

\$37.4 million in reductions. The gentleman who offers this amendment does so because the budget allocation was higher across the board than he wanted. I would simply point out to the gentleman that in our subcommittee, we have reduced the budget outlay by 20 percent below the budget allocation for this bill. This Congress is leading by example. We have done the work. We have saved the money. I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 473, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASTLE) assumed the Chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 104-663.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. CASTLE: Page 35, after line 22, insert the following new section.

SEC. 310. (a) Each mass mailing sent by a Member of the House of Representatives shall bear in a prominent place on its face, or on the envelope or outside cover or wrapper in which the mail matter is sent, the following notice: "THIS MAILING WAS PREPARED, PUBLISHED, AND MAILED AT TAXPAYER EXPENSE.", or a notice to the same effect in words which may be prescribed under subsection (c). The notice shall be printed in a type size not smaller than 7-point.

(b)(1) There shall be published in the itemized report of disbursements of the House of Representatives as required by law, a summary tabulation setting forth, for the office of each Member of the House of Representatives, the total number of pieces of mass mail mailed during the period involved and the total cost of those mass mailings.

(2) Each such tabulation shall also include—

(A) the total cost (as referred to in paragraph (1)) divided by the number (as deter-

mined by the Postmaster General) of addresses (other than business possible delivery stops) in the Congressional district from which the Member was elected (as such addresses are described in section 3210(d)(7)(B) of title 39, United States Code); and

(B) the total number of pieces of mass mail (as referred to in paragraph (1)) divided by the number (as determined by the Postmaster General) of addresses (other than business possible delivery stops) in the Congressional district from which the Member was elected (as such addresses are described in section 3210(d)(7)(B) of title 39, United States Code).

(c) The Committee on House Oversight shall prescribe such rules and regulations and shall take such other action as the Committee considers necessary and proper for Members to conform to the provisions of this subsection and applicable rules and regulations.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "Member of the House of Representatives" means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress; and

(2) the term "mass mailing" has the meaning given such term by section 3210(a)(6)(E) of title 39, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to start my congratulating the chairman for what I think has been an excellent job of trimming the legislative appropriations, and particularly in the area that I am going to talk about, which is the taxpayer funding of franked mail.

The fiscal year 1997 level of funding will be 40 percent lower than the 1996 level of funding. That is an impressive reduction. I do not even know if the chairman is aware of the reductions over the course of years, but starting in the year I was first elected to this body, before I came here in 1992, it was \$59 million. In 1993 it went to \$47,711,000. In 1994 it went to \$40 million, in 1995 to \$31 million, in 1996 it went up to \$35,630,000, and this year is an appropriation of \$20 million, so it really is an extraordinary job that the chairman has done and that the Committee on House Oversight has done in addressing this particular situation.

In recognition of that, I do not intend, as I have in the past, to introduce an amendment to try to further reduce that funding. I think there are a couple of areas for which there is still room for improvement. Too often the franking privilege is not treated as a privilege and is abused. For example, the volume of outgoing franked mail vastly outpaces the volume of incoming mail.

In 1995, the House sent out four times more mail than it received. If the House had responded only to letters it received, franked mail costs would have been only \$12.4 million, saving \$18.6 million or 60 percent from actual mail costs. Also, use of the frank in-

creases cyclically during every election year. During the 102d Congress, the House spent \$31 million in 1991 and \$54 million in 1992, and during the 103d Congress, \$24 million in 1993, and \$42 million in 1994.

□ 1500

The 104th Congress again has addressed and narrowed this gap in total spending, but the irresistible temptation for individual Members facing tough reelection campaigns to use their franking perk extensively in election years remains.

I think Members have a legitimate need to respond to the increasing concerns of their constituents and the franking privilege does facilitate this. I think the public understands this and would support that use of taxpayer dollars.

Unsolicited mass mail from Members, however, I think fails into a different category. I believe that most Americans do not want to receive all the unsolicited mail they get from Congress, particularly if they are aware of the fact that they as taxpayers pay for it themselves. Some Members here, I am certain, would disagree and would argue that the newsletter contains valuable and useful information. I am not trying to prevent that from being used. But I think we should give the public the information it needs to make the determination.

This is what the amendment, the taxpayer's right to know amendment, will do.

It has two components, both of which are based on procedures which the Senate already follows. The first component would require all mass mailings to contain the disclaimer, "This mailing was prepared, published, and mailed at taxpayer expense." This will encourage Members to be more judicious in the mass mailing they send to their constituents, and it is entirely consistent with this Congress's attempt to let sunshine disinfect the policy process.

The second part of the amendment would require the CAO's quarterly Statement of Disbursements to publish to total number of pieces of mass mail mailed during the period involved and the total cost of those mass mailings on a per-residential-address basis. Currently there is no way for the public to get information about the amount Members spend on unsolicited mass mailings versus constituent response mail. My amendment will allow this comparison to take place and I think the public has a right to know how their tax dollars are being spent.

The bottom line here is that this simple amendment will provide information to taxpayers about franked mass mail. It does not ban mass mailings or change the definition from current law. It simply requires public disclosure about the use of frank for mass mail.

I urge Members to pass this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment the gentleman for his amendment.

