for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Mother's Day is almost here, and I have some bad news for my mother and many others. The Republicans have a new budget, and they still cut Medicare. They still want Medicare to wither on the vine.

There they go again, Mr. Speaker. In the Republican Medicare budget, they divide the elderly. They give Federal dollars over to insurance companies for the healthy and the wealthy. Then they want the Federal Government to pay for the sick and the poor.

They offer medical savings accounts to healthy seniors. So, they can use money from the Federal Government—to buy a car or take a vacation. That does not made sense. That will not help the budget or our seniors.

I call on my Republican colleagues to give us a better budget. We should not cut Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. We should not destroy Medicare in the name of saving it.

Don't cut Medicare.

# IT IS A MISTAKE TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about minimum wage and the desirability for low-income wage earners to earn more money. Of course, it is right. Raising low wages appeals to the sense of decency and compassion of Americans. But it would be a mistake.

We have a system of allocating resources in this country called the free enterprise system. It has worked very well for this country. It has made ours the greatest country on Earth. Increasing the minimum wage would impose significant costs primarily on unskilled Americans because the minimum wage is going to deprive some of those Americans from access to an entry-level job.

I ask the liberal labor union bosses if they are sure this is the way they want America to go. If employers cannot afford to pay the increase in minimum wage, then what are they going to do? They are either going to go out of business or they are going to respond by reducing hours, reducing benefits or paying less frequently.

In conclusion, I want to give my colleagues a quote from George Washington, a great man. George Washington said:

If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The rest is in the hands of God.

### CHILDREN AND THE ENVIRONMENT

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, last week I received this letter from Judi LeVine's kindergarten class at Arundel School in San Carlos, CA. It is really a plea from her students for Congress to save the environment, especially our rain forests, and our animals, our endangered species.

Even 5-year-old children can see the value in conserving our natural resources. Yet Republican leaders in Congress seem unable to grasp the need to preserve our environment for the next generation.

The parents may send us to the Congress; they are the ones that cast the votes. But the children are the ones that we need to remember as we shape their future. It is their future that we are shaping, and we should never lose sight of that. Because the opinion of the American people has weighed in and has forced the GOP leaders to abandon some of their destructive attacks on endangered species and wilderness areas, we must never let our guard down against similar assaults.

So to all the kids at the school, I have gotten the message. I hope the rest of the Congress has.

RESTRICT PENSIONS FOR CON-VICTED FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, according to the National Taxpayers Union, the citizens of this country will pay out in 1996 over \$600,000 in pensions to convicted former Members of Congress. What kind of message is this to send out to the taxpayers, farmers, miners, all the workers, about how our Government operates?

H.R. 3310 would restrict Members and former Members of Congress from receiving congressional retirement benefits if convicted of a felony which occurred while serving in the public trust. The bill would serve to punish Members who have taken advantage of the faith of the people who have placed upon them and Members involved in activities unrelated to official duties. Perhaps no other bill than H.R. 3310 will better indicate that this Congress is willing to change the way we do business.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider the provisions of H.R. 3310.

RESPONSIBLE DEFICIT REDUCTION WITHOUT UNREASONABLE CUTS IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year the Republican majority overreached by planning to cut

Medicare by \$270 billion and offering \$245 billion in tax cuts, and when they did not get their way, they shut the Government down. They realized that they were out of step with the American people and the Medicare trustees who said that we only needed \$90 billion in cuts or downsizing, that is all that was needed to keep Medicare solvent.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that they are moving in the right direction now. Their new budget only calls for \$168 billion in cuts, but they still are not quite there yet. I still believe we should continue to do the financially responsible thing by reducing the deficit. If we count the capital gains tax cut and the 4.3-cent gas cut that they want to do, then that adds up to \$176 billion, which adds up close to the \$168 billion they want to cut out of Medicare.

We have reduced the deficit 4 years in a row and will continue to do so, unlike the huge Federal deficits that were run up during the 1980's. We can continue down the road of responsible deficit reduction without the irresponsible cuts in Medicare and education.

