ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1608

Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. DUNCAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 358, because of an interview on a network. If I had been present I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote Nos. 355–358. If I were present, I would have voted: ''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 355 (the Gordon Amendment); ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 356 (the Jackson-Lee Amendment); ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 357 (the Larson Amendment); ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 358 (the Motion to Recommit).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, personal reasons will prevent me from being present for legislative business scheduled after 2 p.m. today, Friday, July 9, 2004. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on the amendment offered by Mr. GORDON (rollcall No. 355); ''yes'' on the amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE (rollcall No. 356); ''aye'' on the amendment offered by Mr. LARSON (rollcall No. 357); ''aye'' on the motion to recommit the bill H.R. 3598 (rollcall No. 358).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, due to a family commitment, I was not present in the Chamber on Friday, July 9, to cast my votes on rollcalls 355 through 358. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on each measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3889

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3889.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, as much as may be required, to inquire of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, of the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and as we have just observed, we have completed our business for the day and for the week.

The House will convene on Monday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We plan to consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of this day. Any votes called for on those measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

Members should be aware we also plan to consider the rule for the fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriation bill, as well as H.R. 4755, the fiscal 2005 Legislative Branch appropriation bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, and the balance of the week, we expect to consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules. We plan to complete consideration of the agriculture appropriation bill, as well as consider additional bills under a rule:

S. 15, the Project Bioshield Act; H.R. 4759, the U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement; and the fiscal year 2005 foreign operations appropriation bill.

Finally, and I know this will be pleasant news to all of our colleagues after a long Friday, we would like Members to know that a week from today, on Friday, July 16, we do not expect any votes on the floor.

And I would be happy to accept any questions that my friend from Maryland, the distinguished minority whip, might like to proffer.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information and appreciate his being open to additional questions.

To clarify the schedule for the appropriation bills the gentleman has listed for next week, does the gentleman anticipate on Monday that we will complete the Legislative Branch bill?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, yes, the Legislative Branch appropriation bill, we hope. Then, as I say, we will be bringing up the rule on the agriculture appropriation bill. And I doubt that that will be completed at that time. It will go over.

Mr. HOYER. So on Tuesday the gentleman expects we will complete the Ag bill?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, yes, the agriculture appropriation bill will be our work primarily on Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have a feel for when we will consider the Foreign Ops appropriation bill?

Mr. DREIER. Probably on Thursday of next week we would most likely consider the Foreign Ops bill.

Mr. HOYER. Will we consider the BioShield bill on that day as well?

Mr. DREIER. No, our plan is to, on Wednesday, deal with both the BioShield Act as well as the U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Now, on the Australia Free Trade Agreement, or any other trade bill, what day does the gentleman anticipate we will be considering the Australia Free Trade bill?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I said, along with the BioShield Act on Wednesday we also anticipate considering the U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. HOYER. All right. I thank the gentleman. On the appropriation bills that we will consider, will they be considered under the usual rule? I understand perhaps the legislative rule may be a restrictive rule.

And I yield to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Yes, if the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we have already addressed the issue of the rule for the legislative branch appropriation bill, and that is in fact a structured rule. It is our intention on the other measures that are before us to consider them under the standard open amendment process, just as we have this week on the appropriation issues that we have addressed.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for the information.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. In closing, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to get deeply into this, but can we anticipate votes on any of these? And if we can anticipate votes on them, will they be in the approximate range of 15 to 20 to 25 minutes? Or does the gentleman have any idea what our plan is?

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would simply say that it is our intention, as is always the case, to have the majority comply with rule XX, clause 2(a), which states that all votes should be held within a minimum of 15 minutes. And then, if my friend would further yield, I would say it is also quite possible that some Members, either still coming to the chamber or who are in the Chamber, who might either have not voted if they are coming to the Chamber or if they are here, may want to consider changing their votes.

As has often been the case, as I said in my closing remarks on the rule today, when I served in the minority, during those wonderful 14 years that my friend was in the majority before 1994, and also since we have been in the majority, we have clearly done that.

So I thank my friend for yielding, and it is our intention to simply comply with clause 2(a), rule XX, when it comes to dealing with votes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation, I suppose is the kindest adjective to apply. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I will say that the gentleman treats gingerly the changing of opinions. That is, obviously, as the gentleman noted in his closing argument, the subject of debate and also subject to discussion that goes on on this floor, which is clearly appropriate.

