

Graham	Martinez	Salmon
Green	Martini	Sanders
Greenwood	Mascara	Sanford
Gunderson	Matsui	Sawyer
Gutierrez	McCarthy	Saxton
Gutknecht	McCollum	Scarborough
Hall (OH)	McCrery	Schaefer
Hall (TX)	McDade	Schiff
Hamilton	McDermott	Schroeder
Hancock	McHale	Schumer
Hansen	McHugh	Scott
Harman	McInnis	Seastrand
Hastert	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Serrano
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Shadegg
Hayes	McNulty	Shaw
Hayworth	Meehan	Shays
Hefley	Meek	Shuster
Hefner	Menendez	Sisisky
Heineman	Metcalf	Skaggs
Herger	Meyers	Skeen
Hilleary	Mfume	Skelton
Hilliard	Mica	Slaughter
Hinchey	Miller (CA)	Smith (MI)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hoekstra	Minge	Smith (TX)
Hoke	Mink	Smith (WA)
Holden	Moakley	Solomon
Horn	Molinari	Souder
Hostettler	Mollohan	Spence
Houghton	Montgomery	Spratt
Hoyer	Moorhead	Stark
Hunter	Moran	Stearns
Hutchinson	Morella	Stenholm
Hyde	Myrick	Stockman
Inglis	Nadler	Stokes
Istook	Neal	Studds
Jackson-Lee	Nethercutt	Stump
Jacobs	Neumann	Stupak
Jefferson	Ney	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Tanner
Johnson (SD)	Nussle	Tate
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Tauzin
Johnson, Sam	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Johnston	Oliver	Taylor (NC)
Jones	Ortiz	Tejeda
Kanjorski	Orton	Thomas
Kaptur	Owens	Thompson
Kasich	Oxley	Thornberry
Kelly	Packard	Thornton
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Thurman
Kennedy (RI)	Parker	Tiahrt
Kennelly	Pastor	Torkildsen
Kildee	Paxon	Torres
Kim	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli
Kingston	Payne (VA)	Traficant
Kleccka	Pelosi	Upton
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Velazquez
Klug	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Knollenberg	Petri	Visclosky
Kolbe	Pickett	Volkmer
LaFalce	Pombo	Vucanovich
LaHood	Pomeroy	Waldholtz
Lantos	Porter	Walker
Largent	Portman	Walsh
Latham	Poshard	Wamp
LaTourette	Pryce	Ward
Laughlin	Quillen	Waters
Lazio	Quinn	Watt (NC)
Leach	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Levin	Rahall	Waxman
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (KY)	Reed	Weller
Lightfoot	Regula	White
Lincoln	Richardson	Whitfield
Linder	Riggs	Wicker
Lipinski	Rivers	Wilson
Livingston	Roberts	Wise
LoBiondo	Roemer	Wolf
Lofgren	Rogers	Woolsey
Longley	Rohrabacher	Wyden
Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lucas	Rose	Yates
Luther	Roth	Young (AK)
Maloney	Roukema	Young (FL)
Manton	Roybal-Allard	Zeliff
Manzullo	Royce	Zimmer
Markey	Rush	

NOES—6

Fattah	King	Towns
Goodling	Myers	Williams

NOT VOTING—4

Fields (LA)	Sabo
Murtha	Tucker

□ 1919

So, the resolution, as amended was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2564, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 269 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 269

Resolved, That at any time after the 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 bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill of failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. If H.R. 2564 is passed by the House in a form that is identical to S. 1060, as passed by the Senate, then at any time thereafter it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider the Senate bill in the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Senate bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution (H. Res. 269) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal

Government, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, with this rule, the House begins important discussions of reform that will, I hope, assist in restoring the public confidence in this institution and its practices. With this rule we embark on the first of the triumvirate of issues that concern Americans most about the mechanics of how this democracy functions: Lobby reform, gift reform and campaign finance reform. Beginning now with lobby reform, we will work to rewrite an outdated, inadequate and exceedingly vague series of rules pertaining to registered lobbyists and, specifically, public disclosure of their activities.