# REPUBLICANS COMMITTED TO FUTURE GENERATIONS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, there they go again, distorting the record. This Republican Congress increases the spending on Medicare each and every year for the next 7 years. We increase it over \$305 billion. This Congress is committed to the senior citizens of America, but we are also committed to the future generations.

We are \$5 trillion in debt, my colleagues, \$5 trillion, costing us \$300 billion, \$300 billion in interest payments alone that could go to critically needed programs if we would get our fiscal house in order.

It is easy for the other side to make accusations, but this Republican Congress has been steadfast in its determination to balance the budget. We have done it with real numbers, honest numbers, addressing the American public's desire for reform of government. We have been in the forefront of that debate, and to be criticized for cutting Medicare once again by the other side is a lie, is a sham, and is distasteful and disgraceful on behalf of the minority party.

PERMISSION FOR ALL COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT FOR TODAY AND THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Lahood). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to clause 2(I) of rule XI, Mr. ARMEY moves that all committees and subcommittees of the House be permitted to sit for today and the remainder of the week while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may assume.

Mr. ÅRMEY. Mr. Speaker, again we have a good deal of work to be done in the committees as well as some important work here on the floor, and I make this request of the House out of consideration for the committees continuing their work. I appreciate the gentleman's effort.

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking me to yield?

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I know his general parsimony when it comes to minimums, so I appreciate the 5 minutes. It is in keeping with his overall approach.

What we have here is one of the opening phases of the 1996 Presidential campaign. It is a Presidential campaign, the Republican campaign, which is not going sufficiently well on its own for the Republicans to conduct it in the normal way. So the House of Representatives is being enlisted into the Republican Presidential campaign. To the aid of a faltering campaign comes now the machinery of the House in a very unfortunate way.

Mr. Speaker, the request is made so the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight can vote an extremely unjustified, unprecedented, unfair, and dangerous contempt citation for the President's counsel.

We have had a number of ongoing investigations which the Republicans are conducting. They are spending enormous amounts of money for very little purpose. Well, I take it back; they have a clear purpose: election of a Republican President. They are spending enormous amounts of money for very little concrete result.

What they now want to do is to change the subject on the travel investigation from the merits to a refusal by the administration to exceed to requests that should never have been made that are unfair and that the House itself would not respond to. And I think we should be very clear. We will be discussing this further.

They are going to cite the counsel of the President for contempt for refusing to release documents to the Republican campaign effort on that committee when they would not release similar documents, and we are going to have a test of this because we are working now on some resolutions, and if in fact the House is going to say these types of documents must be made public.

What are they? They have to do with information that would be relevant to a grand jury; they have to do with things that deal with lawyers, the independent counsel, the wideranging independent counsel who have also again come up with nothing damaging to this administration, as they have been cooperating with him.

They have to do with communications between executive branch and Members. The White House is being threatened with contempt if they do not turn over for public discussion memorandums conversations, and comments between Members of this body and the White House.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the standard, if the standard is that we will subpoena and then make public those kind of documents, let us apply it to ourselves. If we are going to threaten contempt against the counsel for doing his duty in a conscientious way, then let us understand that is the standard by which we will make documents available.

When the Republican leadership sends out a memorandum to other Republicans and says, "Come find some scandal. Have you got any scandal? Have you got any bad news about anybody," we will, I guess, ask that that be made public.

#### □ 1045

If there are memorandums that have existed and letters, phone call conversations that are recorded between the Republican leadership and that committee, what is the strategizing? Yes; there have been conversations between the White House and the Travel Office, I have had some myself, between the White House and Congress about how to respond to some of these things. There have been similar conversations between the leadership of the committee and the Republican leadership, maybe the Republican National Committee. Let us have those out there. This is the most one-sided and blatant misuse of the subpoena power we have seen. I would simply say, if in fact that is the standard, let us make the standard uniform.

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

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, this pattern is going across committees. Apparently the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Nussle] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walker] instructed committee chairmen to use their government-paid positions for the political purpose which the gentleman said a second ago of trying to help the faltering Dole campaign.

