

invest in our infrastructure as an opportunity to slide back on our commitment to balancing the budget and giving the American people the fiscal responsibility that they deserve.

□ 2100

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

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

Mr. MINGE. 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 5 of rule I, further proceedings on the question of adoption of this motion to instruct conferees are postponed until after consideration of the motion to instruct to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1998, OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct House conferees on the bill (H.R. 2400) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2400, be instructed to limit the aggregate number of earmarked highway demonstration projects included in the conference report on H.R. 2400 to a number that does not exceed the aggregate number of such highway demonstration projects earmarked during the 42 years since the enactment of the Highway Trust Fund in 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXVIII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct the conferees on the highway bill now pending somewhere in this Capitol is an attempt to put some limits on the pork barrel spending in BESTEA by placing a ceiling on the total number of highway demonstration projects that can be included in the conference report.

It instructs the House conferees to make a great sacrifice and to limit the

number of highway demonstration projects to the total number of highway demonstration projects that have been approved in all of the previous four years combined since the establishment of the Highway Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, there were over 1,500 highway demonstration projects earmarked in the House version of BESTEA at a cost of about \$9 billion, and the number is growing.

Apparently, the conferees intend to keep all of the House demonstration projects and add an undetermined number of Senate projects into the total pot of \$9 billion for highway demonstration projects.

At 1,500 projects, that is nearly three times the number of projects included in the last surface transportation bill, and 10 times the number of projects in the 1987 reauthorization bill that President Reagan vetoed for going too far.

Mr. Speaker, in all of the years going back to the establishment of the Highway Trust Fund in 1956, Congress has earmarked some 1,022 highway demonstration projects, costing about \$10 billion according to information supplied by the Federal Highway Administration.

If this highway bill passes, which the conferees are intending to wrap up tonight, they will have earmarked in one year 50 percent more pork projects than the Congress passed in the previous 42 years combined.

Let me make it clear. I do not object to all highway demonstration projects. Some are perfectly reasonable. I think that some of the projects in this bill will be reasonable, but it is a question of balance. This bill sets a new record of excess.

I would simply note that, when our good friends on the Republican side of the aisle were trying to win control of this House 3 years ago, they spoke repeatedly about 40 years of excess and mismanagement by the Democratic majority. Often that phrase was used to deride Democrats for using the legislative process to earmark individual projects that may have helped a small number of people or a particular region of the country but could not be justified in the broader context of what was good for the entire country.

But now, the Republican leadership is evidently proposing in a single piece of legislation to earmark more projects than were earmarked by Democratic Congresses during that entire 40-year period. That is enough to give excess a bad name.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that my motion will merely trim about one-third of the demonstration projects included in BESTEA. I would observe that we know from previous experience with highway demonstration projects that, frequently, they languish in the pipeline and may never get built.

Just looking at the 538 demonstration projects approved in the 1991 ISTEA bill, we know that nearly 200 have not even begun construction; and

that has tied up nearly \$800 million in resources that cannot be reallocated to more pressing road and bridge projects. In all, over \$1½ billion in ISTEA funds earmarked for highway demonstration projects remain unobligated today.

In my view, the pork barrel spending spree in this bill is going to make Congress the laughing stock of America. This is one of those bills that will probably pass tomorrow, and it will not receive very much attention. But I would predict to you that, over the next 5 or 6 months, the press is going to dig into this bill, and they are going to find incredible laughing items. You will see on network news on a weekly basis this outrage or that joke funded by the bill. A lot of Members who vote against this motion tonight or who vote for the bill tomorrow will wish that they had not.

This is the time when you have a chance to correct the problem. Frankly, the motion that I am offering is so modest that I am almost embarrassed by it. I want to repeat once more. All this says is that you should not appropriate in this one year, or you should not authorize in this one year more projects than were previously funded in the entire 42-year history of the highway program. I really think that that is the minimum that we should ask the conferees to consider cutting. I would urge Members to adopt the motion.

