

Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson

Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy

Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra
Dingell
Jefferson
Maloney
McDade
McKinney

Moakley
Moran
Morella
Paxon
Reynolds
Sisisky

Stenholm
Stokes
Tucker
Waldholtz

□ 1122

Messrs. OWENS, MCINTOSH, FIELDS of Louisiana, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. TORRICELLI, ROYCE, and GILCHREST changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1617

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2020, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2020, be instructed to agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that under the rules, a Member in

opposition has the right to half the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One-third of the time could be allotted to a Member in opposition.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that the gentleman is yielding to me the time?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield my 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the motion?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of the motion, but I would yield my 30 minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is yielding all 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 30 minutes in opposition to the motion.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, what is before us is the question of going to conference on the Treasury-Postal appropriation bill. The motion that I have just made is a motion which would accept the Senate amendment numbered 130, which in essence indicates that the congressional pay will be frozen for yet another year with no COLA, although that COLA will be provided for other Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House know, this House established a new procedure. As Members will remember in, I believe, 1991, the Congress took a step forward, at least I think many thoughtful Members will recognize it was a step forward, when we decided that outside income for Members of Congress was going to be limited and that instead we would have only one paymaster, that being the general public, rather than supplementing our pay through various activities, including giving speeches and earning outside income in a manner which many people were concerned created the appearance of a conflict of interest.

The Congress took a lot of heat for that action at the time, but I think it was the right action because I think it substantially improved the financial practices around here. It was supported on both sides of the aisle on a bipartisan basis.

We established a new process under that legislation which guaranteed that Members of Congress would never get a pay increase larger than that provided for other Federal employees. And, in fact, the way it was set up, we got that adjustment one year later, so that we could not be accused of setting the trend for increased pay, but rather we were following what would happen in other sectors of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, under that we received two small cost of living adjustments: A 3.5 increase in 1992 and a 3.2 increase in 1993. Since that time we have taken action each year to freeze our own pay. So that means that for calendar year

1994, and 1995, the Congress voluntarily decided not to accept a congressional pay raise, even though other Federal employees did receive a pay raise.

The Senate has now taken an action on this bill which indicates their belief that we should do that for another year.

□ 1130

I think that probably the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle will share the view that under the circumstances that we face with other agencies of Government being cut, with many other programs being cut, when we are in the process of establishing budget guidelines that we will live with for either the next 5 or 7 years on our way to what people would like to think would be a balanced budget, I think that under the circumstances, it would be highly unrealistic to expect that the Congress this year would receive even a cost-of-living adjustment.

So I am simply offering this motion because I think that it is generally accepted in the House that, under these circumstances, it would be appropriate to accept the Senate position.

In doing so, I would make the following observation, however: I believe it is essential to the ability of this House over the long term to attract quality candidates, and I think it is essential to see to it that in the long term we do not have renewed pressures for providing other ways for Members to receive income by, in effect, cashing in on their own notoriety, for want of a better word, or by cashing in on their title as a Member of Congress to increase their pay. In order to prevent those actions from happening, it is going to be necessary at some time for Members of Congress to receive pay adjustments identical to those provided to other workers in the Federal Government.

I do not believe that people can expect that forever there will be no adjustments in congressional pay. But I think it is common good sense to recognize that, under these circumstances, Members of Congress are not and should not be providing themselves with an increase in pay when we are in the process of establishing a multiyear effort to reduce the deficit and cut expenditures.

So, for the third year in a row, the effect of this motion would be to deny ourselves a pay raise. I think that that is the rational thing to do under these circumstances, and I would urge support for the motion.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

It is with some degree of reluctance that I rise in a bipartisan display of support. It is with some degree of reluctance that I rise in an effort to display bipartisan support for the gentleman's amendment.

I agree with the gentleman's conclusions. This Congress has made great

strides in making deep cuts in the Federal budget. To date, the appropriations process has yielded net savings in fiscal year 1995 and 1996 of approximately \$44 billion, and it would be highly untenable for the Congress to say, "Well, we are going to cut the rest of the Federal budget, but we are going to go ahead and allow our own pay to escalate."