We have seen the same things in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Secretary of State told the chairman of the committee that two Ambassadors, our Ambassadors in Europe, would be happy to come by and testify before the committee, one of five or six com-

mittees that they want them to come back for. If it takes them a day to get here, or takes a half a month to do it, it is the same thing.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. That is the same point. If in fact discussions between Members of the House and the executive branch about how to deal with some of these issues, if that is to be subpoenaed and made public, then comparable documents on this side will be. I predict that we will see a very one-sided application of this principle.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the body that oversight is a duty of the Congress of the United States. We have all read about it in our high school history books and political science books as checks and balances. It must be done. It is not an option. It is what we are asked to do as an institution.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], even as a minority member of this committee, asked for this information 3½ years ago. It was denied by the majority in the committee at that time. Subpoenas were issued for this information in January of this year. The White House has not been forthcoming, and the action will be taken in the committee with those.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. 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 230, nays 182, not voting 21, as follows:

### [Roll No. 155]

YEAS-230 Bryant (TN) Crane Archer Crapo Bunning Armey Cremeans Bachus Cubin Burr Baker (CA) Burton Cunningham Baker (LA) Buver Davis Callahan Ballenger Deal Barr Barrett (NE) DeLay Diaz-Balart Calvert Camp Campbell Dickey Doolittle Barton Canady Bass Castle Dornan Bateman Chabot Dreier Bereuter Chambliss Duncan Bilbray Chenoweth Dunn Bilirakis Ehlers Christensen Bliley Chrysler Ehrlich Clinger Emerson Blute Boehlert English Coble Boehner Coburn Ensign Bonilla Collins (GA) Everett Ewing Bono Combest Brewster Cooley Fawell Brownback Flanagan Cox

Kolbe Foley LaHood Forbes Fox Largent Franks (CT) Latham LaTourette Franks (NJ) Frelinghuysen Lazio Frisa Leach Funderburk Lewis (CA) Lewis (KY) Gallegly Ganske Lightfoot Gekas Linder Gilchrest Livingston Gillmor LoBiondo Longley Gilman Goodlatte Goss Graham Manzullo Martinez Greene (UT) Martini Greenwood McCollum Gunderson McCrery Gutknecht McDade Hall (TX) McHugh Hancock McInnis Hansen McIntosh Hastert McKeon Hastings (WA) Metcalf Hayes Meyers Hayworth Mica Miller (FL) Hefley Heineman Moorhead Herger Hilleary Morella Myers Hobson Myrick Hoekstra Nethercutt Neumann Ney Norwood Horn Hostettler Hunter Nussle Oxley Packard Hutchinson Hyde Inglis Parker Istook Petri Jacobs Pombo Johnson (CT) Porter Johnson, Sam Portman Jones Pryce Kasich Quillen Kellv Quinn Kim Radanovich King Ramstad Kingston Regula Riggs Klug Knollenberg Roberts

Rogers Rohrabacher Ros-Lehtinen Roth Roukema Royce Salmon Sanford Saxton Scarborough Schaefer Schiff Seastrand Sensenbrenner Shadegg Shaw Shays Shuster Skeen Smith (MI) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smith (WA) Solomon Souder Spence Stearns Stockman Stump Talent Tate Tauzin Taylor (NC) Thomas Thornberry Tiahrt Torkildsen Upton Vucanovich Walker Walsh Wamp Watts (OK) Weldon (FL)

Weller

White

Wicker

Wolf Young (FL)

Zeliff

Zimmer

Whitfield

Sawyer

#### NAYS-182

Durbin Abercrombie Ackerman Edwards Baesler Engel Baldacci Eshoo Barcia Evans Barrett (WI) Fattah Becerra Fazio Beilenson Fields (LA) Bentsen Filner Berman Flake Bevill Foglietta Bishop Ford Bonior Frank (MA) Borski Frost Boucher Furse Browder Gejdenson Brown (FL) Gephardt Brown (OH) Geren Gibbons Bryant (TX) Cardin Gonzalez Gordon Clav Green (TX) Clayton Clement Gutierrez Clyburn Hall (OH) Coleman Hamilton Collins (IL) Harman Collins (MI) Hastings (FL) Hilliard Condit Convers Hinchey Costello Holden Coyne Hoyer Jackson (IL) Cramer Cummings Jackson-Lee (TX) Jefferson Danner DeFazio Johnson (SD) DeLauro Dellums Johnson, E. B. Deutsch Johnston Dicks Kanjorski Dingell Kennedy (MA) Kennedy (RI) Dixon Kennelly Doggett

