

chamber at the end of this Congress, they will have many, many works of legislative achievement to look back upon. For my money, this one will be the hallmark. They have made a lasting contribution to the well-beings of the children of this country and foster care this morning. And again, I thank them. And on behalf of the people of this country, I thank them for this good work.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wrap up this side of the aisle, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Also, I want to thank the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] for that statement. He has been there. He has lived it. He has done it. And I thank him very much for coming here today and telling us about it.

I also want to put on the RECORD the fact that Sister Josephine Murphy, director of St. Anne's Infant and Maternity Home in Hyattsville, MD, has been very, very helpful in bringing this piece of legislation forward. As the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] spoke from a permanent position, so did Sister Josephine tell us about her day-in, day-out work with children and the facts of the matter of one child is returned to an abusive home and how, in fact, that child knows how wrong that is and the suffering that is involved.

Mr. Speaker, our foster care system is an extremely valuable safety net, and I want to emphasize that. The foster care parents across this country are doing valuable service for children who cannot stay in their own birth homes, and I salute them and thank them.

What this bill is about really, though, is to have a child in a permanent home. And where that safety net is there in a foster care home, the child knows when the home is not permanent. When they go to school, they know that the home they are in is not a permanent home. And though they are glad to be there in the safety of that foster care home, what this bill does is bring forward a safe harbor, a place of permanency and love for this child.

We have to state that the number of children in foster care has almost doubled over the last 12 years; 276,000 12 years ago, now twice that amount. And more than 40 percent of foster children stay in the system for more than 2 years. And when a child is 3 years old, obviously that is much too much. This legislation attempts to reverse this trend by placing greater emphasis on finding adoptive parents for children in foster care.

The bill provides States with a financial incentive; \$4,000 a child, \$6,000 if it is a hard-to-place child. This legislation requires States to remove barriers to adoptions such as parental rights to children who will never return to their birth home.

This does not mean we intend to end our Nation's policy of keeping families together. What this legislation leaves

intact is a so-called reasonable effort requirement to help reunify families and reauthorize the preservation program for these families. But the bill does attempt to identify situations in which reunifying the family seems unwise or unlikely, such as when severe abuse is taking place.

Let me quote one more time the Washington Post, who summed it up best when it said the bill "puts a new and welcome emphasis on the children."

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are so many people who have been working on this legislation. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] mentioned Sister Josephine Murphy, whose personal experience that she shared with us in such a dynamic way both at a press conference immediately preceding this bill coming to the floor, as well as before the committee. We had so many wonderful witnesses give testimony as to what is happening out there and the tragedy of foster care as opposed to getting people into adoption.

I want to thank a few of the staff people, too: Casey Bevan, whose experience in this area has been invaluable to the committee. Deborah Colton, the chief of staff on the Democrat side of the subcommittee, has done a tremendous job of cooperation, as, of course, her boss, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] has done a tremendous job, for which I am deeply appreciative; and, of course, Ron Haskins, who is the chief of staff on the Republican side and the subcommittee. To all of them, all of my colleagues know that we cannot function with good legislation without competent staff. The competence has been tremendous in this regard, and we certainly appreciate it.

I want to close at this time, Mr. Speaker, in sharing with my colleagues an article that was in the Orlando Sentinel. I was in Orlando Monday night, spending the night, and Tuesday morning. The headline in one of the lead stories in the Orlando Sentinel was a colored picture of a baby who is designated as "Disney's darling." The reason she was is that she was found in the restroom in the Magic Kingdom, actually in a toilet, where the mother had left this poor child. They had to give the child CPR. But I am pleased to tell my colleagues that this child is doing well. She is loved by the care she is receiving now in the hospital. Her mother is unknown, as, of course, her father is, too. She has been named by the people at the hospital as Baby Jasmine.

I think the House should reflect a moment on the historic nature of what we are doing today. Baby Jasmine has a real good shot, in fact, I would say a probability at this point, partly because of this legislation, that Christmas of 1998 will find her with a real

family, her permanent family, a loving family in which she will celebrate the Christmas holidays. And that is a wonderful thing to look forward to for Baby Jasmine, as well as thousands of other kids.

