

such regulations, that is the regulations of the States, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

So this Congress could, as any Congress before it could have, preempt every State election law, every State election law in the country governing the election of Representatives either in times of catastrophe or any other time for that matter. But of course just because we have the power to do these things does not mean we should exercise this power, and in this resolution we have chosen a different course. We are going to the States and asking them to act.

What we are doing today is precisely what we ought to be doing, no more, no less. It is the measured response that continues to respect the rights of the States to govern their own elections but highlights to them their critical role in our Federal legislature and emphasizes their responsibility to ensure that their representation in Congress is never long diminished. It is, after all, in the best interest of each State to ensure that it can quickly replenish its congressional delegation, lest it be left out, unrepresented during what could be one of the most crucial moments in our Nation's history.

Therefore, we should, before we do anything more, give the States the opportunity to act in their best interest and in a way that suits each State's own unique needs, and that is precisely what this resolution does.

Our working group has also been examining possible amendments to the Presidential Succession Act of 1947 because the Speaker of the House stands third in line to the Presidency; and any attack on this body that decimates it, that deprives of it of Members, could take away the Speaker as well, indeed, take away other potential successor Speakers. We want to be sure that the line of Presidential succession is clear and uninterrupted.

Virtually ever proposed solution to every issue the working group has addressed, including this one over the past four months, whether it be a change in the rules of the House, passing a new law, amending an old one, or changing our Constitution by altering its language, presents very serious legal issues requiring careful thought and deliberation.

We are not the first to grapple with these issues. The very first Congress, meeting at the site where Federal Hall in New York stands today and where this Congress gathered just a few weeks ago, grappled with the issue of Presidential succession. One can hardly image a Congress more in touch with the sentiments and intentions of the founders than that very first Congress; and one can hardly imagine a government more tentative and fragile and in need of the stability a well-defined and certain line of Presidential succession would provide. Yet the first Congress was unable to agree on a Presidential succession law, and they went without one.

It was left to the second Congress to finally pass the first Presidential Succession Act in 1792. This act stated that in the event of a vacancy in the office of President and Vice President, succession will pass first to the President pro tem of the Senate and second to the Speaker of the House.

The act has been amended in all of the years intervening since 1792 only twice since then: first following the assassination of President James Garfield in 1881 and the death of Vice President Thomas Hendrix in 1886, when concerns were raised because at the time of their deaths Congress had not yet convened, leaving the office of President pro tem and Speaker of the House vacant. As a result, in 1886 Congress removed the Speaker and the President pro tem from the line of Presidential succession.

Fast forward to 1945. President Truman urged Congress to restore the Speaker and President pro tem to the line of Presidential succession. Two years later in 1947, Congress did so. This time putting the Speaker first and then the President pro tem of the Senate second. This brief history demonstrates the time and deliberation that have gone into the very few changes that have been made to our Presidential succession laws since the inception of the Republic. Therefore, those of us on this working group tasked with finding a solution to these problems of congressional continuity, of the line of Presidential succession should take comfort in a history where thoughtful deliberations has been the rule, not the exception.

Mr. Speaker, it is exactly that kind of deliberation, thoughtful and measured, that has gone into the proposals that the working group has put forward to the Committee on the Judiciary on statutory changes, for example, to the Presidential Succession Act, put forward to the Committee on Rules, changes to our quorum requirements in the manner of recognizing the death of a Member, particularly when mass death occurs, and on this question of the special election of Members after a death of a Member.

This resolution is the first step towards ensuring that this body will endure no matter what, no matter what our enemies do to us. I encourage every Member to join the 11 Members of the bipartisan working group in supporting this resolution, this important first step to ensuring the continuity of this great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by thanking in particular the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) and his superb staff for the time, energy and effort they have put into these matters. We have much work ahead of us. We cannot congratulate ourselves too much for work half done, but we will be after this year and next year. And as I mentioned, given this long history, we cannot be concerned that we are not moving too precipitously fast. We are moving very fast, I think. We have gotten

a lot done, but we will have sometime before us. So I look forward toward working further with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members who have spoken on this very important topic today. I apologize to those who were concerned with raising such grizzly topics. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can put ourselves and our minds back to other workday matters more important to we, the living, than this horrible-to-contemplate future contingency. I urge the adoption of this resolution by all the Members of this House, and I urge action of the States in furtherance of this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 26, 2002, the resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 559.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on the Help America Vote Act.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. MEEK of Florida moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 3295 be instructed to take such actions as may be appropriate—

