

Smith, Adam	Tauscher	Watkins	[Roll No. 618]	Whitfield	Wise	Young (AK)
Smith, Linda	Tauzin	Watt (NC)		Wicker	Wolf	Young (FL)
Snowbarger	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)	YEAS—291		NAYS—125	
Snyder	Thomas	Weldon (FL)	Gekas	Northrup		
Solomon	Thompson	Weldon (PA)	Gephardt	Norwood	Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)
Souder	Thornberry	Weller	Gibbons	Nussle	Ackerman	Hilliard
Spence	Thune	Weygand	Gilchrest	Olver	Andrews	Jackson (IL)
Spratt	Thurman	White	Gilman	Ortiz	Barrett (WI)	Jackson-Lee
Stabenow	Tiahrt	Whitfield	Gingrich	Oxley	Becerra	(TX)
Stearns	Wicker	Wick	Goode	Packard	Berman	Jefferson
Stenholm	Torres	Wise	Goodlatte	Pappas	Blagojevich	Johnson, E. B.
Stokes	Trafigant	Wolf	Goodling	Parker	Boehlert	Kaptur
Stump	Turner	Woolsey	Gordon	Pastor	Bonior	Kennedy (RI)
Sununu	Velazquez	Wynn	Goss	Paxon	Borski	Kildee
Talent	Visclosky	Young (AK)	Graham	Pease	Brown (FL)	Kilpatrick
Tanner	Wamp	Young (FL)	Granger	Peterson (MN)	Brown (OH)	Klecza
			Green	Peterson (PA)	Campbell	Kucinich
			Greenwood	Petri	Carson	Lantos
			Gutknecht	Pickering	Clay	Levin
			Hall (OH)	Pickett	Conyers	Lewis (GA)
			Hall (TX)	Pitts	Cummings	Lipinski
			Hamilton	Pombo	Danner	Lofgren
			Hansen	Pomeroy	Davis (FL)	Lowey
			Hastert	Porter	Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)
			Biiley	Portman	DeFazio	Manton
			Hayworth	Poshard	DeGette	Markey
			Hefley	Price (NC)	DeLauro	Martinez
			Hefner	Pryce (OH)	Dellums	Matsui
			Herger	Radanovich	Deutsch	McCarthy (MO)
			Hill	Rahall	McGovern	McGuire
			Hilleary	Ramstad	Dicks	McHale
			Hinchey	Redmond	Dingell	McKinney
			Hinojosa	Regula	Dixon	McNulty
			Hobson	Reyes	Doggett	Meehan
			Hoekstra	Riggs	Engel	Meek
			Holden	Rodriguez	Eshoo	Menendez
			Hooley	Rogan	Fattah	Millender
			Horn	Rogers	Fazio	McDonald
			Hostettler	Rohrabacher	Filner	Miller (CA)
			Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen	Flake	Mink
			Hoyer	Roukema	Forbes	Moakley
			Hulshof	Ryun	Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)
			Canady	Salmon	Franks (NJ)	Murtha
			Cannon	Sandlin	Furse	Nadler
			Cardin	Saxton	Gejdenson	Neal
			Castle	Schaefer, Dan	Gutierrez	Oberstar
			Chabot	Schaffer, Bob	Harman	Obey
			Chambliss	Sensenbrenner		
			Chenoweth	Sessions		
			Christensen	Shadeegg		
			Clayton	Shaw		
			Clement	Shimkus		
			Clyburn	Shuster		
			Coble	Sisisky		
			Coburn	Skeen		
			Collins	Skelton		
			Combest	Smith (MI)		
			Condit	Smith (NJ)		
			Cook	Smith (OR)		
			Cooksey	Smith (TX)		
			Costello	Smith, Adam		
			Cox	Smith, Linda		
			Coyne	Snowbarger		
			Cramer	Solomon		
			Crane	Souder		
			Crapo	Spence		
			Cunningham	Spratt		
			Davis (VA)	Stabenow		
			Deal	Stearns		
			DeLay	Stenholm		
			Diaz-Balart	Stump		
			Dickey	Stupak		
			Dooley	Sununu		
			Doolittle	Talent		
			Doyle	Tanner		
			Dreier	Tauscher		
			Duncan	Tauzin		
			Dunn	Taylor (MS)		
			Edwards	Thomas		
			Ehlers	Thompson		
			Ehrlich	Thornberry		
			Emerson	Thune		
			English	Thurman		
			Ensign	Tiahrt		
			Etheridge	Trafigant		
			Evans	Turner		
			Everett	Upton		
			Ewing	Wamp		
			Farr	Watkins		
			Fawell	Watts (OK)		
			Foley	Weldon (FL)		
			Ford	Weldon (PA)		
			Fossella	Weller		
			Fowler	White		
			Fox			
			Frelinghuysen			
			Frost			
			Gallegly			
			Ganske			

NAYS—64

Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Boswell
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Carson
Chabot
Conyers
Davis (FL)
DeGette
Deutsch
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Engel
Ensign
Ewing
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske

Greenwood
Harman
Johnson (WI)
Kind (WI)
LaHood
Leach
Luther
Markley
McCarthy (MO)
McKinney
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Minge
Nussle
Owens
Petri
Poshard
Ramstad
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema

Roybal-Allard
Royer
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Towns
Upton
Vento
Waters
Waxman
Wexler

