

the floor of the House. That is to ensure that we do the kind of work that translates to our constituents.

I think there are 51 pages of politically motivated investigatory activities. They have already spent \$8 million, and now in the appropriations bill we do not know how much more, and neither of the committees have brought about any results.

I would think we would do well to pass this amendment dealing with the recycling, to pass the amendment dealing with the issue of the bus passes, and spend more of our dollars enhancing the constituency services of our offices.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule which would prohibit use of funds from the reserve fund after October 1, 1998. The amendment would allow, however, the payment of obligations legitimately incurred before the October 1 deadline.

The effect of the amendment would be a return to paying for unexpected costs through an expense resolution approved by a vote of the House, as we have in past Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the text of the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

“SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in Section 3 of this resolution. The amendment may be offered only by Representative Hoyer of Maryland or his designee, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be debatable for 30 minutes.

SEC. 3. The amendment described in Section 2 is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 311. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for payments from the reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees pursuant to clause 5(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, or to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the House of Representatives who certifies, approves, or processes any disbursement of funds from any such fund pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Oversight on or after October 1, 1998.”

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.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I urge that the previous question be defeated, and that we have the opportunity to offer the Hoyer amendment as part of this rule.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleagues that while this rule is structured, the amendments it makes in order are Democratic amendments.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that funding for the legislative branch has been pared down significantly over 4 years, resulting in a 15 percent downsizing. The underlying legislation is bipartisan, and we should congratulate this subcommittee for

their hard work by adopting this rule and moving on to debate the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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. 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 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this resolution will be postponed until later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put the question on the resolutions on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Resolution 491, House Resolution 485, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 489, and adoption of House Resolution 489.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY STRICT WORK PERIOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 491, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 188, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]  
YEAS—225

Aderholt	Ballenger	Bass
Archer	Barr	Bateman
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Bachus	Bartlett	Bilbray
Baker	Barton	Bilirakis

Bliley Hansen  
Blunt Hastert  
Boehler Hastings (WA)  
Boehner Hayworth  
Bonilla Hefley  
Bono Herger  
Bryant Hill  
Bunning Hilleary  
Burr Hobson  
Burton Hoekstra  
Buyer Horn  
Callahan Hostettler  
Calvert Houghton  
Camp Hunter  
Campbell Hyde  
Canady Inglis  
Cannon Istook  
Castle Jackson (IL)  
Chabot Jenkins  
Chambliss Johnson (CT)  
Christensen Johnson, Sam  
Coble Jones  
Coburn Kasich  
Collins Kelly  
Combest Kim  
Cook King (NY)  
Cox Kingston  
Crane Klug  
Cubin Knollenberg  
Cunningham Kolbe  
Davis (VA) LaHood  
Deal Largent  
DeLay Latham  
Diaz-Balart LaTourette  
Dickey Lazio  
Dixon Leach  
Doolittle Lewis (CA)  
Dreier Lewis (KY)  
Duncan Linder  
Dunn Lipinski  
Ehlers Livingston  
Ehrlich LoBiondo  
Emerson Lucas  
English Manzullo  
Ensign McCollum  
Everett McCrery  
Ewing McHugh  
Fawell McInnis  
Foley McIntosh  
Forbes McKeon  
Fossella Metcalf  
Fowler Mica  
Fox Miller (FL)  
Franks (NJ) Moran (KS)  
Frelinghuysen Morella  
Gallegly Myrick  
Ganske Nethercutt  
Gekas Neumann  
Gibbons Ney  
Gilchrest Northup  
Gillmor Norwood  
Gilman Nussle  
Goodlatte Oxley  
Goodling Packard  
Goss Pappas  
Graham Parker  
Granger Paul  
Greenwood Paxon  
Gutknecht Pease  
Hall (OH) Peterson (PA)