His amendment follows a long line of positive amendments offered on both sides of the aisle, and as a matter of fact originally in a bipartisan effort by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the then gentleman, still gentleman, but member of the House from Minnesota, Mr. Frenzel, to begin to separate the cost of franked mail from the general fund category. We have not yet reached the Senate stage. The gentleman from Delaware indicated that it puts us in the same position as the Senate, and I know he is aware that the Senate actually separates the unsolicited mass mail from the other franked mail. We do not do that. But what the gentleman's amendment does is in essence do it in the report so that people can see not only the amount but the number of addresses to which the franked mail has been sent.

The gentleman alluded to the way in which this Congress continues to make changes. He of course is aware that at the beginning of the 104th Congress we cut franked mail by yet another one-third of the total amount and that we moved up the statutorily required 60-day ban to a voluntary 90-day ban.

Once again I want to compliment the gentleman. His addition of a required statement that it is at taxpayer expense is a good, positive notifier of where the money is coming from. It also perhaps might be somewhat of a conscience conditioner in terms of whether you mail it out or not, and by giving it a separate report, we do move closer to the Senate, separating the response mail from the unsolicited mass mailing. I compliment the gentleman on his amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the head of the Committee on House Oversight for what I think is an extraordinary job of dealing with this issue of franked mail. I think we really have in a bipartisan way responsible addressed this particular issue in this Congress and he is absolutely right on some of the numbers. We are just trying to refine this at the end.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PACKARD. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate this amendment and I am very much grateful that the gentleman has worked it out to the satisfaction of the authorizing committee chairman, Mr. THOMAS. With that agreement, I will be more than pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no objection to the amendment. I congratulate the gentleman on working it out and bringing it to the floor.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 104-663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. FAZIO of California: Page 3, after line 3, insert the following caption: "(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)".

Page 3, line 6, insert before the period at the end the following: ; and, in addition, \$4,000,000, which shall be derived by transfer from the amount provided in this Act for "Office of the Chief Administrative Officer" under the heading "Salaries, officers and employees" and shall be available for obligation only by members for initiatives to promote the increased use of computers and other electronic technologies funded by this Act to carry out legislative activities.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report says that \$211 million is provided in this bill for computer and telecommunications investments and that there is quote, "an inexorable movement toward CyberCongress." But, quite simply, we are not yet there. My amendment would be a referendum on whether the CAO and HIR are giving us what we pay for.

We have provided generous resources to the Chief Administrative Officer and to our computer agency over the past 2 years, \$16.5 million in this bill for operating expenses, \$8.2 million for telecommunications projects, a doubling over last year. That does not count the \$6 million in reimbursements and the \$11.7 million in chargebacks that our offices pay for services to the HIR agency.

With Chairman PACKARD, I approved a \$20.5 million reprogramming at the end of the fiscal year 1995 for telecommunications and computer investments.

The CAO and HIR have requested \$85 million over the next 5 years for computer and telecommunications investment. But, notwithstanding the New York Times, which wrote a glowing piece on the CAO, there is evidence that our computer support is falling short.

First of all, I, along with VERN EHLERS, have been part of an effort to identify a new House-wide messaging system, and we are making steady if slow progress on that project. But, in the meantime, our existing House e-mail has been so unreliable and so slow that many users have just abandoned it for daily use.

The Financial Management System was finally switched over to a new system on June 4, 5 months later than a House Oversight deadline and 8 months later than the CAO had originally promised the Members. Your June district office rent payments, which are supposed to be sent in in a timely way so that your landlords in your districts can receive them on the 1st day of each month, still have not left the Finance Office, and I think it is, if I am correct, the 10th of July. This is frankly unprecedented. It has never happened before.

The heralded Office 2000 project, whose purpose is to automate some of the day-to-day functions in our offices, will not have a single operational function available prior to next year.

At the time of our hearings, HIR was 20 percent understaffed, and the CAO admitted that the terminations, pay cuts, and reassignments of his reorganization played a role. Our offices have felt that lack of support every day.

In addition, the office accounting software provided to your offices by HIR in January contained numerous bugs. Because of the CAO's personnel procedures, it took HIR over 7 months to hire a full-time receptionist, and it took over 6 months to hire a security officer, at a time when the inspector general told us our computer systems were susceptible to outside entry.

In short, I have to wonder if we are getting what we pay for. The CAO and HIR have received considerable credit for so-called CyberCongress initiatives. But while the CAO talks a good game about CyberCongress and desk top video conferencing and the like, I believe the performance in tasks affecting Members' offices directly has not lived up to the billing.

We are all getting our "free" computers, in quotes, but HIR has nothing new to show us, which was the whole point of the mass computer buy in the first place. The lack of progress is not because of any lack of resources, and the CAO is not shy about asking for more. The CAO's request this year was for a 32-percent overall increase, primarily for computers and telecommunications. The Committee on Appropriations has provided generous resources, including, I might add, the \$20.5 million I mentioned earlier, yet the CAO cannot seem to invest it. Another \$8

million in unobligated balances is already being predicted for the current fiscal year, 1996.

My amendment would take \$4 million out of the fiscal year 1997 funds in the bill, half of HIR's increase for telecommunications—which is, by the way, a doubling of last year's amount—and allow the use of such funds only if approved by Members, and only for technology already funded in this bill. My amendment is the ultimate in TQM, total quality management, and customer satisfaction that the CAO is so publicly embracing.

