

money in large chunks to the Republican Party?

Madam Speaker, that is why we need campaign finance reform. That is why we are having to debate this issue on a bill dealing with the Coast Guard, because the Republican leadership in either House will not allow this debate to take place.

I find it rather interesting that the same people who were in the meeting talking about setting the agenda to raise campaign money for Republican Senators were the same Senators who engineered the defeat of the McCain-Feingold bill, a bipartisan bill to reform this system. These same leaders in the Senate engineered the defeat of that legislation over the last 2 weeks.

Madam Speaker, we are here to tell our colleagues that campaign finance reform is not dead either in the House or in the Senate. We are going to continue to pursue the Republican majority in the House and in the Senate to give us a vote, to give us the debate on this issue.

If necessary, we will resort to a discharge petition. We will have to force them. We will have to get a bipartisan coalition in this House, 218 signatures to force this leadership to give us a debate. What we are asking for is a debate and a vote on campaign finance reform.

That is what the House of Representatives is supposed to be about. That is what the Congress is supposed to be about. It is about the people's House. The people have spoken now in opinion poll after opinion poll. They are disgusted. They are disgusted with the way that elections are financed in this country. They are disgusted with the fact that now soft money means access. It not only means access to the White House; it means access to committee chairmen who are making multibillion dollar decisions about telecommunications, about energy deregulation, about clear air, about global warming. It is all about access. And if a contributor can write a \$100,000 check, they can get it and the rest of the American public cannot.

Madam Speaker, that is why we are forced to debate this, but we are not going to let the people who engineer on one day the death of campaign finance reform and then run downtown to the Republican headquarters and talk about using the people's legislative body as a fundraising tool. We thought it was bad enough the other day when the Republicans sent out a letter and said for \$10,000 a contributor could have lunch, breakfast, or dinner with the 10 most important Senators who are interested in meeting for \$10,000. It is more than about ham and eggs. It is about the legislative agenda. Now they have gone from sending out letters to designing the legislative agenda for the purposes of fundraising.

Madam Speaker, I thought that if making a phone call is a problem, what about designing an entire agenda and using the Senate of the United States

for the purposes of raising money and doing it with forethought? That is why we need campaign finance reform.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The Chair must caution the Member against improper references to the Senate or its members.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, if my time has not expired, the problem is when I look at the polling numbers, if I said "the Senate majority leader" no one in the country knows who I am talking about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must refrain from such references.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we have brought to the floor a rule that is completely open, that permits all amendments. While we were in the minority it was very rare to get the majority, then the Democrats, to permit an open rule so that all amendments could be introduced, on a subject, by the way, as important as the Coast Guard, where the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], ranking member of the Committee on Rules, admitted that that function is a primary function of national security and law enforcement.

So, Madam Speaker, we come to the floor today with a totally open rule to permit any and all amendments from any Member of this House on a subject as critical to the national security of the United States as the authorization of the Coast Guard and what are we confronted with? We are confronted with what we just heard. No one could ever accuse the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] of lack of imagination, because even on a bill as necessary to the national security as this one, even on a rule totally open, which permits amendment by any Member of this House, we have heard what we have heard today on an issue that has nothing to do with the Coast Guard.

Madam Speaker, I remind all our distinguished Members that we are debating an open rule to authorize that critically important organism of this country, institution of this country, which is the Coast Guard. That is what we are on today, Madam Speaker. I do not want to get confused. We are not going to let ourselves get confused by these arguments which seek to confuse, apparently, people who are not Members of this House and they will not get confused either. We are bringing an open rule permitting all debate on this critically important piece of legislation to this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I am going to make reference to the pre-

vious speaker, the gentleman from California, saying that the leadership of both Houses of Congress are discussing at this time anything else, discussing the issue of campaign finance reform when they should be discussing the issues of the Nation.

I want to say emphatically that the issue that the leadership has been discussing in recent times are the issues of what the Coast Guard needs in the Arctic Ocean in February. They are discussing how the Coast Guard has more influence and can more effectively deal with the pollution problems of the coastal waters of the United States and the inland seas of the United States. The leadership of both Houses is discussing the major problem of cargo ships bringing in enslaved immigrants by criminal thugs and how they can get to the shores of the United States and perform more effectively their criminal activity.

□ 1645

And how does the Coast Guard, made up of very young men and women, stop that? We are talking about a whole range of issues that deal with the Coast Guard. The leadership of both Houses of Congress are talking about welfare reform. They are talking about IRS reform. They are talking about how to improve agricultural practices. They are talking about a lot of things.