So when we approach the holiday season next year, we will know that this vote, this legislation, has been responsible for placing so many of these kids in a permanent loving home.

□ 1115

I want to close with the words of a 3-year-old. I stated these words when the original bill came to the House floor, but I cannot think of any words that express the meaning of what we are doing today better than these words from a 3-year-old. In meeting her adoptive family, the first family that she had ever known in her 3 years, her first comment, standing in front of them with her hands on her hips, saying, "Where have you been?" "Where have you been?"

This bill is going to expedite this entire process and it is going to bring about the joy of adoption and the bonding of a real family to so many kids.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 327.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATION TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES TODAY

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 314, the following suspensions are expected to be considered today:

S. 738, Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997;

S. 562, Senior Citizen Home Equity Protection Act;

H.R. 3025, a bill to repeal the Federal charter of group hospitalization and medical services;

And the FDA reform bill.

PROVIDING FOR AN EXCEPTION FROM THE LIMITATION OF CLAUSE 6(d) OF RULE X FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 326 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 326

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on Government

Reform and Oversight may have not more than eight subcommittees for the duration of the One Hundred Fifth Congress, notwithstanding clause 6(d) of rule X.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for an exception from the limitation of clause 6(d) of House rule X to permit the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to temporarily establish an eighth subcommittee for the remainder of the 105th Congress.

When the House adopted the opening day rules package for the 104th Congress, it amended clause 6(d) of House rule X to require that no House committee shall have more than five subcommittees. As a result of this change, the number of subcommittees of standing committees fell from 118 in the 103d Congress to 84 in the 104th Congress.

However, the rule made an exception for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The panel was authorized by the rule to have no more than seven subcommittees. The committee was granted the exception because it absorbed the functions of two standing committees, the District of Columbia Committee and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which the House also abolished as part of the opening day package of reforms.

The issues which were consolidated in the government reform panel are important, complex, and often contentious. This is particularly so with respect to the Census Bureau's plans for conducting the year 2000 decennial census. It is an issue that is so complex and contentious that it has held up passage of the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill until the very last day of this session.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight believes that the type of oversight that is needed over issues such as sampling, questionnaire content, and continuous measurement cannot be done effectively by the full committee or by its other subcommittees. Thus, the resolution will allow the committee to establish an eighth subcommittee to accommodate the need for extensive oversight over the census.

I share the concerns of some in the minority that we resist the temptation to expand the number of subcommittees in the House. Some will suggest that oversight of the census can be achieved by transferring that responsibility to another subcommittee, or by consolidating subcommittees to make

room for a census subcommittee under the existing limit.

As I mentioned, the committee feels that effective oversight cannot be conducted under the existing subcommittee structure, and I am inclined to give the committee the benefit of the doubt.

But to protect against a permanent expansion of the committee bureaucracy, this resolution does not change the limitations of clause 6(d) of rule X. It simply provides for what will essentially be a 1-year exception for the purposes I just outlined.

I also believe that, irrespective of this temporary exemption, additional subcommittee downsizing is achievable, and that it would facilitate more integrated approaches to policymaking and oversight.

Further, it is my hope that the expenses needed to establish this temporary new subcommittee will, to the extent possible, be derived from the existing resources of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Given the unique nature of the request for this additional subcommittee and the safeguards against a permanent increase in committee bureaucracy, I urge the adoption of this rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the 103d Congress, as the chair of the Democratic caucus committee on oversight, study, and review, I was responsible for drafting the Democratic caucus rules that implemented most of the current limitations on the number of subcommittees that any committee may have. While working on this issue, I had the opportunity to review the history of the House on the issue of the number of committees and subcommittees. I found that in each major reorganization, the number of committees and subcommittees was reduced. However, in each case soon thereafter the number of each began to creep upward again. Therefore, it is of little surprise to me that the majority is beginning to retreat from its self-proclaimed reforms. What I do find surprising is that they are making this exception with so little thought and displaying a notable lack of planning and foresight.