It is simple. If you think the CAO is spending money well and wisely, vote against my amendment. If you think your office can do a better job, then vote for my amendment.

I think we can send the CAO an important message: that we demand results for the money we hand out, and results that will help us serve our constituents now, as well as in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the Members' attention another related matter, related in the sense that it is directly a policy which we will all be adhering to as part of an Internet policy agreement which has largely been forged within the Committee on House Oversight. The amendment I had intended to offer to the body as a whole concerns an Internet policy set by that committee on the 23d of May. The amendment would have prevented funds from being spent to implement this policy.

Some would say, leave this to the Oversight Committee. But I believe it is a policy of sufficient importance that it needs to be reevaluated as we consider funding for House operations, as we are in the amendment I have offered.

The policy was originally negotiated by the majority and minority staff in good faith, and there are good reasons for Web site policy and important elements to the policy. For example, it entitles minorities and subcommittees to a Web page site; it ensures that the maintenance of Web page sites is done behind an official fire wall for security purposes; and it ensures that House Web page sites are clearly identified. The committee's jurisdiction, I believe, is appropriate and I support it.

The problem came literally the morning of the hearing when we thought we had negotiated a policy successfully with the committee staff on both sides of the aisle. It was overruled. After a partisan debate, the Republicans ignored our objections and we were voted down, and so I went to the Committee on Appropriations seeking to bring the matter to the attention of the floor.

I withdrew the amendment in the full committee after Chairman LIVINGSTON agreed to help facilitate some sort of settlement on a new leadership Internet policy and, failing that, to support floor consideration of my amendment under this rule.

That resulted, of course, in further Oversight Committee staff discussions

and a clarification of one of the two purposes of my amendment. That clarification was that the majority determined that it never intended to prevent a process called bookmarking, which allows people to go back on a regular basis to an item which they wish to reference on a regular basis at the Web site, part of the Internet.

However, the main issue remains unresolved. The policy as issued prevents access to a Democratic Web page site, or I should say minority web page site, unless a user first goes to the majority or, in this case, the Republican site first. Our constituents will still have to troll through screens of majority information to even discover that the minority, in this case, the Democrats, have a Web site.

In fact, my colleague and friend from California, Mr. THOMAS, made it clear at the hearing that if a committee chair did not want a minority Web page at all, he could just refuse to have a Web page for the majority as well.

To add insult to injury, the HIR has been instructed to make the technical changes that prevent users who may have stumbled across the site from bookmarking it, though, as I mentioned earlier, the majority claims that it never intended to prevent that bookmarking process from being available to anyone who browses the Internet.

We are talking about access to information, electronic information, but just information in a different form; information, like any others, that ought to flow freely in this process, certainly as part of an institution which is fundamental to our form of democracy. It is, pure and simple, a restriction on access to information.

The effect of this policy is that users of the Internet and the World Wide Web, our constituents, cannot readily get to the information they want. It is ironic to me that the GOP which has gotten so much credit for the CyberCongress would make the first policy about Web pages a restrictive one. This is an important matter and I believe it is one we should elevate to floor consideration no matter what happens on my amendment today. This gives us an opportunity to discuss what I think is a bad policy, even though my amendment will not go directly to the point I am concerned about as I discuss the other amendment I had hoped to offer today.

□ 1515

It flies in the face, this policy, of an open Congress. It perverts the whole idea behind the free flow of electronic information that is inherent in the idea behind the Internet and the World Wide Web.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include a number of communications, particularly one from the American Library Association that agrees that access to congressional information should not be a partisan issue.

The information referred to follows:

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, July 9, 1996.

Hon. VIC FAZIO,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. FAZIO: In response to your inquiry, the American Library Association agrees that access to Congressional information should not be a partisan issue. Recent press reports have described a controversy about access to Congressional committee pages on the World Wide Web. For the past 18 months, citizens have been able to access majority Web pages from a central menu. Under a recently adopted policy, the House of Representatives Committee Office Web Services menu lists Web pages of only the committee majority with access to the minority's page only through the majority's page.

ALA is concerned about this policy and the effect it would have on an informed electorate. This policy would concern us no matter which party was in the majority during any given Congress.

ALA reaffirms its long-standing conviction that open government is vital to a democracy. Of the many issues raised by this policy, I would like to highlight two:

There should be equal and ready access to data collected, compiled, produced, and published in any format by the government of the United States. In the interest of equity, the majority and minority of House committees should have equal access at the same level to the World Wide Web, a dynamic means of communicating with the American electorate; and

The free flow of information between Congress and the American people should be encouraged. Majority and minority viewpoints should be available without either one being dependent on the other.

The American Library Association is a nonprofit educational organization of 58,000 librarians, library trustees, and other friends of libraries dedicated to promoting the public interest in a free and open information society.

Sincerely,

CAROL C. HENDERSON,  
Executive Director,  
ALA Washington Office.

—  
MUCKRAKER

(By Brock N. Meeks)

THOMAS BUILDS A ONE-WAY WEB

In the House of Representatives, all Web sites are created equal. But the Republicans couldn't stomach that thought, so they rewrote the rules.

