

chairman of the DCCC, used to come to me and say "We are going to have an event. We would like to make certain that votes are not called during that time." We always obliged. I think there was always comity between the two sides of the aisle.

We held an event, that side holds events. Both sides do it. This vote had nothing to do with the scheduling of our event. It had everything to do, though, with games being played here in the House that had nothing to do with the NRCC's event last night. However, we certainly will remember that advice in the future, when it comes to scheduling events, and certainly keep an eye on that side's, also.

RECOGNITION OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION'S RESOLUTION, JUNE 22, 1995

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to stand here today to recognize the bold and courageous step the Southern Baptist Convention took during its annual convention. As many of you know, its members passed a resolution acknowledging and asking forgiveness for past acts of racism.

The Southern Baptist Convention was created in 1845 when some members split from the American Baptist Convention over the question of whether slaveowners could be missionaries.

In 1989, its members moved toward this historic resolution when they declared racism a sin.

This resolution commits its members to eradicating racism in all its forms from Southern Baptist life and ministry. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that others would follow the example of the Southern Baptist Convention so that our great Nation can be all that it can be, utilizing the full potential of all its citizens regardless of race.

A LITTLE HYPOCRISY IN COMPLAINTS

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate up in the office. I just happened to see Roll Call this morning. It concerned me that maybe we have a little bit of hypocrisy going on today.

There is an article here entitled "Party Weekend."

The Democrats are holding a retreat for big donors at the notorious Greenbrier resort in White Sulphur Springs this weekend. The price of admission is \$10,000 for individuals, \$15,000 for PAC's. There will be some time for discussion, but most of Saturday is free time for golf, tennis, swimming, horseback riding, and visiting the spa. The Greenbrier retreat is one of six events the Democrats are holding for big donors this year.

Mr. Speaker, let us get some reality here. All this rhetoric is quite disingenuous.

AMERICA IS NOT YET A COLOR-BLIND SOCIETY

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, let me be the first today to welcome all of our colleagues to the new colorblind society. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker himself has said just as late as last week that we were not there yet, but we are. Let us just put down all the weapons we used to get here to the promised land of equality and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, what are the signs that we are here in this land of milk and honey? The Supreme Court last week in the Adarand decision told us, and today in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, we will put yet another nail in the coffin of inequality in fair housing and lending.

News flash, we are not there yet. By taking one of the best weapons we have away from the Attorney General to use testers, qualified minority and nonminority applicants who root out bigotry and discrimination in housing, we have taken a bad detour back to the past.

Shame on those who falsely welcome us to this color-blind America. We are not there yet, Mr. Speaker. Only last week U.S.A. Today reported that there is still discrimination in housing in this land. There is still discrimination in fair lending practices. Mr. Speaker, let us move toward a color-blind society, but we are not there yet.

HOW REPUBLICANS MAKE LAW: LET LOBBYISTS DO IT

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans promised some sweeping changes in how Congress works. In one way, they have certainly delivered.

The Democratic Study Group is today releasing a special report that describes just how this Republican Congress has turned over the reins of congressional power to special interest lobbyists.

Lobbyists have been brought in from the corridors of the Capitol and given a seat of power, where they are performing the functions that are the legal and moral responsibility of Members and staff. These paid agents of private interests are dictating the wording of legislation, conducting official staff briefings advising committee counsel during bill markups, drafting official committee reports, and even sitting on the dais during hearings.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for lobbyists to give advice and suggest bill language. It is quite another for these

agents of private interests, interests with a financial stake in the outcome, to perform the core responsibilities of congressional staff and Members.

Mr. Speaker, this is the business of legislating. It is the public's business. It is to be conducted only by those who are accountable to the public.

COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to clause 2i of rule 11 Mr. ARMEY moves that all committees and subcommittees of the House be permitted to sit for the remainder 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.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take my whole hour.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this is a routine matter. It is a fairly normal thing we have been doing here in order to enable our committees to work while the House proceeds with business. Of course, we do this in all due consideration to all our Members, but also, of course, in due consideration of the fact that the people's work must be done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, with the exception that I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and would like to be heard in opposition to this motion.

Normally, Mr. Speaker, it would be my feeling that this House should proceed in all due speed to attend to matters, certainly on the Committee on Science on which I serve. However, yesterday we had an incredible display of arrogance in that committee. It is not the first time that it has happened, unfortunately.