At last night's Committee on Rules meeting, only the chair of the subcommittee that currently has oversight over the census testified. He was unable to tell us how much the additional subcommittee would cost. He was unable to tell us where the extra funds would come from. He was unable to tell us why the committee chose not to reorganize their seven subcommittees so that the subcommittee with the census would have fewer other areas of jurisdiction. He did not tell us why the committee's leadership when organizing the subcommittee for this Congress did not take into account the increased activity on the census. The decennial

census does not take any of us by surprise. As my friends in the majority often remind us, the census is mandated in article I, section 2 of the Constitution. Did the committee leadership forget the census was coming up in the year 2000 when it organized? Or do we have a multitude of new issues regarding the conduct of the census?

Mr. Speaker, I testified at a 1989 hearing on the census. My testimony centered on the problems of the census undercount and its implications for a representative government such as ours. And what was the controversial topic at that time? This is 1989. Whether sampling should be used to correct the undercount.

Mr. Speaker, as Members can see, these issues, while very important, are neither new nor unable to be anticipated when the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight organized earlier this year. Perhaps the committee is forming an eighth subcommittee to request more resources from the House. If this were the case, one would hope that they would at least know how much they would need. But last night's testimony was that they did not know. We should remember that this committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, already has the largest budget and the largest staff of any of the committees funded through the legislative appropriations bill. Surely within its more than \$20 million budget, which is an increase of 47 percent over the 104th Congress, and within its more than 134 employees, it could simply reallocate resources to the effort. But, no, we are told that we must make an exemption from the subcommittee limitation rule for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, a committee that already has two more subcommittees than most legislative committees. As the Member who for 4 years had the responsibility of reviewing changes in caucus and House rules, I know that sometimes flexibility is required. Exceptional, unforeseen circumstances can and do occur. However, this proposal does not meet any of the criteria that might warrant a rules exception. The census was clearly foreseeable. The committee has both the ability and the resources to reallocate jurisdiction among its current seven subcommittees to adjust for the increasing census workload. A proposal worthy of a change in House rules would include a proposed budget and staffing needs. From testimony at the Rules hearing last night, this proposed change has not been thought out even as to those basic, minimal requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this rules change itself is not that important. However, it does reveal the propensity shown by this supposedly conservative majority to simply change the House rules or, for that matter, the U.S. Constitution for convenience or for politics. A true conservative would join me in demanding a rigorous analysis of the need to change either. Certainly this proposal

does not meet that test. I ask my colleagues to reject this hasty, ill-conceived exemption from the House rules.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. If it is defeated, I will offer an amendment to guarantee the House a separate vote on additional funding to what already is the most expensive committee in this House. I ask that the amendment be printed immediately before the vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to live up to their promises of accountability. Do not tap the slush fund. Vote "no" on the previous question so that the House will vote on additional funding.

Mr. Speaker, I include material on ordering the previous question, as follows:

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote.

A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan.

It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

The text of the proposed amendment is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 326—AMENDING CLAUSE 6(D), RULE X—ADDING AN 8TH SUBCOMMITTEE

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

"Sec. . Any funding provided pursuant to this resolution must be approved by the House."

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 867, the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 because I believe it can improve the lives of many children who find themselves in foster care. Congresswoman BARBARA KENNEDY and Congressman DAVID CAMP deserves our thanks for pulling together a bill that enjoys broad bipartisan support—and for negotiating a good compromise with our Senate colleagues.

H.R. 867 makes commonsense improvements in our child welfare and foster care laws. It makes clear that, in making a reasonable efforts to reunify a family, the child's is paramount. It reauthorizes the capped entitlement funds that we have set aside to preserve and reunify families and promote adoption. It extends health insurance to those children with special needs who cannot be adopted without such coverage. And, it creates an incentive system that will reward those States that increase the number of children who are adopted out of foster care. These are all good reforms, and long overdue.

