every year between now and the year 2002 is going to be affected by the actions that are going to be taken on the House floor. We are going to deal with policy. We are going to deal with economics. We are going to deal with interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to deal with employment. We are going to deal with Social Security. We are going to deal with economic issues. We are going to deal with the level of Federal expenditures. We are going to affect the rights and concerns of every American, from the very young to the very oldest and from the unborn to the dead.

I think to have these kinds of discussions and these kinds of decisions made while the committees and the subcommittees are marking up important matters, but matters nowhere near as important as that which we will be discussing today, is absolutely wrong. I would tell my colleagues that this resolution should not be agreed to for that reason.

I will also point out something else: This is one example of high-handedness.

□ 1200

Another example of high-handedness we will be seeing in the Committee on Commerce very shortly. A member has been added to that committee without a word of consultation with the leadership on this side of the aisle. Very shortly, without any consultation with the leadership on this side of the aisle within the committee, members will be having their concerns and their interests in the structure of the committees and subcommittees of the Committee on Commerce rearranged.

It is an interesting game that the Republican leadership is playing. What it says is that any time the Republican leadership chooses, they can change the composition of the teams on the field. If they do not like playing football with 11 men, they can put 12 or 13 men on the field, simply because they changed the rules, without adding another member on this side of the aisle.

That is an example of arrogance, high-handedness, and quite honestly, a series of practices which are totally inconsistent with the traditions and practices of this House, where the business, when the Democrats were in the

majority, was always done in consultation with the minority, and when we were always exquisitely careful, both on the leadership level in the House and on the leadership level in the committee, to consult and to afford the Republicans full opportunity to be fairly treated and to be heard before actions affecting the structure of committees, subcommittees, and of the House, was taken.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rise up against heavy-handedness, high-handedness, and arrogance on the part of my Republican colleagues in connection with two matters: First, consideration of the budget resolution; and second, the structuring of committees and subcommittees.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let me just buttress the arguments made by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Republicans have put a new member of their party onto the Committee on Commerce. We are entitled to another member on that committee. However, when our requests are made, they are met with silence. There is no response given to us. Business as usual.

That is what we have here, business as usual. They pass a resolution on the first day of the session on committee ratios, saying that we can only have two full committees, yet they have 38 Members that serve on more than two committees. That question needs to be addressed, and we intend to address it in due time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, the minority whip, for raising this issue.

I want to say to my colleagues that not only is it a question of members of one committee deciding to participate in debate on the floor on the budget or on the Clean Water Act or other measures, but we also have the situation where members of the Committee on Resources will be engaged in markup on the bill while at the same time their committee will be engaged in offering bills on the floor of the House under the current schedule.

That disenfranchises members of the committee from one of those two debates. They cannot participate and represent their constituent views in committee, or they cannot participate on the floor and represent their constituent views on those bills presented on this floor.

The same holds true for each and every member. This disenfranchises Republicans and Democrats alike, because if we have to go to committee to participate, we cannot be heard on the budget debate, we cannot be heard on the clean water debate. These are major, controversial, important actions, taken by this Congress.

I think the minority whip has it about right, that they seek to submerge this debate. The reports are

coming in from the precincts. The American people are terribly upset by what the Republicans are doing to Medicare, what they are doing to student loans, and as we saw, what they were doing to student nutrition.

The fact of the matter is, the public does not like this plan, so what is their proposal? To disenfranchise Members of Congress from participating in this debate, from echoing the views of their constituents back home, and to try to keep them locked up in committee activity that is nowhere near as urgent or as important as the budget debate and or the clean water debate.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for raising this issue.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his remarks, Mr. Speaker. He is right on target.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear we are not talking about abstractions here. Last week, Mr. Speaker, we had in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services the single silliest day in the history, I believe, of the House of Representatives.

We voted in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services the week before to pass out a deregulation bill, but while we were having the rollcall on that bill, a rollcall was in progress on the floor of the House, because the committee was meeting simultaneously with the floor proceedings.

In fact, the chairman, an honorable man, trying to do his best under a set of silly rules, had called a rollcall on an amendment, and he announced that there would be a rollcall right after that on the bill. Many members, mostly Republicans who voted first on the amendment, did not hear that, so they left. They came to the floor.

As a result, last week, all the members of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services interrupted what we were doing, those who had gotten the notice, and we sat in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and we pretended to vote on the banking bill. The only reason we had that meeting to vote on the banking bill was that the week before we had a simultaneous rollcall in committee and a rollcall on the floor. Some of the Republican Members were distressed because, having left to vote on the floor rollcall, they missed the rollcall in committee. That is what we are inviting when we have simultaneous rollcalls on both levels, we get this kind of problem.