I am generally an ardent supporter of open rules, and today I bring to the House an open rule for consideration of this lobby reform bill—a rule that should have the support of all members. I should note, however, that in this special case, I have some reservations about what will happen if amendments are adopted to this bill. The reason for my concern is that this issue—lobby reform—has been bottled up in the Congress for years. This year, we have a real chance to break the logjam and send a good bill to the President for signature. The other body has already passed the identical measure we begin with today—and if the House passes the same bill without amendment, the measure could head straight to the White House without further delay. In my view, that would be the optimal result. Although I believe very strongly in the merit of several of the amendments members will hear today—most notably a proposal to restrict lobbying with taxpayer funds by executive branch officials and a proposal to restrict lobbying by organizations that are taxpayer-funded through grants—I intend to vote against all amendments to this bill because of my overriding belief that we've got to get the essence of lobby reform passed and signed into law now. I have learned from past efforts on this and other difficult subjects that, if you load up these bills with new ideas, late in the process, you become spoilers of the good in pursuit of the perfect. I hope my colleagues will consider that as they cast their votes today.

Mr. Speaker, that being said, Members should know that this is a wide open rule, providing that any Member may offer an amendment to H.R. 2564 if that amendment conforms to the standing rules of the House. The rule provides two hours of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule waives clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI—the 3-day lay-over rule—against consideration of the bill and it waives all points of order

against two amendments printed in the Rules Committee report.

Mr. Speaker, those amendments—one offered by Mr. MCINTOSH and the other offered by Mr. ISTOOK—pertain to disclosure by non-profit organizations that lobby and restrictions on the lobbying activities of federal grantees. It is my understanding that the sponsors of these amendments have received some conflicting advice from the Parliamentarian as to whether or not waivers are actually necessary. However, given the great interest among members in these issues, the majority on the rules committee felt that we should provide these waivers just to be sure. The rule further provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions and a procedure to allow for a hook-up with the bill from the other body, should the house pass H.R. 2564 without amendment. Finally, if that hook-up happens, the rule provides one motion to recommit for the bill from the other body.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me commend my colleague from Florida, Mr. CANADY, for his hard work on this subject—and for his efforts to reach across party lines and make this a truly bipartisan effort. I think most members are agreed that lobby reform is not—and should not be—a partisan issue, and it is my hope that we will act with dispatch today to get this matter onto the President's desk. Support this rule and the bill.

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

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

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Florida, Mr. GOSS, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Resolution 269 is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 2564, a bill which strengthens reporting requirements for lobbyists who contact executive and legislative branch officials and their staff.

As my colleague from Florida has described, this rule provides 2 hours of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Under this rule, amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, the normal amending process in the House. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, will have the opportunity to offer amendments.

The rule waives all points of order against two amendments. One, by Mr. ISTOOK, would restrict lobbying activities of organizations that receive Federal grants. This amendment is similar to other recent Istook amendments that have been attached to appropriations bills.

The second amendment which receives a waiver is by Mr. MCINTOSH. This amendment establishes new and detailed reporting requirements for nonprofit organizations that lobby Federal, State, or local governments.

The bill is a fair proposal that will give the American people more information about the influences of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect rule. I am disappointed that Rules Committee waived points of order against the two amendments. I believe that these two amendments should be subject to the same requirement for germaneness that all other amendments must meet.

During committee, Mr. MOAKLEY made a motion to strike the waiver for these two floor amendments. Mr. MOAKLEY'S motion was defeated along nearly a straight party line vote.

However, it is better to be inclusive than too restrictive. Therefore, I urge adoption of this open rule which will permit full debate on this bill and allow Members an opportunity to offer amendments.