H.R. 867 may have an even more dramatic effect on the lives of children in foster care. Its success depends, in large measure, on how the States implement the provisions of this new law. It can reduce the number of children in foster care if State's take seriously our instruction to begin proceedings to terminate parental rights sooner under certain circumstances. But, handled the wrong way, this

new requirement could just as easily spell disaster.

If the end result of this requirement is to flood the courts with requests to terminate parental rights, we will have done little to help these children. And, if States make excessive use of their authority to ignore these requirements when there is a compelling reason to do so, little will have been accomplished. A delicate balancing act is required, for each and every child, to make certain that we have done all that we can to assure that these children have the happiest, healthiest home environment possible.

Let me also comment on the provision of the bill that addresses adoption of children across State lines. The folklore would have it that States hold on to children who could otherwise be adopted out of State because they don't want to give up the Federal foster care payment. More likely, they fear that they cannot adequately monitor these placements. Whatever, the reason, this bill makes clear that geographically alone should not be a barrier to adoptive placement.

This provision deliberately does not mirror the language of the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act—which calls for States to follow a first come, first served approach to adoptions, turning a blind eye to race and ethnicity. My views on that act are clear. Our paramount concern should be what is best for the child, not what is best for the adults who may be waiting to adopt that child.

H.R. 867 makes clear that we are not applying this shortsighted, first come, first served approach to adoptive placements across State lines. We leave in the hands of the professionals decisions about what the best placement is for the child and instruct States to take steps to eliminate any arbitrary barriers to adoption across State lines. This, in my view, is a far more responsible, and practical approach that was taken in the Multi Ethnic Placement Act.

Mr. Speaker, more than half a million of our children are in foster care today, twice as many as were in care in the mid 1980's. With a little support from us, most of these children will return home. For those that cannot, the adoption provisions of H.R. 867 can make a difference. A happy, healthy permanent home is our goal—for every one of these children.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 194, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gibbons	Packard
Archer	Gilchrest	Pappas
Armey	Gillmor	Parker
Bachus	Gilman	Paul
Baker	Goodlatte	Paxon
Ballenger	Goodling	Pease
Barr	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Petri
Bartlett	Granger	Pickering
Barton	Greenwood	Pitts
Bass	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Quinn
Bliley	Hefley	Radanovich
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hill	Redmond
Boehner	Hilleary	Regula
Bonilla	Hobson	Rogan
Bono	Hoekstra	Rogers
Brady	Horn	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hulshof	Roukema
Burr	Hunter	Royce
Burton	Hutchinson	Ryun
Buyer	Hyde	Salmon
Callahan	Inglis	Sanford
Calvert	Istook	Saxton
Camp	Jenkins	Scarborough
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer, Bob
Cannon	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kasich	Sessions
Chabot	Kelly	Shadegg
Chambliss	Kim	Shaw
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shays
Christensen	Kingston	Shimkus
Coble	Klug	Shuster
Coburn	Knollenberg	Skeen
Collins	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cox	Latham	Smith, Linda
Crane	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Crapo	Lazio	Solomon
Cunningham	Leach	Souder
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
DeLay	Linder	Stump
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Sununu
Dickey	LoBiondo	Talent
Doolittle	Lucas	Tauzin
Dreier	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McCollum	Thomas
Dunn	McCrery	Thornberry
Ehlers	McDade	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Tiahrt
Emerson	McInnis	Trafigant
English	McIntosh	Upton
Ensign	McKeon	Walsh
Everett	Metcalf	Wamp
Ewing	Mica	Watkins
Fawell	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Morella	Weldon (PA)
Fossella	Myrick	Weller
Fowler	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Fox	Neumann	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Norwood	Young (FL)
Ganske	Nussle	
Gekas	Oxley	