Last, Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from California, when we are talking about campaign finance reform, each and every Member of this House, as individuals, as representatives of their district, have always the option of how they are going to run their campaign and how they are going to raise their money. So if the gentleman from California does not like the present legal system of the way campaigns are funded, he can simply do what he wants. He could stop taking PAC money. He could stop taking money from anybody from his district. He could do what he wants.

Each of us, as Members of this House, should tell our constituents, this is what I am going to do as a person, regardless of what Congress can or cannot do, I am going to stop taking all money except for those people who can vote for me. I will stop taking PAC money. I will stop taking money from outside of my district. I will stop taking special interest money. I will stop accepting soft dollars into my district. I will only take money from someone who is registered in my district to vote in my district, regardless of what the Congress does.

The leadership of this Congress has been talking about issues relating to the American people and, I might add, in the last 2 or 3 years, doing a fine job. I would remind the American people that sometimes the rhetoric on the floor would make a Shakespearean play look pretty dull, but look through the rhetoric at some of the details. We are talking about how to protect the coastal waters of the United States.

This rule, as the gentleman from Florida has suggested, is open. All amendments are possible on this particular rule.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], majority whip of the Democratic Party.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Rules, both parties, for providing us with a rule that is open and allows us to do the things that my friend from Maryland talked about and that is help with the exploring and science and fighting pollution, dealing with the immigration problems and that our national defense needs, those are all very good things. But I think my friend from Florida may have just a wee bit stretched the procedural argument that he made that this has nothing to do with political campaign reform.

We have no objections to dealing with the Coast Guard issue. It is an important issue for the country and for all of us. But what we will attempt to do is allow that to happen, but at the same time, when that is finished in our rule here, we will ask that the House consider campaign finance reform and the variety of proposals that have emanated from both political parties.

There have been some very good suggestions on this side of the aisle, as well as on our side of the aisle. What the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is objecting to, what I am objecting to, and if I may dare say so, the American people have been objecting to, is the fact that this system is broke and this Congress, in both House and Senate, is not willing to face up to the broken system and fix it. In fact, we have not even faced up to the fact that we want it to be debated, debated.

This is not the first time that we have come to the floor to do this. This is the sixth time in this session that we are demanding a vote on campaign finance reform. We asked that the same procedure be initiated on the 7th of January, 13th of March, 19th of April, 16th of April and, I think, the 21st of May.

We will attempt to defeat the previous question in order to bring finance reform to the bill, campaign finance reform. It is not about a specific proposal. It is about having a debate so we can come to some conclusion to try to fix what I think is a rotten system, a rotten system. Every one of us knows in our hearts that we spend too much time, too much energy seeking campaign contributions in order to stay here and do not devote enough time to the work at hand.

It is a system that has gotten both political parties in enormous trouble. It is a system which has caused the people of this country to lose faith in this institution. It is a system in which

Members of both bodies would prefer not to have. And yet I must say, I watched that handshake between the President and Speaker GINGRICH, when was it, a couple, 3 years ago. They were going to do something about it.

Well, nothing is being done. The Speaker says that the problem is not too much money, but too little money. We ought to be spending more. Well, that is nonsense. That is absolute nonsense and it is not a prerequisite in a democracy today. Nine out of ten of the American people think we spend too much and we spend too much time raising it and it is corrupting this institution and our democracy. We need to fix this system, Madam Speaker. And we need to limit the amount of money, stop this negative advertising and get the American people voting once again.

If other democratic nations can do it, we can do it. Just across the border from my district in Canada, the political season is much shorter, the airwaves are free. Campaigns are publicly financed, Great Britain, Ireland. We ought to be able to craft something that is fair to both sides.

I would say to my Republican colleagues, you should not be afraid to have this debate. Voter cynicism does not just hurt us, it hurts you as well. It undermines our democratic institutions and who we are as a people and why we came here to serve. I suspect that we will lose once again today. It is the nature of the situation here. But as my friend from California said, campaign finance reform will not die. And we will attempt to bring it to the floor of the House of Representatives with a discharge petition. That means every Member of this body will have the opportunity to walk over to the Clerk here and sign a petition that says, we want all the issues related to this most important issue on how we run our democracy and how we finance it, we want it on the floor of the House of Representatives. And we will have a list of those who want to reform the system and those who want the status quo.