## NAYS—188

Abercrombie Clayton  
Ackerman Clement  
Allen Clyburn  
Andrews Condit  
Baesler Conyers  
Baldacci Costello  
Barcia Coyne  
Barrett (WI) Cramer  
Becerra Cummings  
Bentsen Danner  
Berman Davis (FL)  
Berry Davis (IL)  
Bishop DeFazio  
Blagojevich DeGette  
Blumenauer Delahunt  
Bonior DeLauro  
Borski Deutsch  
Boswell Dicks  
Boucher Doggett  
Boyd Dooley  
Brady (PA) Doyle  
Brown (FL) Edwards  
Brown (OH) Engel  
Capps Eshoo  
Cardin Etheridge  
Carson Evans  
Clay Farr

Petri Johnson, E. B.  
Pickering Kanjorski  
Pitts Kaptur  
Pombo Kennedy (MA)  
Porter Kennedy (RI)  
Portman Kennelly  
Pryce (OH) Kildee  
Quinn Kilpatrick  
Radanovich Kind (WI)  
Ramstad Kleczka  
Redmond Klink  
Regula Kucinich  
Riggs LaFalce  
Riley Lantos  
Rogan Lee  
Rogers Levin  
Rohrabacher Lofgren  
Ros-Lehtinen Lowey  
Roukema Luther  
Royce Maloney (CT)  
Ryun Maloney (NY)  
Salmon Manton  
Sanford Martinez  
Saxton Mascara  
Scarborough Matsui  
Schaefer, Dan McCarthy (MO)  
Schaffer, Bob McCarthy (NY)  
Sensenbrenner McDermott  
Sessions McGovern  
Shadegg McHale  
Shaw McIntyre  
Shays McKinney  
Shimkus McNulty  
Shuster Meehan  
Skeen Meek (FL)  
Smith (MI) Meeks (NY)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Traficant  
Upton  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Menendez Sawyer  
Miller (CA) Schumer  
Minge Scott  
Mink Serrano  
Mollohan Sherman  
Moran (VA) Sisisky  
Murtha Skaggs  
Nadler Skelton  
Neal Slaughter  
Oberstar Smith, Adam  
Obey Snyder  
Olver Spratt  
Ortiz Stabenow  
Owens Stark  
Pallone Stenholm  
Pascrell Stokes  
Pastor Strickland  
Payne Stupak  
Pelosi Tanner  
Peterson (MN) Tauscher  
Pickett Taylor (MS)  
Pomeroy Thompson  
Poshard Thurman  
Price (NC) Tierney  
Rahall Torres  
Rangel Towns  
Rivers Velazquez  
Rodriguez Vento  
Roemer Visclosky  
Rothman Watt (NC)  
Roybal-Allard Waxman  
Rush Wexler  
Sabo Weygand  
Sanchez Wise  
Sanders Woolsey  
Sandlin Wynn

## NOT VOTING—20

Brady (TX) Hamilton  
Brown (CA) Hinojosa  
Chenoweth Hulshof  
Cooksey Hutchinson  
Crapo Lampson  
Dingell Lewis (GA)  
Gonzalez Markey

## □ 1328

Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CARSON and Messrs. STARK, CUMMINGS, JEFFERSON, HALL of Texas, CLAY, BARCIA and PASCRELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## □ 1330

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM JUNE 25, 1998, TO JULY 14, 1998, AND FOR RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM JUNE 26, JUNE 27, OR JUNE 28, 1998, TO JULY 6, 1998

Mr. GOSS. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 297) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 297

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 25, 1998, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 14, 1998, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, June 26, 1998, Saturday, June 27, 1998, or Sunday, June 28, 1998, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent

resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 6, 1998, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent 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 the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on adoption of the remaining resolutions on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4104, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 485, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is the resolution.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 125, noes 291, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

## AYES—125

Ackerman	Castle	Edwards
Archer	Clay	Ehrlich
Armey	Clayton	Engel
Baldacci	Coburn	Eshoo
Barton	Conyers	Fawell
Bass	Crapo	Foley
Berman	Danner	Fowler
Bilbray	Davis (IL)	Fox
Blagojevich	Davis (VA)	Franks (NJ)
Bliley	DeGette	Frelinghuysen
Boehler	Delahunt	Furse
Bonilla	DeLay	Gejdenson
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Gilchrest
Brown (FL)	Dixon	Gilman
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Goss
Campbell	Dooley	Granger
Cardin	Dreier	Greenwood
Carson	Dunn	Harman