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman. I have heard that occasionally when bills are introduced, presented on the floor, and they contain a large number of projects for individual Members around the country, that this can affect the acceptability of the legislation and perhaps lead to the passage of legislation that otherwise would be very difficult to pass. Has this problem come to your attention, and could you comment on that?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would certainly say that is true. Let me stipulate, I am not a "Percy Pureheart" on this issue. I think that there are times when it is just as legitimate for the Congress to specify that \$5 million will go for a specific highway project as it is for the administration to determine that that is where the money ought to go.

But I do believe that, when you have this number of projects, there is only one reason you have this many projects in the bill; and that is to pass a budget busting monster.

I did not vote for the budget that passed last year, because, as the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, I warned that this Congress would never live up to the cuts that they were promising in that proposal. I need go no further than this bill in order to demonstrate that that was the case.

I have had many a Member come up to me today and say, I would like to vote for you. In fact, I would like to speak for you. I had one Member say, do you see that? This is the chart that demonstrates the historical growth of the project. One Member said, you see this little item at the top of that red line? I am afraid that is my project.

So you are going to see a lot of folks vote for that bill tomorrow because they have gotten a tiny little bit for their district, and that will mean that they will vote for a product which will bust the budget and, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) says, wind up putting much more pressure on Social Security and other crucial problems that we have in this country.

So I would urge Members that this bill, in my view, cannot even pass the laugh test. If we still had the TV program *Laugh-In*, this would consume the entire show. I would hope that the Members would support the amendment and oppose the bill tomorrow if it does not comply with it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the previous motion, our majority whip had yielded our time back, and we did not reply in any way to that discussion. But I would like to take this opportunity to just point out one thing.

There was expressed great consternation on the minority side that the majority was going to agree to use CBO numbers in the scoring in this conference on the ISTEPA or BESTEPA bill, and that we allegedly closed the government down last year because the CBO scoring was not used, and then they expressed great consternation that now we are going to use OMB scoring.

I would simply say that, while I am not a member of the conference, I have discussed with Members who are, and it is my understanding that they agreed to use OMB numbers because, in the negotiations with the administration, and the administration's concerns, that the administration insisted that the OMB numbers be used; and that was the reason that they were.

Then as far as the budget, I would just say this, that this side, obviously, we are as committed today as we have always been to making sure that we maintain the balanced budget, that we try to pay off part of the Federal debt, that we try to give the American taxpayer some tax reduction, that we save Social Security, that we put Medicare on a sound footing.

Then I would make one other comment. I think that Congress does have a right to specify how some money is spent for highway projects. The State that I am from, Kentucky, the money goes down to the State, and, usually, the Governor and the transportation cabinet in that State make all the decisions.

So I do not think that we should apologize for directing where a small amount of this money will go, because needs have been brought to our attention. We appropriate the money, so we should have some say in how the money is spent.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman who just spoke approves of the grant to PBS that is in the highway bill? Let me simply say that I must say I find it hard not to chuckle at the observations made by my friend from Kentucky.

He indicates that the reason OMB scoring is used is because the administration wants it. If he is telling me that the reason that OMB scoring is being used is to accommodate the administration, I would say congratulations. This is the first time that side of the aisle has paid any deference to the administration this entire year. The rest of the time, they have been savaging them.

I would also simply say that I fully agree with the gentleman that the Congress has an absolute right to designate projects that it thinks are high priority.

My objection is not that there are projects in this bill. My objection is that there is such a gross number in the bill, that these projects are being used to drive a bill that otherwise would not pass, because this bill is a blatant budget buster.

This bill is going to spend at least \$10 billion more than we are allowed to spend under the budget which passed this Congress last year. That means that Congress will have two choices. It will either have to take that money out of some other program and, evidently, the conferees have decided to take a good piece of it out of veterans health care, which I object to, or else the conferees are going to simply use a different set of numbers to wiggle their way out of the budget and wind up enabling themselves to spend at least \$10 billion more than they will admit to spending publicly through their funny money estimates.

□ 2115

That is why I object to these projects.