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Borski	Coyne
Ackerman	Boswell	Cramer
Allen	Boucher	Cummings
Andrews	Boyd	Danner
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Davis (FL)
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Barcia	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	DeGette
Becerra	Carson	Delahunt
Bentsen	Clay	DeLauro
Berman	Clayton	Dellums
Berry	Clement	Deutsch
Bishop	Clyburn	Dicks
Blagojevich	Condit	Dingell
Blumenauer	Conyers	Dixon
Bonior	Costello	Doggett

Dooley LaFalce Rangel Bass Granger Paul Jackson (IL) Meehan Sawyer
 Doyle Lampson Reyes Bateman Greenwood Jackson-Lee Meek Schumer
 Edwards Lantos Rivers Bereuter Gutknecht Paxton Jackson-Lee Menendez Serrano
 Engel Levin Rodriguez Bilbray Hansen Peterson (PA) Jefferson Miller (CA) Sherman
 Eshoo Lewis (GA) Roemer Bilirakis Hastert Petri John Minge Sisisky
 Etheridge Lipinski Rothman Bileley Hastings (WA) Pickering Johnson (WI) Moakley Skaggs
 Evans Lofgren Roybal-Allard Blunt Hayworth Pitts Kanjorski Mollohan Skelton
 Farr Lowey Rush Boehlert Hefley Pombo Kaptur Moran (VA) Slaughter
 Fattah Luther Sabo Boehner Herger Porter Kennedy (MA) Murtha Smith, Adam
 Fazio Maloney (CT) Sanchez Bonilla Hill Portman Kennedy (RI) Nadler
 Filner Maloney (NY) Sanders Bono Hillery Pryce (OH) Kennelly Neal Spratt
 Ford Manton Sandlin Brady Hobson Quinn Radanovich Kilpatrick Oberstar Stabenow
 Frank (MA) Markey Sawyer Bryant Hoekstra Ramstad Kind (WI) Olver Stenholm
 Frost Martinez Schumer Bunning Horn Redmond Kleczka Ortiz Stokes
 Furse Mascara Serrano Burr Hostettler Strickland Regula Owens Stupak
 Gejdenson McCarthy (MO) Sherman Burton Hulshof Klink Kucinich Pallone Tanner
 Goode McCarthy (NY) Sisisky Hunter Riggs Rogan LaFalce Pascrell Tauscher
 Gordon McDermott Skaggs Calvert Hutchinson Rogers Royce Taylor (MS)
 Green McGovern Skelton Camp Hyde Johnson, Sam Ryun Salmon Sanford Price (NC)
 Gutierrez McHale Slaughter Campbell Inglis Istook Ros-Lehtinen Pelosi Peterson (MN)
 Hall (OH) McIntyre Smith, Adam Canady Istook Roukema Pickett Pomeroy
 Hall (TX) McKinney Snyder Cannon Johnson (CT) Royce Ryn Salomon Maloney (CT) Rahall
 Hamilton McNulty Spratt Castle Chabot Johnson, Sam Ryun Salomon Maloney (NY) Rangel
 Harman Meehan Stabenow Chabot Johnson, Sam Ryun Salomon Maloney (NY) Rangel
 Hastings (FL) Meek Stenholm Chambliss Jones Sanford Price (NC) Rahall
 Hefner Menendez Stokes Chenoweth Christensen Coble King (NY) Schaefer, Dan
 Hilliard Miller (CA) Strickland Kelly Saxton Scarborough Schaffer, Bob
 Hinchey Minge Stupak Tanner Coburn Kingston Klug Knollenberg Sessions
 Hinojosa Moakley Tanner Coburn Kingston Klug Knollenberg Sessions
 Holden Mollohan Tauscher Collins Cook Cooksey Cox Kolbe LaHood Large
 Hooley Moran (VA) Taylor (MS) Thompson Cooksey Cox Kolbe LaHood Large
 Hoyer Murtha Thurman Cox Kolbe LaHood Large Latham LaTourette
 Jackson (IL) Nadler Thurman Cox Kolbe LaHood Large Latham LaTourette
 Jackson-Lee Neal Tierney Torres Cunnigham Davis (VA) Deal Lazio
 (TX) Oberstar Tierney Torres Cunnigham Davis (VA) Deal Lazio
 Jefferson Obey Towns Linder Livingstone LoBiondo Lucas Souder
 John Olver Turner Velazquez Deal Lazio Leach Lewis (CA) Lewis (KY)
 Johnson (WI) Ortiz Owens Smith, Linda Snowbarger Solomon Spence
 Kanjorski Owens Smith, Linda Snowbarger Solomon Spence Stearns
 Kaptur Pallone Waters Doolittle Duncan Dunn Ehlrs Ehrlich Emerson
 Kennedy (MA) Pascrell Watt (NC) Waxman Wexler Weygand Wise Woolsey
 Kennedy (RI) Pastor Payne Peterson (MN) Pickett Pomeroy Poshard Price (NC)
 Kennelly Peterson (MN) Pickett Pomeroy Poshard Price (NC) Rahall
 Kildee Peterson (MN) Pickett Pomeroy Poshard Price (NC) Rahall
 Kilpatrick Pickett Pomeroy Poshard Price (NC) Rahall
 Kind (WI) Pomeroy Poshard Price (NC) Rahall
 Kleczka Poshard Price (NC) Rahall
 Klink Price (NC) Rahall
 Kucinich Rahall