□ 1930

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], an extremely valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Sanibel, Florida, Mr. GOSS, in supporting this wide-open rule providing for the consideration of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. Requiring greater disclosure of lobbying activities in Congress on the executive branch is one of the most important elements of our bipartisan reform agenda, and I congratulate my chairman and colleagues on the Committee on Rules for bringing this bill to the floor under an open amendment process.

I also want to congratulate our leadership for allowing the House to consider lobby reform legislation while we are working very hard to resolve differences over the budget and annual appropriations process. It should be very clear to the American people and to the guardians of the status quo that this Congress is firmly committed to changing the institution.

Under the terms of this fair resolution, any Member can be heard on any germane amendment to the bill at the appropriate time. Almost all of the amendments we discussed in the Committee on Rules yesterday appeared to be germane to this debate and can be offered while the bill is open to amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 40 years of being in the minority and having very little control over the agenda, Republicans in the House are understandably anxious to press ahead with our agenda. Last year the Republican freshman class put together a bold comprehen-

sive list of congressional reforms, and, despite being in the minority at that time, we were successful in many of our commonsense proposals. This year sophomore Members, as we are, together with the very active reform minded freshman class and with the help of many of our Democratic colleagues we have continued to fight for real change and reform.

As our colleagues will recall, in the first day of the new Congress the House passed a sweeping set of reforms that included everything from banning proxy voting, cutting committee staffs and overhauling the committee system. Following that, we had the first-ever vote on congressional term limits. We passed two very important budget process reform items, a balanced budget constitutional amendment and a workable line-item veto proposal. Today we are about to add to our list of promises kept by passing legislation which requires the full disclosure of efforts by paid lobbyists to influence the decisionmaking process of both executive and legislative branches of government.

Disclosing the activities of those who want to influence the Federal Government is simply a public right-to-know issue. Our constituents want nothing more than to know who is getting paid to lobby their elected Members, how much they are receiving in compensation and who the clients are.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of bipartisan work has gone into crafting this bill. The fact that the Committee on the Judiciary reported it by an overwhelming vote of 30 to zero reflects strong support on both sides of the aisle for enacting meaningful lobby reform this year.

We should not miss the opportunity to give the American people what they want, what they deserve and what they are entitled to. That is more openness and accountability in government. Together with the new gift restrictions that the House overwhelmingly adopted bipartisanly today, this legislation will help reassure the American people that their leaders in Congress are getting the job done without undue influence from special interests.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that all of us here would like to improve public confidence in government and their elected officials and representatives. The bill soon to come before us will give us the opportunity to do just that by increasing Congress's accountability to the people that we serve. I urge my colleagues to adopt this fair and open rule and pass this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority party for bringing the issue. I also want to say that, when we are talking about lobbying, the issue that I would like to

address are the foreign lobbyists that lobby our Government on behalf of foreign interests. This issue has been covered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 which was promulgated initially to deal with undercover spy operations of Nazi propaganda. Since then, this has changed, folks. Now we have very slick operators who represent trade, industrial and competitive issues. They have been able to avoid the registration, and the law is so archaic, it will not bring it around.

This bill, and I want to give credit to the chairman, does address some of those issues. But it does not go far enough. I give a lot of credit to it, but I am hearing, we are for this, Jim, we are for it for 4 years but not now.

Let me say this. Right now the penalties are so great under this provision, it is like taking a bazooka to kill a gnat, a flea. As a result, the Department of Justice is not pursuing cases where people, literally, do not register. We have had GAO report after GAO report saying that we are just not getting individuals to file and identify themselves. The Traficant bill in essence takes the Foreign Agents Registration Act and technically changes it to the Foreign Interest Registration Act. There are no exemptions. If you represent the interests of a trade issue, you represent a commercial issue, you must register.

The GAO said out of 3,000 possible who should register in their last report, only 775 did register. The Traficant amendment brings about common sense civil penalties for minor infractions. the penalty could be as low as \$2,000 for failure to in fact register. But for serious violations and other complications, the Department of Justice can throw the book at them.