I would also simply say that just because the administration supports or acquiesces in something, does not mean that I always will or that people on this side of the aisle always will. I do not care who engages in this process. In this instance it happens to be wrong.

The administration, it is clear to me, is acquiescing in this legislative outrage because they do not believe that they have the votes to sustain a veto, and that is because the bill has been structured so that virtually every State and every Member has a project that will drive them to support this bill.

This bill is not going to be a bill that is passed to meet the national interests of the country. It is going to be a bill that is passed to meet the political needs of the leadership in this House and Members individually in this House, and that is not the way we are supposed to deal with a major national responsibility.

I passionately support highway construction. I think we need more investment in it. But that is not my only priority. I do not put it ahead of veterans health care. I do not put highways ahead of education. I do not put highways ahead of health. Most of all, I do not put highways ahead of honest budgeting.

So that is the reason that I make this motion; not because I have a "Percy Pureheart" objection to Congress occasionally selecting a high priority project. It is because this is a blatant political power play to bust the budget, and Members ought not to swallow it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if my colleague from Kentucky would be willing to have a discussion. I appreciated his comments, trying to explain why Republicans might oppose the very principle tonight that they were willing to shut down the government for three years ago. I would be willing to hear from the gentleman from Kentucky once again.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of veterans in my district who did not get compensation and pension checks, service-connected veterans who did not have their cases processed because Republicans said in these statements I have before me, made on the floor of this House, that we are willing to shut down the government basically to stand up for this principle of using CBO numbers.

I would like to be able to go back and explain to them tomorrow why the principle that the Republican Party used to shut down the government and cut off veterans' checks, to basically lay off Federal employees, to put their financial health at risk, why the principle that was so important three years ago in fighting for is not worth fighting for, or even, frankly, coming to the floor of the House to even discuss tonight? I would be glad to yield some time to the gentleman to answer.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman that the President is the one that vetoed those bills, and because of that funding ran out. As I said earlier in these discussions, in the conference regarding this very complicated, complex bill, that was one of the areas that I understand our side gave in on, to use the OMB numbers, in an effort to be amicable in this situation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in response I would say I think the American people made it very clear who they held responsible for shutting down the government, and it was not the President they held responsible, it was the Republican majority in this House. Criticism even came from Republican Members in another body in this town of that.

But I guess the answer that I still do not have this evening is why Republicans were willing to hurt veterans, willing to hurt people on Social Security, willing to lay off Federal employees to the tune of hurting millions of American families just three years ago over this principle of honesty in budgeting, and yet tonight we hear that there will be total acquiescence to the President. What happened to the commitment to principle?

Perhaps, frankly, I better understand now why the Republican core base in this country is beginning to have some second guesses about supporting the majority it thought it was electing, committed to certain principles that we find tonight it is very conveniently ignoring in the name of spending more money or cutting more funding out of veterans' health care, perhaps.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I really find it incredible that the conferees are going to be bringing back a bill tomorrow which ignores virtually everything that has been promised to the country on this bill over the last month.

We had a motion last night, which this House adopted unanimously, asking the conferees not to cut veterans' health care in order to pay for highway projects. Yet the conferees will be reporting back a bill which ignores that instruction.

We will soon be leaving for our Memorial Day recess. I wonder how many Members of this House are going to go home and rub shoulders with their veterans and pose for political holy pictures with their veterans organizations, one day after they have voted "yes" to pork and "no" to veterans? And yet that is what is going to happen, I would predict.

I hope that the American people are watching, and I hope that they will understand what is being done. To me, it would be an act of consummate arrogance for the conferees to do that, but I expect that is exactly what they will do tomorrow.

The best we can do is to try to urge them through motions like this not to do it, which is why the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and I are both here tonight.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. 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.