NOT VOTING—18

Combest Matsui Schiff
 Cubin Millender-Scott
 Flake McDonald Smith (OR)
 Gephardt Mink Stark
 Gonzalez Pelosi White
 Houghton Riggs
 Johnson, E. B. Riley

□ 1147

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that this will be a 15-minute vote, and, without objection, the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 327 will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 195, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

AYES—219

Aderholt Bachus Barr
 Archer Baker Barrett (NE)
 Army Ballenger Barton

Bass Granger Paul Jackson (IL) Meehan Sawyer
 Bateman Greenwood Jackson-Lee Meek Schumer
 Bereuter Gutknecht Paxton Jackson-Lee Menendez Serrano
 Bilbray Hansen Peterson (PA) Jefferson Miller (CA) Sherman
 Bilirakis Hastert Petri John Minge Sisisky
 Bileley Hastings (WA) Pickering Johnson (WI) Moakley Skaggs
 Blunt Hayworth Pitts Kanjorski Mollohan Skelton
 Boehlert Hefley Pombo Kaptur Moran (VA) Slaughter
 Boehner Herger Porter Kennedy (MA) Murtha Smith, Adam
 Bonilla Hill Portman Kennedy (RI) Nadler
 Bono Hillery Pryce (OH) Kennelly Neal Spratt
 Brady Hobson Quinn Radanovich Kilpatrick Oberstar Stabenow
 Bryant Hoekstra Ramstad Kind (WI) Olver Stenholm
 Bunning Horn Redmond Kleczka Ortiz Stokes
 Burr Hostettler Strickland Regula Owens Stupak
 Burton Hulshof Klink Kucinich Pallone Tanner
 Callahan Hunter Riggs Rogan LaFalce Pascrell Tauscher
 Calvert Hutchinson Rogers Royce Taylor (MS)
 Camp Hyde Johnson, Sam Ryun Salmon Sanford Price (NC)
 Campbell Inglis Istook Ros-Lehtinen Pelosi Peterson (MN)
 Canady Istook Roukema Pickett Pomeroy
 Cannon Johnson (CT) Royce Ryn Salomon Maloney (CT) Rahall
 Castle Chabot Johnson, Sam Ryun Salomon Maloney (NY) Rangel
 Chabot Johnson, Sam Ryun Salomon Maloney (NY) Rangel
 Chambliss Jones Sanford Price (NC) Rahall
 Chenoweth Christensen Coble King (NY) Schaefer, Dan
 Christensen Kelly Saxton Scarborough Schaffer, Bob
 Coble King (NY) Schaefer, Dan
 Collins Kingston Klug Knollenberg Sessions
 Cook Cooksey Cox Kolbe LaHood Large
 Cooksey Cox Kolbe LaHood Large Latham LaTourette
 Cox Kolbe LaHood Large Latham LaTourette
 Crane LaHood Large Latham LaTourette
 Crapo Cunnigham Davis (VA) Deal Lazio
 Cunnigham Davis (VA) Deal Lazio
 Davis (VA) Deal Lazio
 Deal Lazio
 DeLay Diaz-Balart
 Diaz-Balart
 Doolittle Duncan Dunn Ehlrs Ehrlich Emerson
 Duncan Dunn Ehlrs Ehrlich Emerson
 Dunn Ehlrs Ehrlich Emerson
 Ehlrs Ehrlich Emerson
 Emerson
 Ensigh
 Everett
 Ewing
 Fawell
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fossella
 Fowler
 Fox
 Franks (NJ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Ganske
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Goss
 Graham