So I join the gentleman, and I suspect that the vast majority of the Members of this House will join him. The Senate has already gone on record as supporting this effort, and so this effort is merely to conform with what the Senate has already done.

But let me say that I also have some grave concern that pay, unfortunately, becomes an aspect, an ingredient to a degree of short term politics. I frankly do not know any Members over the years that I have served in the Congress that have been defeated over the pay raise issue. But I suspect, if any have, they are very few in number.

The American people, I think, intuitively understand that public officials have to make a living, and if they do not want a body of 100 percent of millionaires in the House of Representatives or in the Senate, then obviously they have to pay them a salary.

One can argue how much that salary should be. But a few years ago, as the gentleman pointed out, we had an honoraria process whereby Members of the Congress would supplement their own income by going out and getting speaking fees. I think that the press did a pretty good job, and Members in this body and the Members of the other body stood up and talked about how that process had gone astray. That situation had done much to begin to corrupt the institution. People were not working for their pay. They were going out and cutting deals. They were walking into breakfasts and walking out with thousand dollar checks. Frankly, the whole system smelled.

So the gentleman who is presenting this initiative, and several others and I were eager to get rid of honoraria. Honoraria is now history. It is gone for Members of Congress, and I think that is good.

In an effort to compensate for what was a significant loss of income for many Members of the House and in the other body, there was a fairly significant pay increase. But really it was not an increase, because it was offsetting income that was lost.

That being said, that was several years ago, and since then Members have gotten some nominal COLA's, along with the rest of the Federal employees and military retirees and others, but not as often as the Federal employees and the military retirees. In the last 2 or 3 years this body and the other body have joined together and frozen our pay. We have not had any COLA's, even though Federal employees and military retirees have gotten their COLA's, and that is OK. We are doing it again this year.

I dare say, for one reason or another it is quite possible we may do that again next year. But I would like to offer a cautionary note to my colleagues in this body and tell you that unless you want a situation where all of the Members of the various districts, the 435 districts of this great Nation that serve in this body, if you want everyone to be a millionaire, well then just keep on freezing the pay because a person of modest means will not be able to serve here after some length of time. He will not be able to raise his family. He will not be able to send his children to college or educate his kids or meet obligations to his family. She will not be able to raise her family. He or she will not be running for Congress because he or she at some point will not be able to afford to be here. I do not think that is what we want.

I think the great thing about this country is that we have not had to depend solely on the affluent class, if you will, to serve as our public figures.

I think the great thing about this institution, particularly the House of Representatives, and I do distinguish it from the Senate, because 82 percent of them are millionaires, I am not trying to condemn anybody who has been smart enough or affluent enough or wise enough to invest their money and has made great fortune for himself or inherited great fortune. I think that is great. That is the American system. All of those that are of affluent means that serve in this body serve valiantly and serve their constituents, but our constituents should also have the opportunity to elect people who are not affluent, who are not people who absolutely can pay their way to be here.

That is why I think that is a mistake to freeze our pay year after year after year. I think there is great merit in giving the Federal employees a cost-of-living adjustment periodically. There is great merit in giving retired Federal employees, retired military personnel a cost-of-living adjustment periodically, and, yes, I think that there is great merit in providing judges and Members of Congress and heads of departments of the executive branch and other ranking leaders a periodic adjustment in their cost of living as well. Not to do so risks changing this system, risks changing this country, and not necessarily for the better, because it will not only go to those folks who are of independent means, it could go to those folks who might otherwise seek to find outside income through less-than-appropriate channels. I would not want to see that happen either.

So I think that the gentleman's motion is well taken at this time. It is with some degree of reluctance that I support it, but I do urge that all of the Members of this body support it. Let us send this issue on to the conference and get it over with and address this issue next year and the years thereafter.

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

Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons articulated by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I rise in opposition to this motion. I think he is absolutely correct, and the reasons that he articulated were the reasons that undergirded the efforts of this House of Representatives to, in a fair and open manner, adopt legislation which would lead to a reasonable incremental adjustment in the pay of Members.