(1) to convene a public meeting of the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate; and

(2) to ensure that a conference report is filed on the bill prior to October 4, 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Florida (Mrs. MEEK) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion instructs the conferees on H.R. 3295, the election reform legislation, to complete their work and file a conference report prior to October 4, 2002. I speak with a sense of urgency, Mr. Speaker. It has been almost 2 years since the 2000 Presidential election, an election that created a crisis of confidence in our Nation's election system. Last month we had a primary election in Florida that reinforced the need for immediate action on election reform, as it confirmed that many problems that plagued the 2000 Presidential election in Florida are continuing, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 9 months since the House of Representatives passed the Help America Vote Act, H.R. 3295. It has been more than 5 months since the Senate passed their version of election reform legislation, Senate bill 765, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Equal Protection of Voting Rights Act of 2002. The Senate passed it by a vote of 99 to 1, yet the conferees still have not completed this. There is a sense of urgency, I repeat.

Two weeks ago I spoke on the floor here in support of the motion to instruct the election reform conferees offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) instructing the conferees to file a conference report by October 1, 2002. Everyone said the right thing about the need to produce an election reform conference report by October 1, 2002, and yet no conference report was filed. The clock is still ticking, Mr. Speaker.

At that time, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) remarked,

I believe that the conferees, Mr. Speaker, on the election reform bill are within sight of an agreement that will bring critically needed aid and assistance to improve elections in the United States, and I believe this motion to instruct will have a positive effect of reminding the conferees on both sides of the aisle that reasonable negotiations are critical to getting this conference report done in the very near future.

The Chairman also observed,

There is much work left to be done, and I know we are running out of time, but I believe we can meet that challenge. I look forward to being on the floor in the near future and enacting a bill with broad bipartisan support, a bill that makes it easier to vote and harder to cheat, a bill that would demonstrate to all Americans that this Congress can put aside partisanship and improve the election process for all of our citizens.

Last week I returned to the floor, Mr. Speaker, to speak in strong support of this motion to instruct the election reform conferees offered by my good friend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), again di-

recting the election reform conferees to produce a conference report before October 1, 2002. Once again, everyone said that the right thing at that time was the need for the conferees to conclude their work, and yet, once again, an election reform conference report has yet to be filed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, and Senators DODD, MCCONNELL, SCHUMER, BOND, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) have worked very hard on the issue of election reform, and I thank all of them for their efforts. Yet, Mr. Speaker, as the Washington Post observed in an excellent editorial yesterday, it is long past the time for conferees to work out their differences.

As the Post observed,

The negotiators see eye to eye on most aspects of the legislation. Both sides agree that Federal grants should support State election-reform efforts. They have agreed on the size of this support: \$3.5 billion over 5 years. They agree that Federal standards should guarantee the basic quality of elections: There should be accurate registers of voters in each State; voters should get a chance to correct their votes if they mess up their ballot first time around; there should be access to the polls for voters with disabilities. Both sides also agree that the goal of encouraging participation in elections needs to be balanced by vigilance against fraudulent participation.

The sticking points are modest by comparison.

How these issues get resolved matters less than whether they get resolved: The worst of all outcomes is that the legislation dies for lack of negotiating energy. A dozen States have passed election-reform plans,

including my State of Florida,

that will be implemented only if Federal funding is available; if these plans are left to languish, more disputed elections lie in the future. At a time when the Nation's political balance, both in the House and in the Senate, is so nearly even, the importance of accurate vote counting ought to be obvious. And at a time when voter turnout is at an all-time low, bolstering public confidence in the machinery of democracy is especially urgent.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has it right. We need action on election reform, and we need it now. I repeat, we need this now. This is an urgent situation. Thus I am compelled to return to the floor today to offer this motion instructing the conferees to complete their work and file a conference report prior to October 4, 2002.