All seemed fair in the wake of amicable but protracted negotiations to revise the rules governing Internet use for House committees and subcommittees. Each committee and subcommittee—on both the majority (Republican) and minority (Democrat) sides—was allocated a separate but equal amount of server space to create a Web page if they so desired. Under the negotiated plan, Democrats could independently set up their own sites, to post whatever committee information they deemed appropriate.

But that rule didn't sit right with Representative Bill Thomas (R-California), chairman of the House Oversight Committee, which writes the guidelines governing Internet use. He figured it gave the Dems too much freedom and would allow Web surfers simply to bypass any Republican-controlled Web sites. So he rewrote the regulations and rammed the changes through by exploiting his power as committee chairman.

Under the new rules, all subcommittees can have separate pages, but those pages must be "linked to, and accessible only from the committee's page." While a Republican

subcommittee chair might be able to brook that overlord mentality, the ranking minority members who would control the committee's opposing Web pages might be a little ticked off.

If you've begun to smell a rat, you're not alone. "This means that any time someone wants to see an issue from the Democrat's side of things, they first have to wade through the Republican rhetoric," said a minority committee staffer.

The rules go further, according to another minority staffer. "The committee chairman must approve all content on the Web sites. I have to ask whatever happened to the First Amendment on Capitol Hill."

The rules on this issue are vague, and I could only get my hands on a draft copy. Staffers at the meeting at which Thomas ordered the changes swear he made it clear that all information needed to be "approved" by the committee chair before posting.

That account is disputed by Bill Pierce, Thomas's press secretary. "Whatever language you had regarding [content] approval, it's not the case," he said. The rule change is "about process and not about content at all." Pierce noted, for example, that the minority doesn't have separate stationary. And this rule change simply makes net resource allocation "consistent" with non-Net resources.

But for Representative Vic Fazio (D-California), ranking minority member of the House Rules Committee, the issue isn't that cut and dried. "What we're talking about is an attempt to control the minority's communication with the American people." Although the content approval issue is murky, Fazio put a hard edge on how a committee chair could wield the ultimate censorship hammer: "If a chairman doesn't like the contents of the minority's Web page, he could simply decide not to have a Web page at all."

And according to the rules, if the committee chair decides not to have a page, it means the minority's net voice is rendered mute. No argument, no debate. It's de facto censorship and to hell with free speech, even on Capitol Hill.

Fazio also points out that a committee's majority doesn't "have access to or control over the content of press releases or correspondence produced by the minority." Since the Net is simply another way to communicate, and one that "is taking on greater importance," it should be treated as such, Fazio said, "There is absolutely no reason that the majority should control information freely disseminated over the Internet."

Thomas's reasoning is beyond me. The Republicans stand a good chance of losing control of the House in the coming elections. If they do, and power returns to the Democrats, then Thomas has just — his own party. The Democrats will be in power and their committee chair will hold the power to approve content on the Republican committee Web pages.

At first blush, such a power trip seems bent from all angles. All one would have to do is bookmark the minority page URL and thus bypass the majority homepage. But according to a House Rules Committee majority staffer, each committee's homepage would be generated with a CGI script to prevent bookmarking. Seems they've thought of everything. I know the Republican "revolution" has hit on tough times, but this is nothing short of a desperate act, bordering on extreme.

Congress is infamous for its "sausage-making" approach to drafting legislation. Sadly, it appears they are no less enlightened when

it comes to drafting rules for the Internet. Bratwurst.gov, anyone?

Meeks out . . .

BROCK M. MARKS.

[From the Office of the Democratic Leader,  
June 4, 1996.]

REPUBLICAN POLICY RESTRICTS INTERNET  
ACCESS FOR OPPOSITION  
(By Laura Meckler)

WASHINGTON.—If you want to find certain Democratic views on the World Wide Web, you'll have to go through Republican territory.

Until now, Web pages produced by the Republican and the Democratic staffs of House committees were all accessible from the main menu on the House's Web page.

No more. Under a new policy that has Democrats crying foul, users will find Democratic committee pages listed only on the committee's main page, which like the committees themselves are controlled by Republicans.

"What we're talking about is an attempt to control the minority's communications with the American people," said Rep. Vic Fazio, D-Calif., the top Democrat on the Oversight Committee.

"There is absolutely no reason that the majority should control information freely disseminated over the Internet."

Fazio and others complain that to access Democratic views, Web surfers may have to scroll through Republican rhetoric and a large photograph of the Republican chairman.

In addition, if Republicans on a particular committee decide not to have a Web site at all, Democrats can't have one either.

"If a chairman doesn't like the contents of the minority's Web page, he could simply decide not to have a Web page at all," Fazio said.

A few committees currently have Democratic pages but no Republican pages. If a committee chairman wants to, he could kill the Democratic page until there's a GOP counterpart, said Bill Pierce, spokesman for the Oversight Committee.

The old policy gave each side disk space to produce Web pages but did not regulate how they are accessed.

Republicans explain that the party in power controls all committee activities and should control this as well. They note that all members use the same committee stationary, which highlight Republicans.

"We are not going to enter a whole new relationship with the Internet, which is simply an additional way of communicating," said Oversight Chairman Bill Thomas, R-Calif., according to minutes of a May 23 meeting where this was discussed. "Committee activities are under the control of the chairman of the committee."