Without objection, any electronic vote on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) will be conducted as a 5 minute vote, if conducted immediately following this 15 minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 77, nays 332, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—77

Archer	Hoekstra	Porter
Ballenger	Inglis	Portman
Barrett (WI)	Istook	Rangel
Barton	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Bilbray	Jones	Royce
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Salmon
Campbell	Kasich	Sanford
Castle	Kind (WI)	Sawyer
Chabot	Kleczyka	Scarborough
Christensen	Klug	Schaffer, Bob
Coburn	Kolbe	Schumer
Condit	Largent	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Leach	Sessions
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Shadegg
Cubin	Maloney (NY)	Shays
Edwards	McCollum	Sisisky
Eshoo	Meehan	Souder
Gibbons	Meek (FL)	Stearns
Goss	Miller (FL)	Stenholm
Graham	Minge	Stump
Hall (TX)	Morella	Thornberry
Hastings (FL)	Myrick	Vento
Hayworth	Nethercutt	Waters
Hill	Neumann	Wexler
Hilleary	Obey	Wolf
Hobson	Pastor	

NAYS—332

Abercrombie	Callahan	Doolittle
Ackerman	Calvert	Doyle
Aderholt	Camp	Dreier
Allen	Canady	Duncan
Andrews	Cannon	Dunn
Armey	Capps	Ehlers
Bachus	Cardin	Ehrlich
Baesler	Carson	Emerson
Baker	Chambliss	Engel
Baldacci	Chenoweth	English
Barcia	Clay	Ensign
Barr	Clayton	Etheridge
Barrett (NE)	Clement	Evans
Bartlett	Clyburn	Everett
Bass	Coble	Ewing
Becerra	Collins	Farr
Bentsen	Combest	Fattah
Bereuter	Conyers	Fawell
Berry	Cook	Fazio
Bilirakis	Cooksey	Filner
Bishop	Costello	Forbes
Blagojevich	Coyne	Ford
Bliley	Cramer	Fossella
Blumenauer	Crapo	Fowler
Blunt	Cummings	Fox
Boehlert	Cunningham	Frank (MA)
Boehner	Danner	Franks (NJ)
Bonilla	Davis (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Bonior	Davis (IL)	Frost
Bono	Davis (VA)	Furse
Borski	Deal	Galleghy
Boswell	DeFazio	Ganske
Boucher	DeGette	Gejdenson
Boyd	Delahunt	Gekas
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Gephardt
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Gilchrest
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gillmor
Brown (FL)	Dickey	Gilman
Bryant	Dicks	Goode
Bunning	Dingell	Goodlatte
Burr	Dixon	Goodling
Burton	Doggett	Gordon
Buyer	Dooley	Granger

Green	Matsui	Roukema
Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)	Royal-Allard
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Gutknecht	McDermott	Ryun
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Sabo
Hamilton	McHale	Sanchez
Hansen	McHugh	Sanders
Hastert	McInnis	Sandlin
Hastings (WA)	McIntosh	Saxton
Hefley	McIntyre	Schaefer, Dan
Hefner	McKeon	Scott
Herger	McKinney	Serrano
Hilliard	McNulty	Shaw
Hinchey	Menendez	Sherman
Hinojosa	Metcalf	Shimkus
Holden	Mica	Shuster
Hooley	Millender-	Skeen
Horn	McDonald	Skelton
Hostettler	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Houghton	Mink	Smith (MI)
Hoyer	Moakley	Smith (NJ)
Hulshof	Mollohan	Smith (OR)
Hunter	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
Hutchinson	Murtha	Smith, Adam
Hyde	Nadler	Smith, Linda
Jackson (IL)	Neal	Snowbarger
Jackson-Lee	Northup	Snyder
(TX)	Norwood	Solomon
Jefferson	Nussle	Spence
Jenkins	Oberstar	Spratt
John	Olver	Stabenow
Johnson (WI)	Ortiz	Stokes
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Strickland
Kanjorski	Oxley	Stupak
Kelly	Packard	Sununu
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Talent
Kennedy (RI)	Pappas	Tanner
Kennelly	Pascrell	Tauscher
Kildee	Paul	Tauzin
Kilpatrick	Paxon	Taylor (MS)
Kim	Payne	Thomas
King (NY)	Pease	Thompson
Kingston	Pelosi	Thune
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Thurman
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Kucinich	Petri	Tierney
LaFalce	Pickering	Trafficant
LaHood	Pickett	Turner
Lampson	Pitts	Upton
Lantos	Pombo	Velazquez
Latham	Pomeroy	Visclosky
LaTourrette	Poshard	Walsh
Lazio	Price (NC)	Wamp
Lee	Pryce (OH)	Watkins
Levin	Radanovich	Watt (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Rahall	Watts (OK)
Lewis (KY)	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Linder	Redmond	Weldon (PA)
Lipinski	Regula	Weller
Livingston	Reyes	Weygand
LoBiondo	Riggs	White
Lowe	Riley	Whitfield
Lucas	Rivers	Wise
Luther	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Maloney (CT)	Roemer	Wynn
Manton	Rogan	Young (AK)
Markey	Rogers	Young (FL)
Martinez	Ros-Lehtinen	
Mascara	Rothman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lofgren