Finally, in just one word to my friend from Maryland, who I have a deep respect for for his work on the environment and education and some other issues, I admire him as well as the gentleman from Florida. But he makes the argument, well, you know, if you really want reform, do it yourself. That ignores the situation where someone will unilaterally disarm, limit their campaign contributions while their opponent is able to play by the present, I think, rotten and corrupt system and raise so much money that the scales are not balanced nor are the elections. We have to have a level playing field where we are playing by the same rules.

To suggest to us on the floor today that you ought to just take it right out of your district, the fact of the matter is, if some of my colleagues decided to just take contributions out of their

own districts and their opponent decides to take it out of the country, there are districts in this country that are so poor that it would not be a contest financially.

I could make a lot of arguments

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, the comment about taking money just from one's district, I do that now. I do not take any PAC money, no money unless a person can vote for me. I did that in 1992, when I ran against an opponent, an incumbent of this House, who spent a lot more money than I did. It is still possible to win.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, it is possible to win and the gentleman is an example of that happening. But there are districts, and the gentleman, I think, will concede this, where it is extremely difficult to raise the money to be competitive in a congressional race within that district itself. I think the gentleman understands that. That is the dilemma that we face if we are not all playing by the same rules.

So let me just conclude, Madam Speaker, by suggesting that our colleagues vote against the previous question so we can bring this issue to the floor and we can have a full and honest and fair debate so our Republican colleagues, as well as our Democratic colleagues, can offer the suggestions to reform the system so we know where we are. Maybe we will not resolve it. Maybe we will not come to a conclusion. Maybe we will not have the votes to pass anything. But at least we will have some sense of where we are in this debate and where the center of gravity is in terms of where this Congress wants to go and where the public wants us to go. We owe that to the American people. We owe that to the institution that we serve in and we certainly owe it to the people who sent us here.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me the time.

It is with great interest that I listen to the minority whip as we talk about what our priorities should be as those who are duly elected representatives of the citizens of the United States. In fact, Madam Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would join me in this realization, that those who aspire to public office should obey existing law. And unfortunately, the scenario that is played out here, listening to the whip, my friend from Michigan, listening to my colleague from California, is one akin to a speeder pulled over by a traffic cop.

Now, I know many policemen who patrol the highways and byways hear all sorts of excuses. But never have I heard them relate to me that when they pull over a speeder, the speeder says to the

officer, well, you may have a posted speed limit of 55 or 65, but that is just not adequate. That law should be changed. That law should now be 95 miles an hour. And sadly what is going on in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, and going on, I regret to say, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is a massive effort to misdirect the attention of the American people.

Campaign finance reform, indeed, that is a subject that should be discussed. But not to sacrifice, indeed, some, Madam Speaker, might use the word "obstruct," not to sacrifice the legitimate priorities of funding our Coast Guard, of maintaining the integrity of our borders and indeed to maintain the integrity of our electoral process, Madam Speaker. This should be the framework under which we operate, obedience to existing statute.

Sadly, Madam Speaker, what this is about, I regret to say, is the presence of some in the White House. And here we see the President and First Lady in this picture with one Johnny Chung who seems to be unavailable to come before committees in this House and in the other body and freely explain to the American people his role in the 1996 campaign. So let me say candidly, Madam Speaker, to my friends on the other side, to all of my colleagues in this Chamber and indeed to the citizens of the United States, let us first exercise our legitimate oversight to find out exactly what went on in 1996, to find out exactly what went on within the executive branch, to find out when this gentleman is so pleased to be standing with the first couple, to get to the bottom of these very disturbing questions.

If we are to prioritize, it would seem to me that we would start with the numerous concerns, suspicions and allegations sadly confronting this administration. Madam Speaker, there are many lessons to be learned from history. I lament the fact that some of my colleagues have drawn the wrong conclusions from what transpired nearly a quarter century ago.

□ 1700

Because in that era there were those who talked of stonewalling, there were those who talked of the absurdity of the limited modified hangout. And in stark contrast, quite frankly, to the behavior we see displayed today from Members of the minority, two people from my State had the guts and the gumption to go to the White House in 1974 and request that President Richard Nixon resign. Oh, for a true spirit of bipartisanship, not borne out of temporary convenience but of constitutional conviction.

This is not a game. Serious questions remain. Yes, we should take a look at campaign finance reform from stem to stern, but first we must find out who violated, who is under suspicion of violating the rules that now apply in everyday law.

And, moreover, Madam Speaker, we should not try to turn this question of

a legitimate security question to our national boundaries, to a branch of our service, to funding of the Coast Guard for the preening and posing of partisanship in the hopes that those allied with those who would obfuscate and try to run away from the problem might find temporary advantage.