But I will tell the gentleman that his party believed that the keeping of the votes open for an extended period of time, i.e. in excess of 20 minutes, was corrupt, and the Vice President said it was corrupt. The Vice President said it undermines civility. The Vice President, when he then had my job, minority whip, said that it was undemocratic.

The gentleman has indicated that we did, in fact, from time to time, keep the vote open for longer than 20 minutes. The gentleman is absolutely accurate. But we did not claim it was undemocratic, undermining civility or corrupt. It was the gentleman's side that claimed that.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. In just one second.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose, then, the question becomes, in the context of situational ethics, has something changed that has brought about this recognition of it as a lack of corruption, lack of undermining the democratic process, and a lack of undermining civility? And I yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I think he raises a very good point.

I have said on a number of occasions that the year I was born was the last time that my party was elected to serve in the majority here in the House of Representatives, until we won our majority in 1994. In fact, the gentleman referenced the now Vice President of the United States, the former minority whip, Mr. CHENEY. And Mr. CHENEY never served as a member of the majority here in the House of Representatives.

I have admitted that there are a number of things that we have learned, with not a single Member having served in the majority once we emerged to that status following the election of 1994. So it is true we understand that leadership does entail making tough decisions, and, occasionally, as I said in my closing remarks on the rule earlier today, involve extending an invitation to Members to deliberate and, in fact, on occasion, change their mind. That is part of the democratic process.

□ 1615

So I will admit that the process which we observed on numerous occasions when the gentleman's party was in the majority is something which did provide an opportunity for us to learn from.

One thing I will say, when we look at the issue of slowing up a process or creating challenges, I think about the other body which as we all know has this very unique ability to allow one Member to hold up an entire process and delay the opportunity to move forward on a number of issues, including confirmations. So I think we, having a 38-minute vote here, it is not unprecedented. I will say we did in fact see the democratic process work.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, was the Vice President, acting as the minority whip, wrong when he said this was a corrupt practice?

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, what I will say is there was no one in the minority at that time who had the experience that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have had up to that point in 1994 when we won the majority.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I heard the assertion of the lack of experience in the majority, but my question was: Was the Vice President wrong?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to characterize rightness or wrongness. What I am saying is when we on this side of the aisle have extended the invitation to Members to consider changing a vote, we saw that done many times on the other side of the aisle. I can only speak for myself, but I am a Member who has learned that process is a very important part of the legislative process itself, and the process of democratic governance.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say very seriously I have served along with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for over 2 decades in this institution. I care a great deal about this institution, and the attacks made on this institution for the 14 years that I was in the majority and the assertions that were made and the characterization which I did not fully express on the floor that the minority whip made of Mr. Wright, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the names or the epithets that were used against him, there has never been an apology for that, notwithstanding this new information and new perspective that the Republican Party has gained now that they are in the majority and perhaps see the necessity to take actions that at some point in time they thought were corrupt, undemocratic, and undermining of civility.

We are not going to resolve this, but I will state that the gentleman and I have had discussions about comments the gentleman made about open rules, about amendments, about motions to recommit, about time for debate, about time for consideration prior to the Committee on Rules meeting and reporting out bills, and that perspective, as has been noted in our discussions in the Committee on Rules, has somewhat changed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I am happy that in that litany of issues raised, the gentleman raised the issue of motions to recommit.

As the gentleman knows very well, when we were in the minority, we were often denied motions to recommit. Yet when we won the majority in 1994, because of the expertise that so many of us had had serving in the minority for so many years, we made a determination at that time that we would change the rules to in fact provide the minority with at least one bite at the apple, meaning an opportunity to vote on that motion to recommit; and in most instances, not every, I will acknowledge, but in most instances, two opportunities for the minority to have a chance to modify and change a piece of legislation by providing a substitute at the end of a bill itself.

