Saxton

Schumer

Serrano

Sessions

Shadegg

Sherman

Shimkus

Shuster

Sisisky

Skaggs

Skeen Skelton

Slaughter

Smith (MI) Smith (NJ)

Smith (OR)

Smith (TX)

Smith, Adam

Smith, Linda

Snowbarger

Snyder

Souder

Spence

Spratt

Stabenow

Stenholm

Strickland

Stearns

Stokes

Stump Stupak

Sununu

Talent

Tanner

Tauscher

Tauzin Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)

Thomas Thompson

Thornberry

Thurman

Thune

Tiahrt

Tiernev

Torres

Towns

Turner

Upton

Vento

Walsh

Wamp

Weller

Wexler

White

Wicker

Woolsey

Young (AK)

Young (FL)

Wynn

Stark

Waters

Yates

Waxman

Wise

Wolf

Weygand

Whitfield

Watkins

Watt (NC)

Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)

Traficant

Velazquez

Visclosky

Solomon

Shaw

Shays

Schaefer, Dan

Sensenbrenner

McNulty

Meehan

Menendez

Millender-

Miller (FL)

McDonald

Metcalf

Meek

Mica

Minge

Molinari

Morella

Murtha

Myrick

Nethercutt

Neumann

Ney Northup

Norwood

Oberstar

Nussle

Obey

Olver

Ortiz

Owens

Oxley Packard

Pallone

Pappas

Parker

Pascrell

Pastor

Paul

Paxon

Pavne

Pease

Pelosi

Peterson (PA)

Pickering

Pickett

Pombo

Portman

Poshard

Quinn Řahall

Rangel

Regula

Reyes

Riggs

Riley

Rivers

Rogan

Rogers

Rothman

Roukema

Royce

Rush

Ryun

Sabo

Salmon

Sanchez

Sanders

Sandlin

Sanford

Sawyer

Rohrabacher Ros-Lehtinen

Roybal-Allard

Roemer

Ramstad

Price (NC)

Pryce (OH)

Neal

Moran (KS)

Moran (VA)

funds so that Federal health programs like Medicare or Medicaid may provide assistance to patients in efforts to end their lives.

My father passed away December 7, 1996. He suffered from diabetes, prostate cancer, and stomach ulcers. He did not go out of his way to prolong his life, yet he also did not go out of his way to artificially end his life. The fundamental belief that we should preserve life is one that people of all religious denominations can agree on. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" today on the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLI-LEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1003, as amend-

The question was taken.

Abercrombie

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 16, not voting 18, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 75] YEAS-398

# Chambliss

Fattah

Ackerman Chenoweth Fawell Aderholt Christensen Fazio Allen Clay Flake Clayton Andrews Foglietta Clement Archer Foley Armey Forbes Bachus Coble Ford Baesler Coburn Fowler Baker Collins Fox Baldacci Combest Franks (NJ) Barcia Condit Frelinghuysen Cook Barr Frost Barrett (NE) Cooksey Barrett (WI) Costello Gallegly Bartlett Ganske Cox Gejdenson Coyne Bass Cramer Gekas Bateman Gephardt Crane Crapo Gibbons Bentsen Bereuter Cubin Gilchrest Berman Cummings Gillmor Cunningham Gilman Bilbray Danner Gonzalez Davis (FL) Bilirakis Goode Bishop Davis (IL) Goodlatte Blagojevich Davis (VA) Goodling Bliley Deal Gordon Blumenauer DeFazio Goss Graham Delahunt Blunt Boehlert DeLauro Granger Boehner DeLay Green Deutsch Greenwood Bonilla Diaz-Balart Bonior Gutierrez Borski Dicks Gutknecht Boswell Dingell Hall (OH) Boucher Dixon Hall (TX) Boyd Doggett Hamilton Brady Dooley Hansen Brown (CA) Doyle Harman Brown (FL) Dreier Hastert Brown (OH) Hastings (FL) Duncan Hastings (WA) Dunn Edwards Bunning Havworth Ehlers Burr Hefley Herger Hill Burton Ehrlich Buver Emerson Hilleary Callahan Engel Calvert English Hilliard Camp Ensign Hinchey Campbell Eshoo Hinojosa Canady Etheridge Hobson Hoekstra Cannon Evans Holden Cardin Everett Castle Ewing Hooley Chabot

Farr

Horn

Hostettler Houghton Hulshof Hunter Hutchinson Hyde Inglis Istook Jackson-Lee (TX) Jefferson Jenkins John Johnson (CT) Johnson (WI) Johnson, E.B Johnson, Sam Jones Kanjorski Kaptur Kasich Kelly Kennelly Kildee Kim Kind (WI) King (NY) Kingston Kleczka

Kennedy (MA) Kennedy (RI) Klink Klug Knollenberg Kolbe Kucinich LaFalce LaHood Lampson Lantos Largent Latham LaTourette Lazio

Leach Levin Lewis (CA) Lewis (GA) Lewis (KY) Linder Lipinski Livingston LoBiondo Lofgren Lowey Lucas Luther Maloney (CT) Maloney (NY)