It is obviously a very politically difficult situation. No Member likes to vote on their raise, and, in fact, what we talk about here is not a raise in the classic sense. It is a cost-of-living adjustment; that is to say, a mechanism was established to keep Members even with the cost-of-living adjustment.

The gentleman from Louisiana pointed out that we do that for others, social security recipients, Federal retirees, and active Federal employees, some 2 million, as well as for members of the military. We do that so that their standard of living will not deteriorate as inflation occurs. That is the issue here, not a pay raise in the classic sense.

That resolution of a very thorny issue was arrived at through bipartisan work and agreement. The current speaker, Speaker GINGRICH, was a part of that, Speaker Foley and the current minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was part of that, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] was part of that, and my good friend from California [Mr. FAZIO] was a leader in that effort, the current chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was a part of that, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], who was then chairman of the Republican Conference, was a part of that, in trying to deal with a very difficult issue, obviously, with our constituents so that they knew and we knew and our families knew what is the deal, how do we adjust congressional pay in a rational, reasonable way.

The failure to have done that over the years led to anomalies that outraged the American public and gave great fodder for talk show hosts.

What was that? As the gentleman has pointed out, for 3 or 4 or 5 years we would go with zero, and then because Members were falling substantially behind, the quadrennial pay commission would recommend a high figure, and we would take a portion of it, in one instance, for instance, a raise of \$10,000, or approximately that figure. That is a very high figure when one hears about it being a raise and does not divide it by the 4 or 5 previous years that zero was the adjustment.

As a result, the public was outraged at our giving ourselves from this perspective such large pay raises. This, again, was an effort to avoid that consequence and to provide for an annual mechanism that would go into effect

only in the event that Federal employees got a raise, so that if the other employees of the Federal Government did not get a raise, Members of Congress would not get a cost-of-living adjustment. We did that again to ensure that we were not treated differently.

We talked a lot about treating ourselves the same, covering ourselves by the same laws that we expect others to abide by, and that was the reason that we tied ourselves to other Federal employees. We are ultimately paid by the Federal Government, the Federal taxpayer. We are Federal employees, and if they did not get an adjustment, we felt we should not.

In this instance, they will get an adjustment, and the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will provide that we will not have an adjustment, and that will be the third year, and I do not think there is anybody on this floor that believes that next year the Members of Congress are going to have the ability or will to look their constituents in the eye and say, "We are going to take one-fourth or one-half or three-fourths of or a whole of that adjustment which we have not taken."

□ 1145

So, we will go 4 years in a row, and the difficulty that will then occur will be in 1997 there will be an effort, I predict, to do a larger number, a catchup, if you will, and the American public will then again say, "Those guys don't get it. Why are they giving themselves such a big pay raise?" And there will be no discussion about January 1993, or January 1994, or January 1995, or January 1996, or January 1997. That will be forgotten.

So, I rise to oppose this motion, not because I do not understand the concerns of my chairman, the concerns of my ranking member. I think I am a reasonably perceptive Member of this body in terms of the political realities of this body, and so I understand what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has said the realities are, and, having said that, I regret that we find ourselves in a position of suggesting this alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who has forever been a Member of this body who has taken a lot of flak, a lot of heat. He has had the courage to stand up for his 434 colleagues, but, much more importantly, for this institution, and for that I not only have great affection for the gentleman, but great respect.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for yielding this time to me and, far more importantly, for his very kind and generous remarks, and I want to congratulate him for having had the courage, as he always does, to try to educate not only his constituents, not only his colleagues, but, I think, the country on the very, very difficult conundrum we

often find ourselves in on this pay issue. There is no question that the gentleman's comments are pertinent and to the point and that, if we are not careful, we will repeat the very bitter and unhappy history that we have seen occur on this floor where periodically, perhaps once a decade, we go through this catharsis of debate and public reaction over the question of pay for Members of Congress.