Let us adopt the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, we can all parade up to the well of the House and present our favorite photo of a political leader who we may disagree with because of some alleged impropriety. I suspect Members on this side of the aisle could, and have I suspect, done the same thing with the Speaker of the House [Mr. GINGRICH], with his improprieties that found him sanctioned by his Republican colleagues as well as our Democratic colleagues.

I suspect we on this side of the aisle could do the same thing where the former chairman of the Republican Party, Haley Barbour, who was engaged in raising foreign funds in the last campaign. I suspect we could even do that with members of the Republican Party who are presently engaged in similar problems as Members of the House of Representatives. But that really does not get us to where we need to go. Where we need to go is to have a full and honest debate about the ways to reform the system.

I would invite the gentleman from Arizona, who just spoke, to join his Senator, Senator McCAIN, in sponsoring the McCain-Feingold bill, and join those of us in the House who want to bring this debate to the American people. We know how that argument goes, how it plays out in the end, the one that the gentleman propounded on the floor just a minute ago: Let's find out before we do anything.

We have had really 20 years of this system and we have found out. It has gotten many, many people in trouble. It has reduced the number of people in this country who have faith in the system and who have voted. It has in many ways had a very, very negative influence on how people operate in public life.

And so I encourage my friend from Arizona to get on board. We are going to have a line out here on Friday of people signing a discharge petition. I assume we maybe even will have a few Republicans, and we encourage the gentleman to be right in front of the line and he can be that running back that I never was.

I played at the University of Iowa, and I was a kind of a small guy, but I was always looking for somebody to plough that hole open. He can plough that hole open for his party by getting in line and joining us in signing the petition.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the reminiscences of the distinguished minority whip as to his athletic career, a great athletic career that continues even today, as we have seen him on the baseball diamond and on the basketball court.

Let me also invite the minority whip, Madam Speaker, and others on that side of the aisle, to join with me, with my own campaign finance reform bill, the nickname is ERIC, election reform in campaigns, and let them also, Madam Speaker, join with me to reaffirm the basic first amendment rights of members of voluntary associations, trade associations, and union associations not to have their dues taken from them against their will to be used for political causes in campaigns with which those members may not agree.

I would hope that we would move forward in that debate. But for now, and the question before this House now, we dare not turn a deaf ear or a blind eye to the funding requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the legitimate national security concerns therein.

And, Madam Speaker, on the subject of national security concerns, it entirely proves my point that we should assess just exactly what has transpired when foreign nationals, indeed with suspected representatives of foreign governments coming to peddle their influence in Washington and sadly in the last cycle allegedly at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Oh yes, let the committees, Madam Speaker, conduct their oversight. Let the chips fall where they may. Let us end the obfuscation and what sadly has become the misdirection. Let us put our priorities in order.

Campaign finance? Sure. But legitimate constitutional congressional oversight first for very disturbing questions of national security and alleged improprieties that cannot be erased no matter how fond the athletic reminiscences.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, may I inquire what is the remaining time on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 11½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Like all my colleagues who have spoken, I too would like to see campaign finance reform brought to the floor of this House and done so immediately. I rise, however, to raise another issue.

I think that the Coast Guard bill is a good one, but I raise a concern that has

adversely affected the Chicago area, which I represent. For many years the Coast Guard Air Station helicopter facility located in Glenview, IL, patrolled southern Lake Michigan, an area with a high volume of recreational traffic. Recently that facility was relocated to Muskegon, MI, more than 100 miles away.

Under the current setup, it takes a helicopter twice as long to get from Muskegon to the Chicago area as it did from Glenview. Some authorities have contended that moving the unit out of the Chicago area has dramatically compromised the safety margin for those persons who frequent the lake-front.

A recent Chicago Sun Times article reported that during the past year, 26 people have died on southern Lake Michigan as compared to 4 deaths during the previous year. It has been observed that the number of deaths on southern Lake Michigan have continued to spiral upward since the Coast Guard's decision to relocate to Muskegon.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the U.S. Coast Guard will reevaluate this move, which is possibly responsible for a number of senseless deaths. I would also request that the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation review this location site. A site closer to the Chicago metropolitan area could save many lives.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to respond to the gentleman who spoke about the transfer of the helicopter in the Chicago region. I do not see him on the floor now, but I do want to say that this is an area that we have considered. We certainly will try to obtain more funding so the Coast Guard can have more helicopters.

It is my judgment that the Coast Guard, for the past several years, has been, in fact, underfunded. So we are going to correct this in the next cycle, so that we hope with that increase in funding the helicopters can be in more areas than they are now.