Democrats say the Internet is more like a press release, which they can distribute on their own.

Their deepest concern is that this is a first step toward Republican control of content.

"It is even possible that committee chairmen may interpret the new policy to mean that they have direct control or veto power over the information that the minority chooses to post on its Web page," Martha Coven of the House Democratic Policy Committee wrote in a May 28 memo.

There's no chance of that, said Pierce, the Oversight Committee spokesman. "It has nothing to do with content."

In practice, there are many more Republican committee pages than Democratic ones. Democrats on the Banking and Financial Services Committee have a page while the Republican do not, but a committee spokesman said the GOP page should be up and running this week.

In addition, Thomas noted that the new policy guarantees Democrats they will have an opportunity to have a Web page.

"What we have in front of us is a progressive policy that opens up opportunities for the minority," Thomas said, according to the minutes. "It doesn't close them down."

The House of Representatives Web page is located at <http://www.house.gov/>

[From Roll Call, May 27, 1996]

PRE-ELECTION MESSAGES BANNED BY HOUSE  
(By Juliet Eilperin and John E. Morrin)

In its ongoing attempt to adjust to a brave new technological world, Congressional panels last week adopted several policy changes—including a ban on pre-election mass communications—and also experimented with new interactive formats.

But the decisions were not free of controversy or technical foul-ups.

On Thursday, for example, the House Oversight Committee voted unanimously to ban unsolicited mass communications 90 days before a primary of general election. In doing so, it applied previously established House franking rules to several mediums beyond newsletters, including radio and newspaper ads; announcing town meetings; the purchase of broadcast time; production and communication costs for video and audio services; e-mail messages; and faxes.

"With communication technology developing at an increasingly rapid pace, it is critical that the House develop rules consistent with 21st century technology," House Oversight chairman Bill Thomas (R-Calif.) announced in a statement after the hearing.

The role of technology in town meetings first came under intense scrutiny last month, when Rep. Steve Stockman (R-Texas) purchased radio time to hold a town meeting. House Oversight ranking member Vic Fazio (D-Calif.) sharply criticized the use of official House resources for an event he likened to a political ad. Thomas, by contrast, argued that no rules prohibited members from holding town meetings on the air and such techniques could make lawmakers more accessible to voters.

Other Members have also come under fire for buying radio time to announce town meeting, during which they have the opportunity to tout their own legislative record. While all the scripts were approved by the bipartisan Franking Commission, critics said they give incumbents an improper advantage (Roll Call, April 29).

National Taxpayers Union executive vice president David Keating, who had asked House Oversight to reimpose its ban on radio ads, said Thursday's vote constituted "a good first step." He argued, however, that the funds for radio ads should be deducted from Members' mailing allowances and the House "should strictly limit the content so it sounds more like a public announcement instead of a campaign ad."

"Members can still spend literally hundreds of thousands of dollars in radio spots," he said. "I hope they don't take advantage of it."

While the banking reform and the overall adoption of a new committee handbook enjoyed bipartisan support, Democratic Members were less happy with the GOP's new committee Internet policy. Under the policy, which was adopted by voice vote, a minority committee's Web page can only be accessed through the majority's Web page.

Under this scenario, one Democratic leadership aide argued, a voter might have to scroll down through endless pictures of Commerce Committee Chairman Thomas Bliley (R-Va) and text describing the GOP's recent accomplishments before linking up to the minority's site.

"We view it as a suppression of free speech," the staffer said. "It's suppressing the minority's right to offer another perspective."

Currently, the Democrats on the Banking, Budget, and Science Committees all have separate Web sites. Under the new policy, the minority is guaranteed a site only if the chairman of the panel chooses to establish one.

But the Republicans argue that the Internet, like other forms of communications, remains under the auspices of the chairman. In the meeting, Thomas compared the Web page to the minority's committee stationery, which still includes the chairman's name at the top.

"They have to right to communicate and state their views, but under the banner of the full committee," a GOP aides said of the minority.

While House Oversight members grappled over how to communicate with constituents on Thursday, the House Rules subcommittee on rules and organization of the House spent the next morning analyzing how technology would affect communication between Members.

In the hearing—which featured video links with both a panel member and a witness—Members debated whether technical advances would undermine the thoughtful nature of lawmaking.

House Oversight member, Vern Ehlers (R-Mich) called for several reforms to ease this high-tech transition: a common format and language for Congressional documents; a set standard for the creation, maintenance, and purging of online documents; and legislation allowing Congressional Research Service reports to be placed online.

He also predicted the technological revolution would reduce the use of paper, allow citizens to print GPO documents on demand, and bring video conferencing capability to every Congressional desk.

These advances, subcommittee Chairman David Dreier (R-Calif) insisted, should not lead to short cuts like proxy voting.

"If there is a concern that Members are unduly influenced by lobbyists waiting in the halls of the Capitol," Dreier said, "how concerned should we be when they have to vote on a controversial bill from their district offices with protesters demonstrating outside?"

Ranking member Tony Beilenson (D-Calif) said he was worried that the "essence of communication" between Members would be negatively affected by video conferencing.

But committee member Scott McInnis (R-Colo), speaking via satellite from his district, responded that the technology will enable him to give greater access to the constituents of his rural district and allow them greater participation in the political process.

Beilenson cautioned against embracing technology too quickly.