NOT VOTING—18

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Cubin
Foglietta
Gillmor
Gonzalez

Kennedy (MA)
Klug
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

Quinn
Riley
Schiff
Taylor (NC)
Walsh
Yates

□ 1525

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Messrs. ROTHMAN, EWING, DICKEY, MARKEY, STUPAK, WAXMAN, and RUSH Rush changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BRADY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 125, not voting 18, as follows:

NOT VOTING—18

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Cubin
Foglietta
Gillmor
Gonzalez

Kennedy (MA)
Klug
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

Quinn
Riley
Schiff
Taylor (NC)
Walsh
Yates

□ 1540

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GREEN and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1150), to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], is

this on the bill we just passed? I voted for the bill that we just passed. But there is a lot of concern, as my colleague knows. And I presume we are going to conference on this bill.

Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. How did he vote?

Mr. HOYER. I voted "aye" on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Good.

Mr. HOYER. I know the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] thinks that is good. The chairman or the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations does not think it is good. The reason he does not think it is good is because we on the Committee on Appropriations are concerned that there is already a done deal and the Committee on Appropriations is going to be in a bad strait as a result.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] that there has been no negotiation with the Senate, the other body. There has been not one word from me or anyone in the House or on the Committee on Agriculture or by the staff. We have been awaiting the passage of a clean bill, which all should support. We have heard the questions raised from some as we debated the bill.

I understand the issues. Both parties will be, of course, represented in the conference. And I understand the concern of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Under those circumstances, I will not object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], to ask a couple of questions with regard to the conference that the committee would have on this bill.

The question I have is, if we are going to conference, my understanding is there is a large difference between the Senate version and the House version in one critical respect, that the Senate version extracts \$1.2 billion in savings from food stamp programs through administrative accounts, and my understanding from the Senate bill is that none of that money was put back into food stamps.

On this side, some of my colleagues are concerned that none of the money, that \$1.2 billion, will be used to restore food stamp programs, \$27½ billion that was cut last year.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is correct, the House bill is an authorization of \$2.8 billion to various States regarding agricultural research, which has come unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture.

□ 1545

The Senate bill has an additional \$1.25 billion, and frankly I am not exactly sure how they want to distribute it. But I have heard, as I mentioned, from many people, including the gentleman from California, regarding his concern. He will have representatives on the conference committee. So will we. To try to suggest to him what will be finally decided by the conference committee, I cannot. All I can say to the gentleman is if this bill does not pass and the gentleman objects, then he has no possibility of gaining anything that he wants out of the conference committee.

Mr. BECERRA. Reclaiming my time, my understanding is we are operating under martial law which allows any bill to come to the floor under a unanimous-consent request. Most of us who opposed the bill right now on suspension are not opposed to this House bill. What we are opposed to is the preconferring that we are aware of that has already been undertaken on this bill with the Senate which did not include funding for food stamps, at least not to any measurable degree. The concern on the part of a number of us is that the \$1.2 billion that will be taken out of food stamps will not be used to any measurable degree to go back to food stamps. Otherwise, I think he would find that virtually with a unanimous vote, this bill would go through if there were some assurance that there would be money invested in food stamps to restore some of the \$27.5 billion that we cut from food stamps last year.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sorry the gentleman missed the debate. He could have responded in exactly that way instead of at this late date. But let me say to the gentleman as I have responded to the gentleman from Maryland, there has been no preconferring of this bill. Beyond that, it is very difficult for me to predict what will occur in a conference committee. I can tell the gentleman that his side will be represented and I have heard his concerns. I reiterate. If the gentleman does not allow this bill to pass, he will have no chance to increase funding for his concerns at all. If he allows this bill to go forward, he will have a chance in the conference, and if he does not like it, he merely defeats the conference report.

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

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I voted for the bill but I also support the cause for I know why

125 did not. I voted for the bill because nothing in the bill itself says it is going to take any of that money to use it in any way. But because people have the lack of trust in the conferencing process, they are now expressing their will now. Not because of the bill. I guess if the chairman and the ranking member could assure that in that process that those moneys that have been allocated to food, \$1.2 billion, would not be deviated or given to other things, I think that kind of advocacy or opportunity for advocacy would reassure people here that what is now clean would later become convoluted and taking away much needed resources from people who need it who are hungry.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, just as I have not preconference with the Senate nor do I want to preconference with this body, the point is that I have listened, as has the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture who no doubt will be on the conference committee. We understand the gentleman's concerns and we will take them to the conference.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to arbitrarily cut this off, but at the same time I do not want the House to engage in needless conversation when this proposition is going to be objected to, and I am going to object. The fact is that we have been told by a lobbyist on good authority that he has already been told what number he is going to get under the conference agreement. It seems to me that there may not have been a preconference, but it appears to me that there is a pretty good idea of what is likely to happen once that conference takes place.

I do not want this House to be in a position where Members, regardless of which side of the issue they are on, find the committee coming back in the dead of night with a done deal and having this bill pass with virtually nobody on the floor.

To try to help save Members from that, I do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Objection is heard.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

(Mr. SMITH of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I think the point is here, and I can speak for the gentleman from Texas, neither he nor I have discussed, or pre-conferenced this bill with the Senate or with any lobbyist.

The gentleman has on his shoulders now the rejection of \$2.8 billion of research to agriculture throughout the