Mr. Speaker, need I say it again? Election reform is long overdue. Wherever I travel, my constituents and many other Americans ask what is going to be done about election reform; what are we going to do to correct these problems in the election system? The confidence of the Nation is being

certainly inhibited by the lack of election reform. How many more election day catastrophes, like last month's voting in Florida, will be required for this Congress to get the message that our people need a real election reform bill, and they need it now?

Mr. Speaker, we must protect the right to vote. Too many have sacrificed too much to secure this right for any of us to shrink from our responsibility to protect it. Equal protection of voting rights laws requires an electoral system in which all Americans are able to register as voters, remain on the rolls once registered, and vote free from harassment. Ballots must not be misleading, and, again, every vote must count. Every voter must count equally, and every vote must count.

I have read these newspapers over and over again, and I have read the indication that election reform conferees have not yet been able to work out their differences and suggesting that election reform, therefore, may be dead this session. Election reform should not be dead this session. As I noted last week, this outcome is absolutely unacceptable to say that election reform is dead for this session. We should be able to pass a strong election reform conference report and send it to the President for his signature before this session ends.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the conferees' good intentions. In fact, I presume their good faith. But the time for words has passed. It is time for action. It is time for the conferees to act. We need to get this conference report done and report it out. I am here to remind all of the conference members and the conferees of the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. NEY) comments that I quoted and encourage them to act on it.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the lessons of the 2000 election and last month's Florida fiasco. The most fundamental issue facing all of us during this Congress is restoring the public's faith in democracy. It appears that many of us have forgotten that, but it is extremely important that we keep this in front of the American public. To restore that faith in democracy, we must make sure that every vote cast is counted. None of us can rest until we ensure that every vote counts and is counted.

I urge all of my colleagues to support my motion to instruct election reform conferees to file a conference report prior to October 4, 2002.

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Let me just say I appreciate the gentlewoman's motion to instruct. We are going to agree with the motion to instruct. In fact, I just want to present this in the correct way. We are speaking, as we are speaking, so, therefore, I am going to have to actually yield back the balance of my time so we can go on and get this product done.

I am working with our colleague the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the other members of the conference. We need a product. We want to have a product. We want something that works. We do not want an issue; none of us want that. We all want something that is going to help the American people.

I appreciate the gentlewoman pushing in the correct way on this conference committee motion.

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Let me begin by recognizing the outstanding leadership of the gentlewoman from Florida. I am not objecting. She is a close friend. She is a close friend. I am a strong admirer. She has had an extraordinary career in this House, State senate, in the Legislature of Florida and her community. The cause of election reform has no greater advocate. She has been motivated not just by a conviction that it is good public policy, but also by firsthand experience of the indignities a voter can face.

When registration rolls are improperly maintained, when provisional ballots are inadequate and voting equipment is so obsolete it fails to register duly cast votes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, I can think of few Members of this body, perhaps the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) come to mind, but few Members who are as qualified to speak on election reform in uniquely moral, constitutional and American terms than my friend the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mr. Speaker, in less than 4 weeks this Nation will hold its first Federal elections since the November 2000 debacle. Mr. Speaker, I will include the balance of my remarks, but I want to say this. I want to say it to all the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker. We took a historic step last year in December and passed overwhelmingly election reform. Over 350 Members of this body voted for that. Some 5 months, 6 months later, the United States Senate passed a bill 99 to 1, passed it in April. April has come and gone. May has come and gone, June, July, August, September. Now we are in October. We are in a new fiscal year.

The 107th Congress is about to end, and, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to pass election reform. We have yet to pass the bill that arguably had the greatest impetus coming out of the 2000 election of any issue in this land, and that was ensuring that every American not only had the right to vote, but would be facilitated in making that vote, and that

their vote would be accurately counted.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a lot of optimism that we are going to pass this bill. I continue to have optimism, but the hour is late. This motion is absolutely appropriate, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for making it. We have been working in private, difficult sessions, tried to iron out differences. The good news is, Mr. Speaker, from my perspective, we have agreement on 90 percent of this bill's major points.