"We don't need more information, we need understanding and wisdom," he said. "Our job is simple—either push the yes or no button. We shouldn't act immediately."

Dreier attempted to strike a middle ground between his colleagues, explaining, "We need to get information more efficiently without upsetting the deliberative nature of Congress."

While the hearing heralded "the Third Wave information age," it also underscored the pitfalls of the new era. Several technical difficulties marred the event, most notably the absence of Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga) due to a video conferencing system malfunction. The special Web site established for the event also failed to work.

NEWS RELEASE FROM CONGRESSMAN VIC FAZIO, MAY 28, 1996

The following is a statement from Rep. Vic Fazio about the House Oversight Committee's action on committee web pages:

"What we're talking about is an attempt to control the minority's communication with the American people. If a chairman doesn't like the contents of the minority's Web page, he could simply decide not to have a Web page at all.

"The committee's majority doesn't have access to or control over the content of press releases and correspondence produced by the minority. The Internet is another way to communicate—an electronic form that is taking on greater importance in American life and society—and should be treated as such. There is absolutely no reason that the majority should control information freely disseminated over the Internet."

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman, and I strongly oppose this amendment. This amendment would transfer \$4 million from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House to the Members' representational allowance. The Chief Administrative Officer asked this year, and felt justified that he needed, a \$17 million increase simply to be able to accomplish the things that the House has asked him to do and his office to do. This would literally cut them \$2.5 million below current levels. We did not give them the \$17 million he asked for. We gave them \$1.6 million, and that was barely enough to cover the mandatories; in other words, the COLA's for staff and the staff benefit packages, which are mandated by the Government. We had to fund that, but we gave him no more than that.

We have asked them actually to cut back on their employment levels by 13 positions in this year's bill. To take \$4 million out of their existing levels in this bill would require them to fire about 90 additional staff members of the House. We think that would be unconscionable.

The bill provides \$8 million for the CAO's budget for telecommunications. The telecommunications, incidentally, is for computers and telecommunication systems that benefit each of the Members' offices. Over \$1.5 million is for local and district office telephones that connect directly with our Washington offices, again directly benefiting our communications within each of our offices.

But the biggest problem of this amendment is not what it does to the CAO's office but it is what it does in reversing a policy that the maker of the amendment [Mr. FAZIO] was strongly supportive of last year and really gave us a great deal of help in getting it passed in our bill last year, and that was the reforms that we wanted to bring about in Congress. Those reforms are absolutely crucial to the effective operation of each Member's office. That was in all of the allocations in budget categories that are allowed for each Member's office. We consolidated

those into one account with the help of the gentleman from California, and we gave the Members of Congress individually some flexibility, not some but almost total flexibility, in the use of those accounts. That was a good move. I think moving toward a consolidated bill that we had last year was a very good move, and I personally want to thank the gentleman from California for helping us to do that.

In my judgment, this is a reversal of that process. This takes us back to where we were before, and I think that would not be a move in the right direction; a step backward, I think.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I concur. I think this is a 1-year effort to surround this funding for purposes of Member investment in computerization, telecommunications, simply because I do not think the CAO has spent his money wisely.

But I agree with the gentleman and with the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight that, as a general rule, we ought to give complete license to the Members.

Mr. PACKARD. Reclaiming my time, I think that this is just the first step, though, in reversing that process and the next step would be some Member of the Congress would want to put controls on E-mail, travel and everything else that Members now have some flexibility in.

So I would hope and I would urge the Members of the House to resist this amendment that would be, in my judgment, regressive from the policies that we have established in the past.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the amendment which he has put before us with regard to the transfer of the \$4 million from the CAO to the Members' allowance.

But I would like to use a minute or so to discuss the other item which the gentleman from California referred to, and that is the policy with regard to minority access to the Internet through the majority. This was the subject of a rather extensive article in the Washington Post on July 1 which is headlined "House Web server leaving minority off the menu." While that may be a slight exaggeration, I think it is true that what this does is put an additional roadblock in the way of our Representatives throughout the United States having access to the material emanating from the minority in the Congress.

Now, in an ideal world, of course, the majority would contend, and it might be true, that this was not a roadblock and that there was no effort to censor or in any other way restrict communication. This is not an ideal world, and I will tell Members that the very fact that we have to use access through the majority is going to be a block which many constituents will find insurmountable because it will take an additional 1 or 2 minutes on their computer if they have a slow computer to scroll through and find out where the minority actually is within this vast network.

It is for this reason that it is a roadblock when we should be trying to make it easier, not because I suspect that the majority would want to do anything to restrict our minority page that I think this is a poor policy. We are doing everything possible to make it easier for people to communicate, constituents to communicate with their Representatives. This goes in the opposite direction. It is poor policy, and I urge that something be done to correct this at the earliest possible date.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me rise to comment on the specific amendment which we are supposed to be dealing with during this time, and I do not know about the desire for Members to have a referendum on the CAO. I am concerned about the language of the amendment which the gentleman from California, who as a member of the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committee has the ability to move freely between the two areas, and attempt to write policy from an authorizing committee position in the appropriation. We are supposed to have that be against the rules. It is legislating on an appropriations bill, but the Committee on Rules did make it in order, notwithstanding that.