That is that after the bell had rung for Members of the Committee on Science to come to the floor of this house and cast their vote on behalf of the over half a million people that each of those Members represent, after that bell had rung, the chairman of the committee attempted to force the committee to vote in committee at the same time, several blocks away from where they were being asked to vote on the floor of this House.

The effect of that action is to deny that half a million Americans the opportunity to cast their vote either in the committee or on the floor, since even the Committee on Science, as advanced as its outlook might be, has not

figured out a way to have Members of Congress sit in two places at the same time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with this having happened on a prior occasion, I began talking about this in the Committee on Science in hopes that there would be an opportunity to simply have the common decency and the common courtesy to postpone the vote until immediately after the vote here, because several members of the Committee on Science, Democratic members, had already left, realizing how really critical this vote was on the floor of the House concerning, ironically, the Office of Technology Assessment, a matter that relates directly to the jurisdiction of our committee.

Those members left. They included the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan, LYNN RIVERS. Ms. RIVERS, as she told the House yesterday, has never missed a vote on the floor of this House. She has never missed a vote in any of the committees on which she served until yesterday. The only reason that she missed that vote was the vote was forced while she was trying to cast her vote on the floor of the House, the vote was forced in the Committee on Science.

Mr. Speaker, I talked for 5 minutes, asking for the opportunity to simply delay the vote until such time as all our Members could return, and that opportunity, that common courtesy, was rejected. It is for that reason that I oppose this motion, because I think that the House needs to make a statement that we will not place any Member of this House, Democratic or Republican, in the position, the dilemma, of deciding shall I vote on the floor for my constituents, shall I vote on the committee to which my expertise is called?

Mr. Speaker, none of this would have been necessary yesterday. None of this rush to justice would have occurred had it not been, as several Members have pointed out this morning, for the fact that some of our Republican colleagues just could not move fast enough to get to that big bucks fundraiser up in New York City, where all of the corporate elite was gathered to shower down benefits on them. There is nothing wrong with having a fundraiser. They do go on all the time on both sides. It is the only way this place seems to be able to operate.

However, what is wrong is when democracy is trampled in the process, and people are cut off and denied their right to vote, be it on the floor or in an important committee of this House like the Committee on Science.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that immediately following the disposition of this motion by the floor leader, that we are going to be back on the legislative branch appropriation bill. The very first vote is going to be, again, on OTA. At least that is being corrected.

However, then we are going to follow with other votes about 10, 11 minutes apart. We are going to have other amendments and they each have about 10 minutes to them. Those are very important amendments. Those on the Committee on Science are going to have to stay over there and not listen to the debate.

Mr. DOGGETT. They are over there right now meeting. That is the problem. They cannot be in two places at once.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will yield further, they do not know what is going on, Mr. Chairman. They have to run over here and try to make this vote. If the chairman does like he did yesterday and calls for votes, we are back in the same pickle all over again.

Would it not be better for the Committee on Science just to say no, we will not finish up today, we will come back in next week and we will finish up, at a time when it is not going to interfere with Members trying to do two things at one time?

Mr. DOGGETT. Perhaps at a time when simple common courtesy and decency and collegiality could prevail, instead of pomposity and arrogance, which is what we have had too much of.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I might point out what happened yesterday as it relates to what occurred here on the floor. I know the gentleman is interested in the total inconsistency, because when we did rush over here, literally in a gallop from way over at the Rayburn building, to try to be two places at once, we found, or I did, in response to a parliamentary inquiry, that a phone call had been made, and that the vote had been extended far beyond 17 minutes, but that was the vote immediately before the one that was cut off a few seconds shy, and 1 million Americans' right to vote shy, of being able to be cast here.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman and other Members of the minority had been informed by the chairman of the Committee on Science that that phone call was being made, and that there would be sufficient time for the gentleman to respond to the rollcall vote over here, he would not have had to run over here right away

□ 1145

You were not told that, were you?

Mr. DOGGETT. We heard nothing of it. It would have allowed those Members like the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS] to keep her 100-percent voting record for the people of Michigan.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I really thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this. I know in Judiciary, we

were confronted with exactly the same thing the day before. That after the second bell I left to come here to vote because I thought the 15-minute thing was legit and I guess my mother emphasized promptness too much. I left, I came over here, went back and found out that they had a rollcall and so I had not been able to participate in the rollcall in Judiciary.