We have been offering these exemptions. Let me say this to the majority party. You want to do something about lobbying. Democrats have supported you, but let me tell you what you are doing. If you do not come down tough on those high-powered people that lobby our Government on behalf of foreign governments, we will have failed with the integrity of this particular legislative initiative.

I am asking that my colleagues review my amendment. The leaders are saying, we do not want to complicate this, and the other body, we do not want to get it beat. We like your stuff. If other amendments pass to this bill, this bill is going to carry some different changes. The Traficant amendment should be incorporated without a fight because, my colleagues, we have allowed some powerful lobbyists to influence legislative and government decisions, and they do not even, have not even been registering under our law.

So with that, I would appreciate that any Member who wants information on this to contact my office.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the gentleman from Ohio needed a waiver or not. I think in an open rule he would be able to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank the majority leader for scheduling a vote on this very important bill of lobby disclosure and to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the other members of the Committee on Rules for having an open vote.

I am hoping at the end that this bill will remain as it is, unamended and sent directly to the President instead of sent to the Senate where it could likely die. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for keeping this bill clean in subcommittee and in the full committee.

I just want to weigh in as strongly as I can that lobby disclosure has basically not changed since the late 1940s. In 1946 we passed a lobby disclosure bill. The courts basically gutted that law in the early 1950s. We have, it is estimated, 40- to 60,000 lobbyists in Washington. Only about 4,000 or so are registered. This bill is necessary. The President supports it. The President deserves for us to send it to him rather than back to the Senate. I am hopeful that the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, if there are logical amendments to this bill, are able to hold hearings on those amendments but not incorporate them in this bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As we did in the last Congress, he and I worked together, and we have achieved some reform, and I believe we will go to achieve it now. I have spoken to the chairman of the subcommittee. I wish things were different and that we had more confidence that, if we sent something back to the other body, it would not just sink into the La Brea tar pits. But given the experience, I am committed and I know more importantly the people, the chairman of subcommittee is committed. There will be a number of amendments offered that many of us will think well of, and it will be our intention I hope to bring out a second bill. But we would like to keep this one free of amendment because that is the difference between simply sending it back to the Senate and having no hope of sending it for signature.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Connecticut is saying, I think we have agreement, those of us who have worked on this, we, many of us plan to vote against all amendments, even

some that in other contexts we would favor because we want to get a bill to the President. That will then leave us, I think, with the job of having another round of hearings and markup and send a second bill over there.

We do not want to jeopardize this bill. That is why many of us who have been working on this with all of the Perils of Pauline we have been through, we have a chance now to send the lobbying bill to become law before the end of year, and then we will start on the second round.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for the incredible work he did on congressional accountability when he was in the majority and also when he was in the minority. We can work on a bipartisan basis, I think, to pass this bill unamended and then to work for logical reform.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I agree with him; we can work on a bipartisan basis. It is just not as much fun.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, it may not be as much fun, but it certainly is more productive. I for one welcome the bipartisan spirit that I am confident will surround this debate.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2564, the Lobbying Disclosure Act. My words in many ways will echo the bipartisan comments previously made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE].

Last January I stood at this very microphone and fought with my colleague on behalf of the Congressional Accountability Act when the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. SHAYS] and I and others said that it was time that Members of Congress should be covered by the same laws that govern all other American citizens. Today's effort on behalf of 2564 is very much in that tradition.

Let me first of all indicate, Mr. Speaker, the quality of the current law. The current lobbying disclosure legislation originally passed in 1946 as noted by my friend, Mr. SHAYS, is in my view totally inadequate. The current law is a piece of legislative Swiss cheese with more holes than substance. Again it has been noted briefly a couple of moments ago out of some 14,000 Washington lobbyists, only 4,000 have been required to register under the provisions of existing law, law that is woefully inadequate to the task at hand. Some 50 years after its enactment, we can do better.