My problem is that it builds a fence around the \$4 million. I would be less opposed to the amendment if he gave the \$4 million to the House Committee on Oversight so that we could place it where the Members could get the best use out of it. This amendment places it where the gentleman from California thinks we can get the best use out of it.

Where we are is the gentleman from California, notwithstanding the fact that he is in the minority, still wants to basically run the place and tell people what to do. I do not deny that that is a desirable position, it is just that I wanted 16 years to be in the same one and I would now like to exercise it. But the gentleman from California apparently does not want me to because he wants to tell me where to put the money.

At the beginning of this Congress, we took the separate categories of the Members' representational account and put them into one so that Members would have freedom to choose between staff or computers or travel or a district office. The gentleman now wants to go back to the policies of old, that he has already repudiated by his vote in committee, to free up the ability to determine where the member spends his money.

So on that particular amendment, I would ask for your opposition.

Now the Internet. The gentleman from California said something that I agree with, and that is that the Internet is information in a different form. After that, I had a fairly fundamental disagreement with what he has had to say. I really believe the people who took the floor earlier and said this was a gag rule—the gentleman from Colorado said it was un-American, that this is censorship I think got a little carried away with their rhetoric.

The reason I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] that this is information in a different form is that we really ought to look at that information in a different form so that we can understand what we are talking about. Committees give reports. They hold hearings. They write a report. Very often the minority disents from the majority report, and so you have the majority report and the minority report. Is the minority report presented in a completely separate document available to those constituents who want to find out about the hearing? No. It is included in a package that says, "Committee on House Oversight, House of Representatives, together with minority views." It is the majority and the minority combined.

The gentleman, and I think he waxed eloquent in the Committee on Rules, said that it was possible that visitors would probably thumb through 120 electronic pages to be able to find the minority location.

Every committee in the House except the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Committee on Intelligence has a Web site. We might understand why those two prefer not to have a Web site: The Ethics one probably would be too full and the Intelligence one would be blank. But for the other committees, here is the Committee on Resources. First page, picture of the chairman, Democrats, minority of the committee. We do not have to thumb through pages; it's right there. It is on the front, just like the reports. Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, right up front. "Welcome to the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services. Greetings from Chairman Jim Leach;" the Democrats' view, right up front. House Committee on the Budget, they even put a donkey so that those folks who have trouble with the cursive can locate the minority home page.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] was complaining about the

Committee on Science. We do have to go to the second page on the Committee on Science because the chairman decided "Hot News" would take up a third of the page. Current issues that affect both the majority and the minority would take up a portion of the first page; but right there, the Democrats.

Let me talk about information in another form in another way. If we go to the House of Representatives telephone directory, we will find staff listed alphabetically. We will find staff listed by Members' offices, and we will find staff listed and Members listed by committee. On that page it says Committee on House Oversight, for example, just thumbing to that page, the majority, the minority, the majority staff, the minority staff, located by committee.

What the gentleman from California and the others are really asking for is something that is unprecedented in the history of the House, a wedge, if you will, to open up the opportunity to create a distinct and separate structure for the minority.

Now, if our colleagues had been in the majority for 40 years and now have to suffer under the yoke of being in the minority, our colleagues would not accept the fact that their colleagues share the page with the majority in the phone book or share the pages under the cover of committee reports or that they are second on the Internet page for the particular committee. Our colleagues would want their own distinct structure.

Well, it has never been that way. They are trying to use this argument of censorship on the Internet as a wedge argument to begin to unravel the 40 years of history that they established as the majority.

Now, the new majority is somewhat more conservative than the old and we probably would tend to hang on to those areas that worked well. One of the areas that worked well was to use the committee as the structure, underneath that, the majority and the minority. All we are doing is continuing that structure on the Internet as well.

□ 1530

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the prior speaker, it occurred to me that perhaps he has not searched the Web extensively because I heard the analogy to committee reports. Now I am new to the Congress, but I read some committee reports and they tend to go through legislation, and there are pros and cons on each side, and they are bound together in one volume. I think that is just dandy. That is the way it ought to be. But if you take a look at Web sites, that is not what you find.

For example, in the Committee on Resources Web site there is a picture of the chairman, along with articles like, "The Republican Investment in the Environment," which is bookmarked under "Humor" on the Web, and there is a small link to Democrats buried under committee information. The Joint Economic Committee opens with, "Welcome to the home page of Vice Chairman SAXTON and House Republican members of the JEC." It then links to each Republican JEC House member and the JEC Republicans in the Senate, and provides the text of partisan Republican publications on the "Contract With America" and the "Debt Limit Charade."

These are not like committee reports, and requiring the minority to be just a subset of the majority on Web sites is kind of like saying you can send out a press release, minority, but only if you staple it to the majority's press release, if they send one out. That is what I object to. I think it is what most Members who are speaking here object to.

The fact is that under the House rules that we adopted, there is 10 megabytes of space for the majority and there is 10 megabytes of space for the minority. That space should be used, hopefully prudently, honestly and usefully for the American public, by each side to speak the truth about what they know of issues of importance to America.

A few hours ago I talked to a gentleman in high-tech who had heard the debate. He is an immigrant. He built his company from nothing and he said this is fascism. This immigrant said he has heard what is going on. He said that he comes from a place where he saw fascism arrive. "You leaders in America must stop fascism when it first surfaces, when you first see those signs," he said, "and that is now. Please do not allow this to happen."