Look, during the first 100 days, I think our side cooperated when we had this 15-ring circus going on. But at this point when you have got committees that are doing markups and hearings and meanwhile having issues on the floor that the committee is also interested in at the same time, I would think what we are really saying is we are just running around here voting and people do not have any time to really focus on these tough issues. I think the people expect a little more of us. They expect us to work later than 3:30 in the afternoon and in the middle of the week, knock off to go to New York City and whatever.

I think the gentleman is making an excellent point and I would hope that everybody could get some idea of what the rules are. Are we going to have committee votes after the second bell? Are we going to have them after the third bell? Are we going to be able to hold the thing open down here if that is happening? Who has the clout to do it? Is it only people on that side of the aisle? People on this side do not have that clout? These are serious issues.

Mr. DOGGETT. They are serious issues, because democracy has to work both ways. It has to be the same rule for Democrats and Republicans and people of no party affiliation. I certainly do not object to their need to rush off to a fundraiser in Manhattan with the tobacco lobbyists and the other big corporate interests, but why is it that the people's workday had to be cut short in the middle of the afternoon? The folks I represent down in Texas do not usually get off at 3 or 4 in the afternoon to head off to some big bucks party. They have to stay and put in at least their full 8 hours of labor. Had these folks been willing to put in their full 8 hours of labor and then catch their corporate jet to New York and enjoy the chance to be wined and dined with the big corporate lobbyists, then we would not have had this problem. We could well have permitted people to vote in due order in the Committee on Science and to vote here on the floor of the House without rancor, without any kind of interruption or disruption such as we have had, and we would be much further along on the people's business today had these nasty incidents, one here on the floor of the House, one in the Committee on Science, totally uncalled for, totally unnecessary, had those not occurred.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. That what we are talking about is by trying to compact the day into just a

few hours so it is convenient for jet-setters, or fat cats, so they don't have to be kept waiting and whatever is wrong. You do your business first and then you do the other thing. We understand that.

If people say, "Well, we don't want to work late that night," that may be one thing. But 3:30 in the afternoon is not really late. I think that most people would be very surprised by that. But I think basically what Members want to know is what are the rules around here? How many times can we have votes? How late are they going to be? Are we going to have to start choosing between where our vote is recorded? And it is not our vote. It is the vote of the people we represent. I think that is the thing we have to keep focusing on. People expect their voice to be heard here and Members are now being forced to choose between where they are going to cast their vote since we do not really quite know what the new rules are. I thank the gentleman for pointing this out.

I hope people vote "no." I think we have got to get a little more in order here.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think there is no doubt about the outcome of this vote on my objection than any of the other votes that we have had this time. But I would commend to the majority leader the leadership of a member of the majority of the subcommittee on which I serve on the Committee on Science, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], because we went through a subcommittee hearing on some of the same legislation being considered in the Committee on Science. It was without disruption, it was without ill feeling, even though we disagree on some of the substance as much as with any member of the full committee. That is the way that the committees and the subcommittees of this Congress need to be operated.

The people did not ask for us to come here and get engaged in some kind of partisan tussle. They simply wanted a full exchange of ideas where every Member is accorded the dignity of a vote, to represent their constituents.

I would ask the distinguished majority leader, whatever the outcome, perhaps the predetermined outcome of this vote, to simply work with us to see that this does not happen again, to see that Members are not forced to a choice between representing their constituents within a committee and representing them on the floor of the House. That is what all this is about, so that there can be informed representation, fair representation. We ask for no special privilege on the Democratic side, only the opportunity to represent our constituents and hopefully work toward a bipartisan answer to some of the problems that this country faces.

I know that there will be times when the crush of campaign duties may draw people away. But let that not be at the expense of the normal workday. There is no reason why this body cannot work

until at least 5. There will be plenty of time to fly off in the corporate jets and deal with the contributors that I know are so vital to the Republican Party. They can do that and still conduct the people's business in a fair and proper way.

I think that yesterday democracy was trampled twice, once on the floor of this House, once in the Committee on Science. Let us see in today's action that in addition to revotes, that we actually have a commitment to reform.