The legislative history of H.R. 2564 is straightforward. The language we are

considering today, if we are wise enough not to amend it, is identical to language that passed in the Senate on July 25 in an overwhelming unanimous bipartisan vote, 98 to 0. If we pass language today without amendment, the bill will go straight to the President's desk, and after 50 years of inadequacy on the subject of lobbying disclosure, we will finally have a law that measures up to the task.

The bill covers paid professional lobbyists, those who spend 20 percent or more of their time lobbying and are paid more than \$5,000 during a 6-month period. It requires the semiannual report. Documents are to be filed with the Clerk of House and the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for full public inspection. Grassroots lobbying activities are protected as they are under the Constitution, and we do not infringe upon those activities in any way.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me once again emphasize, this is the type of bipartisan action the American people have requested. Today's legislation reflects great credit on the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

I urge an affirmative vote on the rule and the defeat of all amendments.

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

Mr. McHALE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman. He introduced this bill identical to what the Senate did and then incorporated his bill and the committee bill. I just want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and to say that it has been a pleasure to work with him as well. I am sorry I left him out of my salutes because he deserves to be on the very top.

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, I would note that the quality of the bill was much improved when the name of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] was moved to the front.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of wealthy special interests peddling influence through the halls of Congress. We need to change the way Washington works, and we need to do it now.

□ 1945

For too long, Congress has been held hostage by lobbyists trying to force their special interest agendas on the American public. And too often, they are successful.

H.R. 2564 is the first truly comprehensive lobbying reform bill in almost 50 years. This bill will let the American people know who the lobbyists are and how much they are spending to influence Members of Congress.

The Senate passed this important bill unanimously. We don't need to change it. We need to pass it and send it to the President right away. Let us not delay this much needed reform any longer.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore faith in American Government. Vote for honest government. Vote for this bill and vote for it without amendment.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, contrary to published reports in the local newspaper this morning, will support this rule. I would add parenthetically that I have received an apology from the newspaper for making a mistake, and that started my day in a very pleasant way, but people have been asking me why I would not support this rule. I am supporting this rule. I urge others to do the same.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTPONING VOTES AND LIMITING DEBATE TIME ON AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2564, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2564 pursuant to House Resolution 269 the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes; and further, that debate on each amendment to the bill and any amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment to the bill and an opponent.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not expect that I will object, but I just want to inquire of the gentleman if it is further his understanding that agreement has been reached informally with the proponents of certain of the amendments that have been noticed on this bill that they will not come up tonight, namely the amendment protected by the rule offered by the gentleman from

Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the amendment protected in the rule to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], and two other amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] dealing with the same general subject?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] have both agreed that those amendments would not be brought before the House this evening.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Let me give the gentleman further assurance. It is my guess that there being a significant majority of Members left that have any brains, that within about 20 minutes after this unanimous-consent request there will not be any Members left in this place. Therefore any amendment that is offered would be at the suffrage of people who did not want to suggest the quorum problem, so I would assure my friend, if there was any problem, that all of a sudden we would be deterred by the lack of a quorum.

Mr. SKAGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's further assurances.

Further on my reservation, the ½ hour equally divided debate time that was included in the UC request would apply to each and all amendments to the bill either considered tonight or at such subsequent date as we might resume debate on this legislation; is that correct?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me further under his reservation of objection?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Let me say to the gentleman who has been very responsible for this, and I appreciate our ability to work together, while we would have the power under this unanimous-consent request to roll votes when we resumed, I would assume that a spirit of comity would govern whether or not we use that; that is, if there was not agreement on both sides, we would not roll the votes when we come back at it on the next time.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. It would certainly be my desire that that power be exercised in consultation with the minority and other interested parties so that the interests of all Members of the House could be fully protected.

Mr. SKAGGS. Further reserving the right to object, and in the same vein, I think, and as I understand it, there are some logical groupings of amendments,