NOES—195

Abercrombie Clement Etheridge
 Ackerman Clyburn Evans
 Allen Condit Farr
 Andrews Conyers Fattah
 Baesler Costello Fazio
 Baldacci Coyne Filner
 Barcia Cramer Ford
 Barrett (WI) Cummings Frank (MA)
 Becerra Danner Frost
 Bentsen Davis (FL) Furse
 Berman Davis (IL) Gejdenson
 Berry DeFazio Goode
 Bishop DeGette Gordon
 Blagojevich Delahunt Green
 Blumenauer DeLauro Gutierrez
 Bonior Dellums Hall (OH)
 Borski Deutsch Hall (TX)
 Boswell Dicks Hamilton
 Boucher Dingell Harman
 Boyd Dixon Hastings (FL)
 Brown (CA) Doggett Hefner
 Brown (FL) Dooley Hilliard
 Brown (OH) Doyle Hinchey
 Cardin Dreier Hinojosa
 Carson Edwards Holden
 Clay Engel Hooley
 Clayton Eshoo Hoyer

Jackson (IL) Meehan Sawyer
 Jackson-Lee Meek Schumer
 (TX) Menendez Serrano
 Jefferson Miller (CA) Sherman
 John Minge Sisisky
 Johnson (WI) Moakley Skaggs
 Kanjorski Mollohan Skelton
 Kaptur Moran (VA) Slaughter
 Kennedy (MA) Murtha Smith, Adam
 Kennedy (RI) Nadler
 Kennelly Neal Spratt
 Kildee Oberstar Stabenow
 Kilpatrick Obey Stenholm
 Kind (WI) Olver Stokes
 Kleczka Ortiz Strickland
 Klink Owens Stupak
 Kucinich Pallone Tanner
 LaFalce Pascrell Tauscher
 Lampson Pastor Taylor (MS)
 Lantos Payne Thompson
 Levin Pelosi Thurman
 Lewis (GA) Peterson (MN)
 Lipinski Pickett Tierney
 Lofgren Pomeroy Torres
 Lowey Poshard Towns
 Luther Price (NC) Turner
 Maloney (CT) Rahall Velazquez
 Maloney (NY) Rangel Vento
 Mantou Reyes Visclosky
 Markey Rivers Waters
 Martinez Rodriguez Watt (NC)
 Mascara Roemer Waxman
 McCarthy (MO) Rothman Wexler
 McCarthy (NY) Roybal-Allard Weygand
 McDermott Rush Wise
 McGovern Sabo Woolsey
 McIntyre Sanchez Wynn
 McKinney Sanders Yates
 McNulty Sandlin

NOT VOTING—18

Bartlett Houghton Schiff
 Buyer Johnson, E. B. Scott
 Combest Matsui Smith (OR)
 Cubin Millender- Stark
 Flake McDonald White
 Gephardt Mink
 Gonzalez Riley

□ 1205

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2977, an act to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to clarify public disclosure requirements that are applicable to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 927. An act to reauthorize the Sea Grant Program; and

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Prince Nova*, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) laid before the House the following resignation as a member