When I came here in Congress for the first day in January of this year, I have to admit that I was not all that happy about finding myself in the minority. But I will also admit that I was quite happy to see Republican colleagues saying they were going to shake this place up. I think business as usual needed to be shaken up in this place. If I have any disagreement with them now, it is not that they shake too much but that they did not shake enough. When things like this happen, it suggests we are right back to business as usual.

It is not enough to say, "Well, that's the way somebody else did it 10 or 20 years ago." These are supposed to be revolutionaries, committed to revolutionary change in this House. It is nothing but revolting to see what happened yesterday. We do need revolutionary change in this House, and I think that assuring that every Member gets to cast their vote fully and fairly in committee and on the floor of the Congress is absolutely vital to that reform.

If we can combine with that opportunity some affirmative and immediate action, if we could have as much of a rush to true campaign finance reform, as much of a rush to a gift ban and free trips and this kind of thing, to changing our rules to deal with that as there was a rush to justice yesterday to get to that fund-raiser up in Manhattan, we would begin to reform this system so that people had not only their full 100-percent right to vote on the floor of this House and in the Committee on Science but so that our citizens were dealt with fully and fairly, so that the ties that seem to bind too many Members of this body to the lobby, the gifts, the freebies, the free trips, so that those would be ended, as my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] has been trying to do with a true gift ban limitation in our rules but which we cannot get up for a vote on the floor of this House. Maybe we could have done that after 4:00 yesterday. Likewise, so that we could move forward as there appeared to be some bipartisan support for moving forward earlier in the week but it seems to have vanished away, to do something about campaign finance reform.

That gets to the heart of real reform, to genuinely shaking this body up and giving the American people the kind of reform that they need to have a Congress that is responsible first and foremost to the people that are struggling

to climb up that economic ladder instead of tilting all of the benefit to those who are sitting comfortably on top. That is what this is about.

I object and ask for a "no" vote on this attempt of the Committee on Science to continue to operate under the same old procedures. I ask that we assure democracy and fair play for our constituents as well as our Members and hopefully put some genuine meaning in the term "reform."

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have just a few more comments before I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks. I am sure we would all agree they were very entertaining.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has clearly demonstrated, I think, to the satisfaction of this entire body that he does moral outrage very well. But I must admit, he is far more entertaining when he does wide-eyed innocence, and I should hope that I will not have to experience the performance again in the future.

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 announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ARMEY. 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.

This is a 17-minute vote.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 187, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—232

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Allard | Callahan | Duncan |
| Archer | Calvert | Dunn |
| Armey | Camp | Ehlers |
| Bachus | Canady | Ehrlich |
| Baker (CA) | Castle | Emerson |
| Baker (LA) | Chabot | English |
| Ballenger | Chambliss | Ensign |
| Barr | Chenoweth | Everett |
| Barrett (NE) | Christensen | Ewing |
| Bartlett | Chrysler | Fawell |
| Barton | Clinger | Fields (TX) |
| Bass | Coble | Flanagan |
| Bateman | Coburn | Foley |
| Bereuter | Collins (GA) | Forbes |
| Bilbray | Combest | Fowler |
| Bilirakis | Cooley | Fox |
| Bliley | Cox | Franks (CT) |
| Blute | Crane | Franks (NJ) |
| Boehlert | Crapo | Frelinghuysen |
| Boehner | Cremeans | Frisa |
| Bonilla | Cubin | Funderburk |
| Bono | Cunningham | Galleghy |
| Brownback | Davis | Ganske |
| Bryant (TN) | Deal | Gekas |
| Bunn | DeLay | Gilchrist |
| Bunning | Diaz-Balart | Gillmor |
| Burr | Dickey | Gilman |
| Burton | Doolittle | Goodlatte |
| Buyer | Dreier | Goodling |