Now, one of the reasons that the Coast Guard helicopter was moved from this gentleman's particular area to another area is because of the assessment of where most of the accidents occur. Most of the accidents, clearly over 90 percent of the accidents that the Coast Guard responds to, they respond with small boats, not helicopters. There is only a small percentage of the accidents where they actually use helicopters, but the helicopters are moved to those areas that need that type of assistance more, and that is a judgment by the Coast Guard. But I assure the gentleman it is an area that we are taking under serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if I can just go back to our favorite subject, I suppose at least

for some Members, campaign finance reform, I would like to remind my colleagues on the House floor that each of us, regardless of what the regulations are regarding the Federal Election Commission, and regardless of whatever regulations there are out there for campaign finance fundraising, each of us, as individuals, can eliminate the entire system at the snap of a finger.

What is good about this country is that it thrives on individual initiative and individual responsibility. So if a Member thinks the system is bad or corrupt, or whatever they think about the system, I would like to remind my colleagues that they can simply stop taking money from everybody; from PAC's, from interest groups, from unions, from trade unions. Just name it. Just stop taking all those dollars that might be tainted or might be corrupted and run the campaign without taking any money or just from people that vote in the district.

In 1990 I won an election. I was very honored to come to the House of Representatives. And I defeated an incumbent. I was a candidate and I defeated a 10-year incumbent who had a lot of money. I figured if I wanted to get to Congress, I had to create a strategy where I could meet as many people as possible and convince them that I would be a better Member of the House of Representatives.

It takes a lot of work, a lot of courage, a lot of planning as an individual, using one's own initiative. So if we do not like the system, then we can change it ourselves.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, talk, talk, talk. That is what we have been doing about campaign finance reform. It is time to vote, vote, vote. That is what we need to do in this House. We would not need to talk so much about campaign finance reform if the Republican leadership of this House would bring this matter to a vote.

And if I could just respond briefly to what the gentleman from Maryland was just saying, about we can always do it our own way. When we play tennis, we play by the rules. When we play football, we play by the rules. We do not make up individual rules for individual players.

What we need in this body is, we need a vote on a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill. We know enough about what went on in the 1996 elections to know that we need to do something different.

I am a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, chaired by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. We have spent \$3 million for 1 day of hearings; \$3 million for 1 day of hearings.

And when I was back in my home State of Maine this past week, I heard

over and over again the same refrain: We are tired of these investigations. We want to get to the bottom, but we are tired of investigations with no legislation. We want to see Members of Congress do something for us people back home.

Now, there are not many Republicans who are on a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill, but my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. ASA HUTCHINSON, is cochair with me of our freshman bipartisan group. We produced a bill. We went through a 5-month process. It was a bipartisan effort. We ban soft money. We take the biggest of the big money out of this system.

We have put together a bill with no poison pills. We took the poison pills out. And I think that is the kind of legislation that ought to come to the floor of this House; that we ought to give every Member of this House a chance to stand up and vote, not just talk about campaign finance reform.

□ 1715

I believe that if we do that, if we ban soft money, if we take the biggest of the big money out and we make sure that the parties have enough money to keep going so they can fulfill a role, if we make sure that every group, every group that wants to participate in this system by way of a third-party advertisement has to disclose who they are, has to disclose how much money they are spending. Then the American people will know more about what is going on in this political system and they will be able to deal with it.

I sense in my home State a crisis of confidence in this political system. I also sense a real impatience with this Congress for all of the talk and no action. The fact is that if we bring this matter to a vote, then we can move this question ahead. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against the previous question and bring campaign finance reform to the floor for a vote.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. May I remind the House that this is the rule to bring the Coast Guard authorization bill to the floor?

We do not have other speakers on this side, but my understanding is that the other side wants to talk about issues that have nothing to do with the Coast Guard. Of course it is a democracy that we live in, Mr. Speaker. People when they rise can speak about anything they wish. That is one of the beauties of the system, Mr. Speaker. But I think it is important for the Members who may be trying to find out what the debate is about, what we are on here, dealing with, what we are on the floor dealing with.

This is the rule, which is an open rule, and during the many years before we acquired the majority, Mr. Speaker, there were very few open rules. Open rules are rules that bring bills to the

floor with the opportunity for all Members to offer amendments on that legislation. That is something that we cherish, that is something that we fought for. Since we are in the majority, we are able to do it. We are able to bring legislation to the floor with what are known as open rules, which are guidelines that permit any and all amendments, any and all amendments by any Member to the legislation that is brought to the floor. What we are bringing to the floor with this open rule is the authorization of the Coast Guard, which is critically important to the national security of the United States, which is critically important to law enforcement, which is critically important to drug interdiction, issues that are obviously essential for the American people.