I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and a number of other Members, served so stalwartly on the commission that we formed in 1989 that brought the bipartisan leadership of both the caucus and the conference together to resolve this issue, and we hope once and for all. Obviously that is not the case. Lynn Martin, who cochaired that effort along with me at that time, I think would agree that we tried to put in place a very conservative and automatic process, but in fact, unless we have total bipartisan consensus in this institution from one generation, one class, to the next, it is very unlikely that we will have the courage even to allow the automatic mechanism which guarantees that we make our cost-of-living adjustment less by five-tenths of 1 percent than anything that the private sector made. It guarantees that we always get something that is very modest behind inflation, behind what is happening in the private sector.

The comments of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] are, therefore, on point, and I regret that we are at the point we are today, but reality, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has said, has crashed in. We are at a point, and I would hope that all the Members would understand that regardless of how we may feel differently on this issue, we ought to accommodate the situation, the politics of the moment, and we ought to do what we can to lower our voices and to allow this process to go, as I think we all know it must, toward the decision that I am sure we will make with great—a majority here in just a moment—to lay this issue aside for this Congress. But, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has said and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has said, to continue to do this is to create an atmosphere of crisis that will do far more damage to this institution out in the future than we can at all mitigate by the minor act we will be making here in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Mr. HOYER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. OBEY, with this kind of leadership where our Speaker and minority leader are brought together, ultimately we can accomplish our purpose and, I think, educate the American people as to the importance of it." We are not there at the moment, and so, while I know the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] speaks with great sincerity, I do hope

that his opposition, which I believe is largely symbolic here today, will not succeed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not see my opposition as largely symbolic. I perceive it as very real, and those that talk to me about it know that it is not symbolism that I am seeking.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have just one additional observation.

I recognize fully what the gentleman from Louisiana said, and I understand the position of the gentleman from Maryland. I do not think it is reasonable to expect that the only people in America who never get a pay adjustment would be Members of Congress.

I make no apology for the efforts of the past that have been engaged in on a bipartisan basis in this House, in full view of the public, not in a midnight vote, as did occur in the other body, but in full view of the public, in the afternoon, an up-or-down vote after a long discussion. I make no apology for the fact that we decided that we would make the public our only paymaster, because I believe this place is a much cleaner place for having done that. And I have no argument with the suggestion that Members of Congress should be treated the same as other Federal employees with respect to cost-of-living increases. That is probably as good a guide as any.

Unfortunately we are stuck with the job, under the Constitution, of determining our own pay. I wish we did not have that job because it is a no-win situation, and so I think, if we are to set a guideline, what happens to other Federal employees is probably as good a guideline as we can find for what ought to happen to us in terms of pay. I would gladly have somebody else set that pay, but under the circumstances I think that it is appropriate this year, given what is happening with the budget, for the Congress to freeze its own pay.