I will acknowledge when it came to the issue of the amendment process itself, we are here Friday afternoon having gone through a long and drawn out appropriations process, which we are in the midst of right now, most of these bills are being considered under an open amendment process. We have a very narrow majority in the House. When the gentleman's party was in the majority, they had a 70-vote margin. We have a responsibility to move our agenda, so we have often done it under a structured amendment process. But at the end of the day, we still have provided something that did not exist when we were in the minority, that being the right to offer a recommittal motion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, prolonging this will not be very educational for Members or others who might be interested, but I will observe that oftentimes the offering of a motion to recommit without the provision for the waivers that are given to the majority in terms of the germaneness of those motions to recommit with instructions essentially precludes the minority party from offering the alternative which they believe is the best alternative.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield on that point, I would just remind the gentleman when we were debating an issue which is very important to this institution, that is the continuity of Congress, we had a recommittal motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. And as the gentleman knows, that was accepted on this side as we were moving ahead with that very important quest to try to bring about a bipartisan solution to the challenge of dealing with a potential catastrophe to this institution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is that the same bill on which the committee refused to have a hearing on that very critically important issue, the alternative offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD)?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the last Congress did hold a hearing on that

legislation, and when the request was made to deal with the proposals of the constitutional amendment, they were not even offered by Members of the Committee on the Judiciary when they did proceed with the markup in that committee.

Mr. HOYER. My question was for this year. There was no hearing, am I correct?

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman is correct, although I recall testifying on this issue before the Committee on House Administration this year as we dealt with this issue.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 12, 2004

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

REPUBLICANS WIN COVETED ROLL CALL TROPHY

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the results of the 43rd Annual Roll Call Baseball Game for Charity between the Democrats and Republicans. While the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is still on the floor, I want to thank him for his warm hospitality in his district at the Prince George's County Stadium and his graciousness, despite losing. And I particularly want to thank all of the players and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the Democrat manager, for being such great sportsmen. We are pleased for one more year to possess this coveted Roll Call trophy, which is all one word, coveted Roll Call trophy. I am glad to have it here on the floor, and I will have it protected in my office for the next year. The score was 14–7.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the manager of the Democratic team, is not on the floor, but I know he would want me to congratulate you. As painful as defeat is, we graciously acknowledge that the second inning was devastating in which you scored 9, 10, 11 runs. It is going up, 10 runs, I guess. And it would be not as gracious to observe that other than that second inning, the game was pretty good. But I congratulate the gentleman on behalf of the somewhat gracious losers.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The final score was 14–7. I thank the sponsors of this event. There were over 5,000 people, the largest crowd at the event ever, and it will produce over $100,000 for the Adult Literacy Council and Boys and Girls Clubs of the Washington area. They are always very worthy recipients.

Thanks to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), half of the budget of the Adult Literacy Council will be provided from the proceeds of this game. We are very pleased about that. I notice the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), one of the announcers for the game, he and former member Martin Russo. We thank them for their fine work. And finally, I want to thank Hall of Famer Lou Brock, who was brought here by the auspices of the Baseball Hall of Fame, as well as Major League Baseball. He was very gracious, threw out the first ball, threw a strike, signed autographs for the kids, and had pictures taken. To Lou Brock and his wife, thank you for making the 43rd annual baseball game one to remember.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2828, WATER SUPPLY, RELIABILITY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2828, the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action of the House just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

WE NEED A DIFFERENT ECONOMIC POLICY

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Vice President CHENEY was in Cleveland this week trying to explain the President's economic policy to a State which has lost one-sixth of its manufacturing jobs since President Bush and Vice President CHENEY took office, a State that has lost almost 200,000 jobs overall, a State that has lost 195 jobs every single day of the Bush administration.

His answer to Ohio's economic problems is more tax cuts for the wealthiest people in the State hoping those tax cuts will trickle-down and create jobs. That clearly has not worked. And his other answer is more trade agreements like NAFTA and other trade agreements which have hemorrhaged jobs and shipped jobs overseas.

Clearly we need a new direction. The Bush economic policies are not working in the industrial Midwest. They are not working in small-town Ohio; they are not working in the big cities. We need a different economic policy. The Bush program simply is not working.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1630

CONGRATULATING ALCEE HASTINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of pride to announce to the Members of the House the election of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), as president of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly.

That assembly, Mr. Speaker, is an assembly of 55 signatory states to the Helsinki Final Act. Those 55 nations were represented by over 300 parliamentarians at their annual meeting in Edinburgh, Scotland, this past week.

Earlier today, Edinburgh time, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) received on the first ballot over 55 percent of the votes. This is a historic occasion. He is the first American ever elected president of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. Not only that, he is the first minority to be elected president of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe and, based upon the information I have, I believe the first and only African American to ever be elected president of one of the interparliamentary assemblies, combining Europe and the United States.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a distinguished member of our body, has served on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe since 2001 and has been vice president of the OSCE for the past 2 years. He also has gained important experience in international affairs as a