So we are bringing to the floor the Coast Guard authorization law, bill, legislation with an open rule. I wanted to remind Members of the fact that that is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. Of course since it is the United States of America, since it is this wonderful free Nation of laws, people can come to the floor and talk about whatever they wish when they are given time by the Speaker. But I wanted to remind my colleagues who may be watching on their screens in their offices or the American people what it is that we are seriously doing here today, and it is serious, reauthorizing the Coast Guard, protecting the American people from narcotics, helping the national security. That is what we are doing by bringing forth the Coast Guard authorization and we are bringing it forth, we are bringing it to the floor with a rule that permits any and all amendments obviously that have something to do with the Coast Guard; in other words, that are germane.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform both Members that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 6½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to what everyone said. I heard what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and all. I must admit I do not see anything wrong with it. I have voted no on most of the parliamentary motions that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has made concerning campaign finance reform, but I think it comes to a time that we have to make up our mind, are we going to have a debate? Are we going to have a vote on campaign finance reform? I think I have waited long enough. I think most of the other Members have.

You turn on TV, you listen to the radio, you read the newspaper, and the

entire country is talking about campaign finance reform. They are not just talking about what has happened at the White House. They are talking about what has happened in all congressional districts, in all States in the United States. They know what other countries have done when it comes to campaign finance reform, and they know what we have not done in the United States of America. And the American people know the influence of big money on political campaigns. It has gotten to the point in time where people buy elections. They do not earn elections anymore. They buy elections.

We also know the disparity of income between the haves and the have-nots. We know that that is growing daily. We know that the middle class is being squeezed now. And we know also that a lot of people are not even participating in the electoral process anymore. Why are they not participating? I think they are not participating because of the influence of big money.

I say to the Republicans and I say to the Republican Party, let us have a vote, let us have a debate, let us have it now, not later, because it is in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any other speakers at this time. I would just remind the Members who may be tuning in that this is the Coast Guard authorization, the open rule.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Maloney].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because it does not allow for the consideration of campaign finance reform on the House floor. I do not oppose this bill and I would otherwise not oppose this rule, but I do not believe that we should move forward with other legislation without a commitment to campaign finance reform by this House.

More than 300 Members of this House have signed on to various campaign finance reform bills. Nearly everyone has an idea and they have worked hard to turn those ideas into legislation. The evidence is before this House. There are 87 different campaign finance reform bills before this House. But not a single one of these bills has made it to the floor for debate, not a single one of these bills, not one of the 87 has even been considered in a committee hearing this year. Mr. Speaker, there are 435 Members of Congress and 311 of them have signed on to various campaign finance bills. That is 72 percent, a majority of the Members. And a majority of Americans are pleading for reform. Yet these pleas are not being heard by the majority party.

Our counterparts in the Senate, they did not have much success but at least they tried. At least they brought it to the floor. Let us do the same here, Mr. Speaker. Let us bring some of these 87

bills to the floor for debate. Nearly three-quarters of this House is asking for it. Nearly three-quarters of this House is a sponsor of a campaign finance bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] in calling for and signing a discharge petition so that we can get the issue before this body for debate and before this body for a vote. We certainly owe it to our constituents to have a vote on campaign finance before we adjourn and go back to our districts.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I include for the RECORD an explanation of the previous question, as follows:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

House Rule XVII ("Previous Question") provides in part that: There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum is present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked or ordered.

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the vote on the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] was really on point in this debate which was brought up by our distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle in this open rule on Coast Guard; in other words, on nothing that had to do with the Coast Guard. But the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], in setting the record straight, I think had a very interesting point and that is the analogy of the policeman who stops someone who is speeding because the speed limit is 50 miles an hour and then when the person is stopped, the person wants to change the law. This law is very bad, yes, it is true I was going 70 miles an hour, but I think it should be a 30-mile-an-hour speed limit. That is an excellent point because that is exactly what we are dealing with here.

The allegations that are being made and that are being substantiated on a day-in and day-out basis are very serious. These allegations have to do with selling of influence to enemy dictatorships. I think few allegations can be more serious. And so when we have an analogy about stopping someone for going 50 miles an hour, remember the 50 miles an hour that we are talking about. We are talking about selling influence to enemies of the United States being the 50 miles an hour. And yet saying, oh, no, no, the law is bad, make it 30 miles an hour.