Mr. Speaker, it would be tragic, but more than that, it would be disgraceful, if this House and the Senate adjourned sine die without passing this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since September 5, I suppose, when we reconvened here, maybe it was the 4th, we have done little. We have not passed any appropriation bills. The end of the fiscal year came on September 30 and went. We passed a continuing resolution to keep the government funded. We are going to pass another continuing resolution tomorrow, but we have not done anything of substance, Mr. Speaker. Neither this body nor the other body has passed any legislation of significance in the past 25 days.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, we will debate next week the issue of war and peace. We will debate how we extend the blessings of democracy and protect people from those who would visit terror and death and destruction upon them, their families, and their countries. Mr. Speaker, as we do so, let us hope that we also pass a piece of legislation which will say that in the world's greatest democracy that believes that all men and women are created equal and that in this Nation every one of them is entitled to have their voice heard and that in a democracy, that that voice is heard through the ballot box.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you, I hope that I, I know that the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) will work as tenaciously and vigorously as we know how to ensure that we will vindicate that right in legislation; in legislation which will extend to the States resources to give us the best technology possible, resources to provide training for those who administer our elections, resources to educate our voters, and requirements that we have a statewide registration system so that a voter does not come to the polls and hear, oh, I am sorry, we cannot find you on the list; and by the way, we cannot get through to the central office on our phone.

I hope this will be legislation which will ensure that everybody, irrespective of the disability with which they are challenged, will be able to cast their vote and cast their vote in secret; legislation which will say that that person that comes to the poll will get a provisional ballot; and legislation which will say and guarantee that elec-

tion officials will be able to say to individuals, if the technology permits and an individual makes a mistake and that vote may not be counted, do you want to correct it? Do you want to correct it so that your voice in this democracy will be heard?

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time; but much, much more importantly, I thank her for the courage, the conviction, and the time that she has spent through more than 5 decades of public service to make this a better country.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by recognizing the outstanding leadership of the gentlewoman from Florida, for whom the cause of election reform has been motivated not just by a conviction that it is good public policy, but also by firsthand experience of the indignities a voter can face when registration rolls are improperly maintained, when provisional ballots are not available, and when voting equipment is so obsolete it fails to register duly cast votes.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I can think of few Members of this body—Representative BROWN and Representative HASTINGS come to mind—who are as qualified to speak of election reform in uniquely moral terms as Representative MEEK.

Mr. Speaker, in less than 4 weeks, this Nation will hold its first Federal elections since the November 2000 debacle.

Nobody can predict with certainty how smoothly those elections will go.

After almost 2 years studying what went wrong in November 2000, I am convinced that confidence in this Nation's election system will not be restored until this Congress enacts meaningful national standards, and offers State and local authorities the resources to improve their election infrastructure.

I am pleased to report that Congress is on the threshold of doing just that.

Thanks in large measure to my colleague and good friend from Ohio, Chairman BOB NEY, we are closer than ever to enacting the most comprehensive package of voting reforms since the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Reform that will require States to offer provisional ballots to all voters whose registration materials have been mishandled by election officials.

Reform that will require States to maintain statewide, computerized registration lists to ensure the most accurate, up-to-date rolls and minimize the number of voters who are incorrectly removed from the voter rolls.

Reform that will reward States for retiring obsolete voting machines—especially the notorious punch cards machines and their dangling chads—that prompted this Congress to act in the first place.

Reform that will require voting systems to be accessible for individuals with disabilities, including nonvisual accessibility for the blind and visually impaired, and allow them to vote privately and independently.

Reform that allows voters to review and correct their ballots before they are cast.

Reform that does not weaken any existing voting rights laws, includes meaningful enforcement, and ensures that every vote counts.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is intended to ensure that we on the Conference Committee complete our work prior to October 1, 2002.

Given the extraordinary progress the Conference Committee has made in the past 14

days, there is no legitimate reason we cannot meet that deadline.