NOT VOTING—23

Bateman	McCrery	Stark
Berman	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Deutsch	Meeks (NY)	Torres
Foley	Moran (VA)	Towns
Gonzalez	Ney	Waxman
Harman	Parker	Wicker
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Yates
Manzullo	Skaggs	

□ 2143

Messrs. SKEEN, SMITH of New Jersey, SHAW, ROTHMAN, DOOLEY of California, HILLIARD, ANDREWS, BISHOP, POMEROY, RUSH, HEFNER, GEJDENSON, MILLER of California and PAYNE, and Ms. DANNER, Mrs. THURMAN and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, JONES, KOLBE, STUMP, HILLEARY and GIBBONS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2145

MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1998, OFFERED BY MR. MINGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 2400) offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The Clerk will designate the motion to instruct.

The Clerk designated the motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 251, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—156

Andrews	DeGette	Kennelly
Archer	Doggett	Kind (WI)
Baker	Dooley	Kingston
Ballenger	Dreier	Klecicka
Barr	Edwards	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	LaFalce
Barrett (WI)	Emerson	Lantos
Bartlett	Ensign	Largent
Barton	Eshoo	LaTourrette
Bentsen	Etheridge	Leach
Bilbray	Evans	Levin
Boyd	Everett	Lewis (GA)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Lofgren
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Lucas
Burr	Fox	Luther
Campbell	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)
Canady	Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)
Cannon	Goss	McCollum
Cardin	Graham	McDermott
Carson	Hall (TX)	McIntosh
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Chabot	Hayworth	McKinney
Chenoweth	Hefner	Meehan
Christensen	Heger	Mica
Clayton	Hill	Miller (FL)
Coble	Hilleary	Minge
Coburn	Hobson	Morella
Combest	Hoekstra	Myrick
Condit	Hoolley	Nethercutt
Costello	Hoyer	Neumann
Cox	Hulshof	Norwood
Crane	Hunter	Nussle
Crapo	Hutchinson	Obey
Cubin	Inglis	Paul
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Pickett
Davis (FL)	Jones	Pomeroy
Davis (VA)	Kasich	Porter
Deal	Kennedy (RI)	Portman

Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough

Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns

Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Thurman
Turner
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Wexler
Weygand
Wolf

White
Wise
Peterson (MN)

Woolsey
Wynn
Sabó
McCrery
McDade
Meeks (NY)
Moran (VA)
Ney
Parker
Quinn
Skaggs

Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Stark
Taylor (NC)
Torres
Towns
Waxman
Whitfield
Wicker
Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

NOT VOTING—24

NOES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Chambliss
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doollittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Engel
English
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson

Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinche
Hinojosa
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowe
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)

Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Serrano
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stabenow
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traffant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

□ 2153

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Messrs. BISHOP, GEJDENSON, MILLER of California, and ROTHMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROGAN, SPRATT, FOX of Pennsylvania, and EVERETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 119, PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING, AND H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 442 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 442

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit campaign spending. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative DeLay of Texas or his designee and a Member in favor of the joint resolution. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. During consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Chairman of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 or rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of