So yes, we can debate and we will very happily debate this issue, but the bottom line is that today what we are doing is something else that is very important to the United States; by the way, very important, Mr. Speaker, to the national security of the United States as well. And that is authorizing the Coast Guard.

And so we bring forth to the floor the legislation to authorize the Coast Guard with the opportunity for all Members of this House under what we call in this House an open rule, an opportunity for any and all Members to bring forth any amendment that is germane, that is relevant to that legislation. That is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. That is what we ask at this moment, that the resolution, the rule be accepted.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority argues that our attempt to defeat the previous question is futile because our proposed amendment is not germane. The fact of the matter is that the Chair has not made a ruling nor heard our arguments as to the germaneness of our amendment. The only way to make that determination is to allow us to offer the amendment by defeating the previous question.

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.

I include the following material for the RECORD.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's "Precedents of the House of Representatives," (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition.

Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership "Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives," (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

"Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's "Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives," the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

"Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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.

H. RES. 265—PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT TEXT

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

"Section 2. Before the House adjourns sine die for the first session of the 105th Congress, it shall consider campaign finance reform legislation under an open amendment process."

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). 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.

Mr. MILLER of California. 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 min-

imum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 196, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—196

Abercrombie	Berry	Brown (OH)
Ackerman	Bishop	Capps
Allen	Blagojevich	Cardin
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carson
Baessler	Bonior	Clay
Baldacci	Borski	Clayton
Barcia	Boswell	Clement
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Clyburn
Becerra	Boyd	Condit
Bentsen	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Berman	Brown (FL)	Costello

Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy
Cramer	Kennelly	Poshard
Cummings	Kildee	Price (NC)
Danner	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Klecza	Reyes
DeFazio	Klink	Rivers
DeGette	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Delahunt	LaFalce	Roemer
DeLauro	Lampson	Rothman
Deutsch	Levin	Roukema
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lipinski	Rush
Dixon	Lofgren	Sabo
Doggett	Lowey	Sanchez
Dooley	Luther	Sanders
Doyle	Maloney (CT)	Sandlin
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Sawyer
Engel	Manton	Schumer
Eshoo	Markey	Scott
Etheridge	Martinez	Shays
Evans	Mascara	Sherman
Farr	Matsui	Sisisky
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Skaggs
Fazio	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Filner	McDermott	Slaughter
Flake	McGovern	Smith, Adam
Frank (MA)	McHale	Snyder
Frost	McIntyre	Spratt
Furse	McKinney	Stabenow
Gejdenson	McNulty	Stark
Gephardt	Meehan	Stenholm
Goode	Meek	Stokes
Gordon	Menendez	Stupak
Green	Millender-	Tanner
	McDonald	Tauscher
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Hall (TX)	Minge	Thompson
Hamilton	Mink	Thurman
Harman	Moakley	Tierney
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Torres
Hefner	Moran (VA)	Towns
Hilliard	Nadler	Turner
Hinchey	Oberstar	Velazquez
Hinojosa	Obey	Vento
Hooley	Oliver	Visclosky
Hoyer	Ortiz	Waters
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Watt (NC)
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Waxman
(TX)	Pascrell	Wexler
John	Pastor	Weygand
Johnson (WI)	Payne	Wise
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Woolsey
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Kaptur	Pickett	Yates
Kennedy (MA)		

NOT VOTING—14

Bono	Gillmor	Neal
Cubin	Gonzalez	Schiff
Dellums	Jefferson	Shadegg
Foglietta	Lantos	Watts (OK)
Ford	McIntosh	

□ 1748

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed their 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. DICKEY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2464, de novo; and