Indeed, given the larger context in which we operate, I would submit that this Congress has a moral obligation to enact election reform before we adjourn:

Mr. Speaker, over the last year this country has committed vast resources to ridding the world of those who would employ the tools of terror to destroy systems of government that derive their legitimacy from the ballot box.

In just the past few weeks we in Congress have been challenged to contemplate the use of overwhelming military might to bring to heel one of the great despots of the past 50 years, a figure whose utter contempt for democracy and the people he rules is the only reason he has held power for so long.

As we consider such profound measures to extend democracy where it does not now exist and strengthen it where it is fragile, we have an urgent responsibility to do the same at home.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this motion.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I wish to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, who has been steadfast in his support and building a rationale in this country for election reform. He did not need to be asked. He rose to the occasion. He worked extremely hard in this Congress. He held hands with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY). This has been a bipartisan push, and it has to happen.

It is very difficult for me to understand why it has not happened. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has laid out here a history of what has happened. I am a part of that history. I make history every day, and the people I represent make history because we are being misrepresented when the vote is not counted. We may go throughout the highways and byways of this country and get people to go to the polls and vote; but if their votes are not counted, it undermines a system which we are so proud of.

We are proud of this country. We know what it can do. We know what it has done. And we are saying over and over again we cannot accept the fact that many people, over 22,000 of them in Broward and Dade County, were overlooked, even more than that in Duvall County. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) has nightmares of what happened in Duvall County. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and I have nightmares of what happened in Dade and Broward. But now it is beginning to happen to all citizens.

Not many people got alarmed when it happened to the people I represent. I came to this Congress, and I talked about it. I represent those people who are underrepresented. But now it is beginning to happen to the American populace. It happened when Janet Reno ran for Governor in Florida. People who wanted to vote for her could not. People who thought they had voted for her had not.

It is extremely important, Mr. Speaker; and I again appeal to this Congress, with the conscience I know my colleagues have, to stand up for America and see that the conferees get their work done, get it done immediately, and report it and the President pass it. Otherwise, the talking is cheap. Only their confidence, only their good will, only action will prove that every vote will count.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3295, introduced by the gentlewoman from Florida, Mrs. MEEK.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Members of Conference Committee to convene a public meeting, finish their work on this legislation, and report it out.

It is time to have a final election reform bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. We've waited long enough.

For the past three weeks now, I have joined a number of Members at this podium and recounted how allegations of voter intimidation, inaccurate voter registration lists, arbitrary ballot counting standards and antiquated machinery deprived so many citizens of their right to vote during the 2000 election.

Just last week, we called for the House-Senate Conference Committee to complete their work by no later than October 1st.

Unfortunately, yet another week has come and gone, and still we have no election reform bill.

How can we go home to our Districts and look our constituents in the eye if we fail to enact legislation to protect this most sacred right, a right that is the cornerstone of our democracy?

Recent primary elections in Florida and elsewhere have only confirmed that the problems of the 2000 elections will still haunt us until we pass legislation to enact meaningful election reform standards. We in Congress have legislation almost within our grasp that will take giant strides to remedy the disenfranchisement of the last election.

We must pass this bill, and we must send it to the President for his signature before another day passes.

Now, it has taken a substantial amount of work to get us where we are today. I believe all Members of the Conference Committee deserve our gratitude for their work on this difficult issue.

I would also like to salute my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for fighting to make "every vote count".

But while I recognize these individuals for their hard work, I want to remind all of them that our work will be for naught if we fail to pass this legislation.

In just 34 days, Americans across the country will go to the polls to cast ballots for their elected representatives.

Congress must act immediately to ensure that every American has the right to vote and to have their vote counted. Time is running out for the 107th Congress.

We've come so close to compromise, and the price for not passing election reform is far too high. It's time to quit wasting time.

I call on the Conference Committee finish its hard work, convene a public meeting, and

come to an agreement before October 4, 2002. We cannot afford to let this opportunity slip away.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1406

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

H. Res. 543, de novo;

H. Res. 559, de novo;

Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3295, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD COMPLETE ACTION ON H.R. 4019, PERMANENT MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo on the resolution, House Resolution 543.