Manton Manzullo Markey Martinez Mascara Matsui McCarthy (MO) McCarthy (NY) McCollum

McCrery McDade McGovern McHale McHugh McInnis McIntosh McIntyre McKeon

Becerra Conyers DeGette Dellums Frank (MA)

Jackson (IL)

Ballenger

Bono

Capps

Carson

Dickey

Doolittle

Kilpatrick McDermott McKinney Miller (CA) Nadler Scott NOT VOTING-18

NAYS-16

Filner Hefner Moakley Mollohan Peterson (MN) Porter Radanovich Scarborough Schaffer, Bob Schiff Watts (OK)

## □ 1137

Ms. KILPATRICK. Ms. WATERS, Mr. California, MILLER of and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from 'yea'' to ''nay.

Mr. OLVEŘ changed his 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.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall vote No. 75, final passage of H.R. 1003, the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act. I was in my district attending the memorial service of Scott Williams, a guard at the Federal Penitentiary in Lompoc, CA, who was killed in the line of duty last week.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 1003.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I am writing to explain that on Thursday, April 10, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 75. If I was present, I certainly would have voted "aye" in support of H.R. 1003, the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 75, I was unavoidably detained and consequently missed the occasion to have my vote recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1003 and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the

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

There was no objection.

### REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE **PROGRAM**

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to seek guidance from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about the schedule for the remainder of the day and next week.

Mr. Speaker, Federal law requires that Congress complete its budget by next Tuesday, and we are all waiting to understand if we are going to meet that deadline. Also, it has been an unusual week that we have had here.

We have had bills that we considered only on suspension, but one of the most important bills on the schedule was pulled, and that bill was to eliminate mortgage insurance for the

American families. That bill was approved almost unanimously in a bipartisan vote in committee. We want to know why it was pulled from the floor and why it is not on the schedule next week.

So are we going to move to the budget? Law requires that we have a 15th of April deadline. What is the problem? And second, if that is not going to happen, we want to know why this mortgage interest bill was pulled.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will try as a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and I participated in working on that bill which passed 36 to 1 that was sponsored by a very distinguished Republican Member from Utah and, in the other body, by a Republican Senator from New York, and it was aimed at protecting consumers.

The SPEĂKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan

[Mr. BONIOR] has expired.

#### REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE **PROGRAM**

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the point I would make is this:

My understanding is that the majority has pulled this bill because we voted for a States rights amendment. The gentlewoman from California offered an amendment to this bill in committee that said it would not override State protections, that the Federal protection would be in existence, the State protections, and apparently the majority does not think we should respect the rights of States in this case, and apparently this bill was pulled because we have taken a position respective of the rights of the States to set policy.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the

gentleman yield? Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield

to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the other point that I think should be made is this would save literally hundreds of dollars a year for people in this coun-

Ís there a response from Republican colleagues about why we are not going to do the budget next week or if we are going to do the budget next week? Anybody from their leadership want to participate in this discussion?

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 900

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 900.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1997

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1997

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday April 14, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 15, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH **CALENDAR** WEDNESDAY BUSINESS WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### □ 1145

# SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7. 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern that the Pentagon appears, once again, to be prepared to avoid tough decisions. The ongoing Quadrennial Defense Review due to Congress on May 15 is supposed to be an all-inclusive examination of our national security needs. It has been described that way by every Defense Department official who has testified this year before the National Security Committee, on which I serve.

Although Secretary Cohen's personal involvement in the QDR process is commendable, it now appears results may be a lot less than we expected. Some Department officials are apparently ready to delay critical decisions about the defense agency's infrastruc-

ture and Reserve components because, we are told, these questions require

Yet, each of these areas is clearly in need of reform. Each offers the potential for substantial savings, each has already been studied in great detail over the past 2 years, and each is critical to how we structure our national security forces for the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon has an opportunity now to provide more effective, less costly defense. That is right. Better defense for less money. But boldness and willingness to make tough decisions are required to do that. Delaying recommendations on the agencies, the infrastructure, and the Reserves is neither tough nor bold; it represents business as usual and is an indication that the Department will, once again, be hostage to parochial interests while the public pays more for unneeded capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's forces will not win tomorrow's wars. And yesterday's funding may not be available either. DOD can and must do better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 5 min-

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. UPTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

### THE 18-MONTH PUBLICATION PRO-VISIONS CONTAINED IN H.R. 400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina COBLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution charges Congress with the responsibility of creating an incentive for inventors to share their inventions with society by granting a monopoly for a limited amount of time in which the inventor alone can prosper from the success of the invention.

Why was this incentive necessary? Because the Founding Fathers knew that our country would not achieve progress in science and the useful arts without effective disclosure of the inventions of our citizens. This straightforward point, which is integral to the understanding and promoting the beneficial patent changes set forth in H.R. 400, is regrettably lost on some of the critics of the bill.

Disclosure through publication provides many benefits. It allows other inventors to discover what inventions have already been applied for and encourages them to invest their time and