H.R. 1962, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for each electronic vote in this series.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT TO EX-EMPT INTERNATIONALLY ADOPTED CHILDREN UNDER AGE 10 FROM THE IMMUNIZATION REQUIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2464, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2464, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	Cannon	Ehrlich
Ackerman	Capps	Emerson
Aderholt	Cardin	Engel
Allen	Carson	English
Andrews	Castle	Ensign
Archer	Chabot	Eshoo
Armey	Chenoweth	Etheridge
Bachus	Christensen	Evans
Baessler	Clay	Everett
Baker	Clayton	Ewing
Baldacci	Clement	Farr
Ballenger	Clyburn	Fattah
Barcia	Coble	Fawell
Barr	Coburn	Fazio
Barrett (NE)	Collins	Filner
Barrett (WI)	Combest	Flake
Bartlett	Condit	Foglietta
Barton	Conyers	Foley
Bass	Cook	Forbes
Bateman	Cooksey	Fowler
Becerra	Costello	Fox
Bentsen	Cox	Frank (MA)
Bereuter	Coyne	Franks (NJ)
Berman	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Berry	Crane	Frost
Bilbray	Crapo	Furse
Bilirakis	Cummings	Gallely
Bishop	Cunningham	Ganske
Blagojevich	Danner	Gejdenson
Bliley	Davis (FL)	Gekas
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Gephardt
Blunt	Davis (VA)	Gibbons
Boehlert	Deal	Gilchrest
Boehner	DeFazio	Gilman
Bonilla	DeGette	Goode
Bonior	Delahunt	Goodlatte
Borski	DeLauro	Goodling
Boswell	DeLay	Gordon
Boucher	Deutsch	Goss
Boyd	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Brady	Dickey	Granger
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Green
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Greenwood
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Gutierrez
Bryant	Doggett	Gutknecht
Bunning	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Burr	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Burton	Doyle	Hamilton
Buyer	Dreier	Hansen
Callahan	Duncan	Harman
Calvert	Dunn	Hastert
Camp	Edwards	Hastings (FL)
Campbell	Ehlers	Hastings (WA)
Canady		Hayworth

Hefley	McInnis	Sandlin
Hefner	McIntyre	Sanford
Herger	McKeon	Sawyer
Hill	McKinney	Saxton
Hilleary	McNulty	Scarborough
Hilliard	Meehan	Schaefer, Dan
Hinchey	Meek	Schaffer, Bob
Hinojosa	Menendez	Schumer
Hobson	Metcalf	Scott
Hoekstra	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Holden	Millender-	Serrano
Hooley	McDonald	Sessions
Horn	Miller (CA)	Shadegg
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Houghton	Minge	Shays
Hoyer	Mink	Sherman
Hulshof	Moakley	Shimkus
Hunter	Mollohan	Shuster
Hutchinson	Moran (KS)	Sisisky
Inglis	Moran (VA)	Skaggs
Istook	Morella	Skeen
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Skelton
Jackson-Lee	Myrick	Slaughter
(TX)	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Jenkins	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
John	Neumann	Smith (OR)
Johnson (CT)	Ney	Smith (TX)
Johnson (WI)	Northup	Smith, Adam
Johnson, E. B.	Norwood	Smith, Linda
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Snowbarger
Jones	Oberstar	Snyder
Kanjorski	Obey	Solomon
Kaptur	Oliver	Souder
Kasich	Ortiz	Spence
Kelly	Owens	Spratt
Kennedy (MA)	Oxley	Stabenow
Kennedy (RI)	Packard	Stark
Kennelly	Pallone	Stearns
Kildee	Pappas	Stenholm
Kilpatrick	Parker	Stokes
Kim	Pascrell	Strickland
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Stump
King (NY)	Paul	Stupak
Kingston	Paxon	Sununu
Klecza	Payne	Talent
Klink	Pease	Tanner
Klug	Pelosi	Tauscher
Knollenberg	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
Kolbe	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (MS)
Kucinich	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kucinich	Pickering	Thomas
LaFalce	Pickett	Thompson
LaHood	Pitts	Petri
Lampson	Pombo	Thune
Largent	Pomeroy	Thurman
Latham	Porter	Tiahrt
LaTourette	Portman	Tierney
Lazio	Poshard	Torres
Leach	Price (NC)	Towns
Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Trafficant
Lewis (GA)	Quinn	Turner
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Upton
Linder	Rahall	Velazquez
Lipinski	Ramstad	Vento
Livingston	Rangel	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Redmond	Walsh
Lofgren	Regula	Wamp
Lowey	Reyes	Watkins
Lucas	Riggs	Watt (NC)
Luther	Riley	Waxman
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Weldon (FL)
Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez	Weldon (PA)
Manton	Roemer	Weller
Manzullo	Rogan	Wexler
Markey	Rogers	Weygand
Martinez	Rohrabacher	White
Mascara	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Matsui	Rothman	Wicker
McCarthy (MO)	Roukema	Wise
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McCollum	Royce	Woolsey
McCrery	Rush	Wynn
McDade	Ryun	Yates
McDermott	Sabo	Young (AK)
McGovern	Salmon	Young (FL)
McHale	Sanchez	
McHugh	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—13

Bono	Gonzalez	Neal
Cubin	Hyde	Schiff
Dellums	Jefferson	Watts (OK)
Ford	Lantos	
Gillmor	McIntosh	