I would note that that is unquestionably a lot easier for Members of the other body to do because, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] indicated, newspaper stories indicate that there are possibly up to 80 percent of the Senate that are millionaires. I regret that condition; I think we would be better off if we had a more even spread among income groups in the other body. But we do not, and I recognize it is much easier for them to do this than it is for those on this side of the Capitol, but I think under the circumstances this is the best course of action. I think Members understand that.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Without objection, the previous questions is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 31, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 648]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie	Crane	Gunderson
Ackerman	Crapo	Gutierrez
Allard	Creameans	Gutknecht
Andrews	Cubin	Hall (OH)
Archer	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Armey	Danner	Hamilton
Bachus	Davis	Hancock
Baesler	de la Garza	Hansen
Baker (CA)	Deal	Harman
Baker (LA)	DeFazio	Hastert
Baldacci	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Ballenger	Dellums	Hayworth
Barcia	Deutsch	Hefley
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hefner
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Heineman
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Herger
Bartlett	Dixon	Hilleary
Barton	Doggett	Hilliard
Bass	Dooley	Hinches
Bateman	Doolittle	Hobson
Beilenson	Dornan	Hoekstra
Bentsen	Doyle	Hoke
Bereuter	Dreier	Holden
Bevill	Duncan	Horn
Bilbray	Dunn	Hostettler
Bilirakis	Durbin	Hunter
Bishop	Edwards	Hutchinson
Bliley	Ehlers	Hyde
Blute	Ehrlich	Inglis
Boehner	Emerson	Istook
Bonilla	English	Jackson-Lee
Bonior	Ensign	Jacobs
Bono	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Evans	Johnson (SD)
Boucher	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Browder	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Brown (CA)	Farr	Johnston
Brown (FL)	Fawell	Jones
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Kanjorski
Brownback	Fields (LA)	Kaptur
Bryant (TN)	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Bryant (TX)	Filner	Kelly
Bunn	Flanagan	Kennedy (MA)
Bunning	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Foley	Kennelly
Burton	Forbes	Kildee
Buyer	Ford	Kim
Callahan	Fowler	Kingston
Calvert	Fox	Klecicka
Camp	Frank (MA)	Klink
Canady	Franks (CT)	Klug
Cardin	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Chabot	Frisa	LaFalce
Chambliss	Frost	LaHood
Chapman	Funderburk	Lantos
Chenoweth	Furse	Largent
Christensen	Gallegly	Latham
Chrysler	Ganske	LaTourette
Clement	Gejdenson	Laughlin
Clinger	Gekas	Lazio
Clyburn	Gephardt	Leach
Coble	Geren	Levin
Coburn	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Coleman	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Collins (GA)	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Collins (IL)	Gilman	Lincoln
Combest	Goodlatte	Linder
Condit	Goodling	Lipinski
Cooley	Gordon	Livingston
Costello	Goss	LoBiondo
Cox	Graham	Lofgren
Coyne	Green	Longley
Cramer	Greenwood	Lowey

Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
Luther	Petri	Solomon
Manton	Pickett	Souder
Manzullo	Pombo	Spence
Markey	Pomeroy	Spratt
Martini	Porter	Stearns
Mascara	Portman	Stenholm
Matsui	Poshard	Stockman
McCarthy	Pryce	Studds
McCollum	Quillen	Stump
McCrery	Quinn	Stupak
McHale	Radanovich	Talent
McHugh	Rahall	Tanner
McInnis	Ramstad	Tate
McIntosh	Reed	Tauzin
McKeon	Regula	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Richardson	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Riggs	Tejeda
Meek	Rivers	Thompson
Menendez	Roberts	Thornberry
Metcalf	Roemer	Thornton
Meyers	Rogers	Thurman
Mica	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Miller (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Miller (FL)	Rose	Torres
Mineta	Roth	Torricelli
Minge	Roukema	Trafficant
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Molinari	Royce	Vento
Mollohan	Rush	Visclosky
Montgomery	Sabo	Vucanovich
Moorhead	Salmon	Walker
Myers	Sanders	Walsh
Myrick	Sanford	Wamp
Neal	Sawyer	Ward
Nethercutt	Saxton	Waters
Neumann	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Ney	Schaefer	Weldon (FL)
Norwood	Schiff	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Schroeder	Weller
Oberstar	Schumer	White
Obey	Scott	Whitfield
Olver	Seastrand	Wicker
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Williams
Orton	Shadegg	Wilson
Owens	Shaw	Wise
Oxley	Shays	Wolf
Packard	Shuster	Woolsey
Pallone	Skaggs	Wyden
Parker	Skeen	Wynn
Pastor	Skelton	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Payne (VA)	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Pelosi	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Peterson (FL)	Smith (TX)	Zimmer

NAYS—31

Berman	Gonzalez	Nadler
Boehler	Hastings (FL)	Rangel
Brewster	Houghton	Serrano
Clay	Hoyer	Stark
Clayton	King	Thomas
Collins (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Towns
Conyers	Martinez	Velazquez
DeLay	McDermott	Watt (NC)
Engel	Mfume	Waxman
Fattah	Moran	
Flake	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra	McKinney	Stokes
Dingell	Moakley	Tucker
Hayes	Morella	Volkmer
Jefferson	Paxon	Waldholtz
Maloney	Reynolds	
McDade	Sisisky	

□ 1215

Messrs. TOWNS, STARK, FLAKE, and MFUME changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I was in a meeting on the Senate side of the Capitol during rollcall vote No. 648 on the