Mr. Speaker, it was the Republicans who insisted that the chairman of the committee have this phony meeting. We all sat there, it was like a play, and we all voted. It was the silliest waste of time ever. Why? Because of this kind of tactic.

Therefore, what we have here is that the Republicans took power in January and announced this wonderful contract and all these rules changes, but we

should have checked the warranty on the contract, because apparently, on the rules changes, it was good only until inconvenient. I have never seen people profess good intentions, as they define them, and so little live up to them as we have seen here.

The kind of burlesque that we had in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services last week, where we had a rollcall vote, a solemn rollcall vote solely because some Republican Members had missed the previous rollcall vote because there was another rollcall vote going on was silly, but what the Republican leadership wants to do is to create the circumstances in which that silliness will recur.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, to conclude, let me just ask my friends and colleagues today, please do not put themselves in the situation where they are not here defending the interests of their constituents by being away, by being at another markup, by being at another hearing, on the most important piece of legislation that we will consider perhaps this year, the budget of the United States of America, that will have serious consequences for seniors, for students, for middle-aged children who have to support seniors; an important bill.

Let us not play Casper the Ghost and have people participating in one or two different places at the same time. Let the sunshine pour through these Chambers so every Member can be here, can participate, and can be a full participant in the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion, and to give themselves the affordability and the comfort of being able to participate in the budget debate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if I can just take a moment to put back into perspective a point that has been stretched beyond belief, what we are doing here is asking the Members to vote to enable the committees to sit during the 5-minute rule while we continue to work on the Clean Water Act.

In particular, the work that we want to see continue in committees while we are on the Clean Water Act on the floor is the hearings of the Committee on Commerce on telecommunications, which has been the only objection that has been raised.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska] announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BONIOR. 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.

This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—181

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Owens
Andrews	Gordon	Pallone
Baessler	Green	Pastor
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Pelosi
Becerra	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Bentsen	Hefner	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hilliard	Poshard
Bishop	Hinchee	Rahall
Bonior	Holden	Rangel
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Brewster	Jefferson	Reynolds
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Chapman	Kennelly	Sabo
Clay	Kildee	Sanders
Clayton	Klink	Sawyer
Clement	LaFalce	Schroeder
Clyburn	Lantos	Schumer
Coleman	Levin	Scott
Collins (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Conyers	Lincoln	Sisisky
Costello	Lofgren	Skaggs
Cramer	Lowe	Skelton
Danner	Luther	Slaughter
de la Garza	Maloney	Spratt
DeFazio	Manton	Stark
DeLauro	Markey	Stenholm
Dellums	Martinez	Stokes
Deutsch	Mascara	Studds
Dicks	Matsui	Stupak
Dingell	McCarthy	Tanner
Dixon	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McHale	Tejeda
Dooley	McKinney	Thompson
Doyle	McNulty	Thornton
Durbin	Meehan	Thurman
Edwards	Meek	Torres
Engel	Menendez	Towns
Eshoo	Mfume	Velazquez
Farr	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fattah	Mineta	Visclosky
Fazio	Minge	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Mink	Ward
Filner	Moakley	Waters
Flake	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Moran	Waxman
Ford	Murtha	Williams
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wise
Frost	Neal	Woolsey
Furse	Oberstar	Wyden
Gejdenson	Obey	Wynn
Gephardt	Olver	Yates
Geren	Ortiz	
Gibbons	Orton	

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman	Coyne	Klecza
Berman	Evans	Lipinski
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	Peterson (FL)
Collins (IL)	Hoyer	Porter
Cooley	Istook	Torricelli
Cox	Johnston	Tucker

□ 1227

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on H.R. 1590, the bill previously considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 4, LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-121) on the resolution (H. Res. 147) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 4) to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 219, REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-122) on the resolution (H. Res. 148) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 219) to improve the economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ESTABLISHING TIME LIMITATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 961, CLEAN WATER AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the clean water bill which we will be considering in the next few moments that we establish time limits as follows:

In title VIII on wetlands:

One hour on the Boehlert substitute to title VIII; 30 minutes on the Gilchrest amendment to delete wetland delineation; and 20 minutes on all other amendments which will be considered, excluding title X for which no time limit will be set, and specifically the amendments to which I refer, which will have 20-minute time limits, are as follows:

The Gilchrest-Dingell amendment on migratory waterfowl; the Frelinghuysen amendment on delegated programs; the Wyden amendment to prohibit compensation; the Minge amendment with regard to permits for the Department of Agriculture; the Riggs amendment on certain wastewater treatment facilities; the Taylor amendment to require consideration of beneficial uses of dredged material; the Pallone amendment, which will be two amendments en bloc; and the Franks amendment to limit changes in title IX, with the time to be equally divided by the proponent and opponent of the amendments.

□ 1230

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