Dooley

Doyle

Kildee Kleczka

Klink LaFalce Lantos Levin Lewis (GA) Lincoln Lipinski Lofgren Lowev Luther Maloney Manton Markey Mascara Matsui McCarthy McDermott McHale McKinney McNulty Meehan Meek Menendez Millender-McDonald Miller (CA) Minge Mink Moakley Mollohan Montgomery Moran Murtha Nadler Neal Oberstar Obey Olver Ortiz Orton Owens Pallone Pastor Payne (NJ)

Thurman Payne (VA) Pelosi Schumer Scott Torres Peterson (FL) Serrano Towns Peterson (MN) Sisisky Traficant Pickett Velazquez Skaggs Poshard Skelton Vento Visclosky Rahall Slaughter Rangel Volkmer Spratt Reed Stark Ward Richardson Stenholm Waters Stokes Watt (NC) Rivers Roemer Studds Waxman Wilson Rose Stupak Roybal-Allard Tanner Woolsey Taylor (MS) Rush Wynn Sabo Tejeda Yates Sanders Thompson

#### NOT VOTING-21

Thornton

Andrews Brown (CA) Goodling Pomeroy Schroeder Hefner Houghton Torricelli Chapman de la Garza Weldon (PA) Kaptur Laughlin Farr Williams Fields (TX) Molinari Wise Fowler Paxon Young (AK)

#### □ 1108

Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. SPRATT changed their vote from "yea" 'nay.

Messrs. MANZULLO, WELLER, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 426 and rule XXIII, the Chair decalres the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2406.

#### □ 1109

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2406) to repeal the United States Housing Act of 1937, deregulate the public housing program and the program for rental housing assistance for low-income families, and increase community control over such programs, and for other purposes, with Mr. GUNDER-SON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 8, 1996, title II was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of that day, debate on each amendment, and any amendment thereto, shall be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, with the following exceptions:

Amendment No. 7, as modified, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for 60 minutes; amendment No. 17 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for 60 minutes; amendments Nos. 33 and 34 by

the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] which may be considered en bloc for 20 minutes; amendment No. 22 by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] for 20 minutes; and amendment No. 8 by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] for 20 minutes.

Are there any amendments to title

AMENDMENT NO. 7, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the unanimousconsent request of last night, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment No. 7, as modified, offered by Mr. Frank of Massachusetts:

Section 225(a) of the bill (as amended by the manager's amendment), strike paragraph (2) of such section and insert the following new paragraph:

LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding other provision of this subsection, the amount paid by a family for monthly rent for a dwelling unit in public housing may not exceed 30 percent of the family's adjusted monthly income.'

Section 322(a) of the bill (as amended by the manager's amendment), strike paragraph (2) of such section and insert the following

new paragraph:

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the amount paid by an assisted family for monthly rent for an assisted dwelling unit may not exceed 30 percent of the family's adjusted monthly income.

Section 352 of the bill (as amended by the manager's amendment), strike subsection (a) and insert the following new subsection:

(a) Units Having Gross Rent Exceeding PAYMENT STANDARD.—In the case of an assisted family renting a dwelling unit bearing a gross rent that exceeds the payment standard established under section 353 for a dwelling unit of the applicable size and location in the market area in which such assisted dwelling unit is located, the amount of the monthly assistance payment for housing assistance under this title on behalf of such family shall be the amount by which such payment standard exceeds the lesser of (1) the resident contribution determined in accordance with section 322(a)(1), or (2) 30 percent of the family's adjusted monthly in-

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of Wednesday, May 8, 1996, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and a Member opposed will each control 30 minutes.

Does the gentleman from New York wish to control the time in opposition? Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will be controlling the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ], one of the coauthors of the amendment.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly urge my colleagues to