Goss Longley
 Graham Lucas
 Greenwood Manzullo
 Gunderson Martini
 Gutknecht McCollum
 Hancock McCreery
 Hansen McDade
 Hastert McHugh
 Hastings (WA) McInnis
 Hayworth McIntosh
 Hefley McKeon
 Heineman Metcalf
 Herger Meyers
 Hilleary Mica
 Hobson Miller (FL)
 Hoekstra Molinari
 Hoke Moorhead
 Horn Morella
 Hostettler Myers
 Houghton Myrick
 Hunter Nethercutt
 Hutchinson Neumann
 Hyde Ney
 Inglis Norwood
 Istook Nussle
 Jacobs Oxley
 Johnson (CT) Packard
 Johnson, Sam Parker
 Jones Paxson
 Kasich Petri
 Kelly Pombo
 Kim Porter
 King Portman
 Kingston Pryce
 Klug Quillen
 Knollenberg Quinn
 Kolbe Radanovich
 LaHood Ramstad
 Largent Regula
 Latham Riggs
 LaTourette Roberts
 Lazio Rogers
 Leach Rohrabacher
 Lewis (CA) Ros-Lehtinen
 Lewis (KY) Roth
 Lightfoot Roukema
 Linder Royce
 Livingston Salmon
 LoBiondo Sanford

NAYS—187

Abercrombie Eshoo
 Andrews Evans
 Baesler Farr
 Baldacci Fattah
 Barcia Fazio
 Barrett (WI) Fields (LA)
 Becerra Filner
 Beilenson Flake
 Bentsen Foglietta
 Berman Ford
 Beville Frank (MA)
 Bishop Frost
 Bonior Furse
 Borski Gejdenson
 Boucher Gephardt
 Brewster Geren
 Brown (CA) Gibbons
 Brown (FL) Gonzalez
 Brown (OH) Gordon
 Bryant (TX) Green
 Cardin Gutierrez
 Clay Hall (OH)
 Clayton Hall (TX)
 Clement Hamilton
 Clyburn Hastings (FL)
 Coleman Hayes
 Collins (IL) Hefner
 Collins (MI) Hilliard
 Condit Hinchey
 Conyers Holden
 Costello Hoyer
 Coyne Jackson-Lee
 Cramer Jefferson
 Danner Johnson (SD)
 de la Garza Johnson, E. B.
 DeFazio Johnston
 DeLauro Kanjorski
 Dellums Kaptur
 Deutsch Kennedy (RI)
 Dicks Kennelly
 Dingell Kildee
 Dixon Kleczka
 Doggett Klink
 Dooley LaFalce
 Doyle Lantos
 Durbin Levin
 Edwards Lewis (GA)
 Engel Lincoln

Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaefer
 Seastrand
 Sensenbrenner
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Shuster
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Solomon
 Souder
 Spence
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stockman
 Stump
 Talent
 Tate
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Torkildsen
 Traficant
 Upton
 Vucanovich
 Waldholtz
 Walker
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Zeliff
 Zimmer

Richardson
 Rivers
 Roemer
 Rose
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo
 Sanders
 Sawyer
 Schroeder
 Scott
 Sisisky
 Skaggs
 Skelton
 Slaughter

Ackerman
 Browder
 Chapman
 Dornan
 Harman

Stark
 Stenholm
 Stokes
 Studds
 Stupak
 Tanner
 Taylor (MS)
 Tejada
 Thompson
 Thornton
 Thurman
 Torricelli
 Towns
 Tucker
 Velazquez

NOT VOTING—15

Kennedy (MA)
 Laughlin
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Schiff

Vento
 Visclosky
 Volkmer
 Ward
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Williams
 Wilson
 Wise
 Woolsey
 Wyden
 Wynn
 Yates

Schumer
 Serrano
 Torres
 Waters
 White

□ 1214

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

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.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1854.

□ 1217

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 21, 1995, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 104-146 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] had been disposed of.

DE NOVO VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the Chair will now put the question de novo.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as amended.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] be allowed to speak out of order for 2 minutes in order to underscore and explain the amendment that is about to be voted on.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will only consent to this request if we are given equal time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I would amend my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request now is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] will be given 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be given 2 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] will be recognized for 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, rather than exercising my right to speak for 2 minutes, maybe I can handle this through a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Am I right that this is a revote on the Fazio amendment, amended by me yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOUGHTON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

I would reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman has yielded it to me.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on this, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, under what authority would the gentleman have the right to close on a unanimous-consent request that was divided?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is the manager of the bill.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. But this is not on the bill. Under what authority would he have the right to close? This is a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. This is additional controlled debate, permitted by unanimous consent, on an amendment to the bill.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I know we have had a lot of discussion this morning about Members