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for allowing me to speak.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for a response.

Mr. Chairman, I really seriously object to the analogy that was just used, fascism.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that was not really the intent of the gentlewoman. The concern, obviously, is great, but I would not want to typify it as anything more than a disagreement on policy.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would appreciate the gentlewoman's response.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I was quoting an individual who spoke to me, not a Member of this body. And per-

haps as a new Member I am not as aware of the rules as I might have been. If it offended or it was inappropriate, I would certainly withdraw the remark.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the association, though, to this body or to any Members of this body or either side of this body is an inappropriate association.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express one point, and that is that this amendment will cost money. The House information resources can negotiate a large volume of purchases and thus get volume buying and volume cost discounts for the entire cyber Congress initiative. Some 440 individual contracts are negotiated by each Member, and that would lead to a lot of additional expense. It would lead to a lack of standardization of our equipment in each of our offices, and, overall, I think it would be chaotic.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, from today's issue of The New York Times I read where it says, "For years, each lawmaker has decided which computer system, if any, they wished to buy and to install in their office. This has led to a congressional Tower of Babel that receives a total of 100,000 E-mail messages a week. Some messages arrive three days late on one of nine overlap systems."

So I really would oppose this amendment and feel, again, it would be regressive.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I find it rather hypocritical to respond to the comment about fascism that "I have done my homework and I know that it was a quote and, therefore, in quoting others on the floor that it is not a breach of the rules; however, since I am a new Member I may not be aware of the rules."

It seems to me we cannot have it both ways. The gentlewoman knew exactly what she was trying to do, and what she did was interject a level of hostility which is totally inappropriate on this particular subject. What she does not know, perhaps, is that there was never any intention not to provide the ordinary software procedures for moving to sites that one is returning to by those people who browse frequently.

The problem arose when the ranking Member, using that unique authorizing and appropriations avenue that he has, moved to the appropriations route to try to meet his needs instead of sitting down with the chairman of the committee and working it out.

As we move forward with this new technology, just as we have in every area, just as the letterhead says, chairman and minority, we will share. And we share far more than the other side ever shared when they were the majority. We are doing more in reaching out to the minority than they did, and we will continue that trend, despite the references.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to simply say this amendment, of course, does not go to the Internet policy. It does, however, I think send a message to the CAO that we need to manage the cyber-Congress in a much more effective way.

Just simply in reference to Internet policy, my only reason for bringing it this route is that, of course, our committee makes these decisions in and of itself. I do not mean to deny that that in most cases is appropriate. But this is a new policy. It ought to be a solidly compromised and accepted policy by all, on all sides of the debate, minority or majority, and I do think this is a worthy discussion for us to have. I would hope Members would err on the side of openness and equal access to the Internet.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and, in closing, I would like to emphasize that I do not believe we have ever had a time when there has been more willingness to cooperate than this majority has extended to this minority. We, I think, have bent over backwards to make equal access, equal opportunity and equal funding for virtually everything we do, and I think that the gentleman from California would admit to that.

This amendment takes money away from our movement to the cyber-Congress, to the electronic age for this body and for each of our offices, and all of which really benefits our communications and our operations. These investments will make us more efficient and more effective in our offices, both in our congressional districts and here in Washington. Instead, this amendment would free up additional money in our allowances for additional mailings and travel and a variety of other things that I think the public would really object to. I think that would be move in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The amendment was rejected.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 6, as modified, offered by the gentleman

from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], and amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote, if ordered, on the pending question following this vote.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—239

Allard	Deal	Hostettler
Andrews	DeLay	Houghton
Archer	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Armey	Dickey	Hutchinson
Bachus	Dooley	Hyde
Baker (CA)	Doolittle	Inglis
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Istook
Ballenger	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Barcia	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Barr	Ehlers	Jones
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	Kasich
Bartlett	English	Kelly
Barton	Ensign	Kim
Bass	Everett	King
Bateman	Ewing	Kingston
Bereuter	Fawell	Klug
Berman	Fields (TX)	Knollenberg
Bilbray	Flanagan	Kolbe
Bilirakis	Foley	LaHood
Bliley	Forbes	Largent
Blute	Fowler	Latham
Boehlert	Fox	LaTourette
Boehner	Franks (CT)	Laughlin
Bonilla	Frelinghuysen	Leach
Bono	Frisa	Lewis (CA)
Brewster	Funderburk	Lewis (KY)
Brownback	Galleghy	Lightfoot
Bryant (TN)	Ganske	Linder
Bunn	Gekas	Livingston
Bunning	Geren	LoBiondo
Burr	Gilchrest	Lucas
Burton	Gillmor	Manzullo
Buyer	Gilman	Martini
Callahan	Gingrich	McCollum
Calvert	Goodlatte	McCrary
Camp	Goodling	McHugh
Campbell	Goss	McInnis
Canady	Graham	McIntosh
Castle	Greene (UT)	McKeon
Chabot	Greenwood	Metcalf
Chambliss	Gunderson	Meyers
Chenoweth	Gutknecht	Mica
Christensen	Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)
Chrysler	Hamilton	Molinari
Clinger	Hancock	Moorhead
Coble	Hansen	Moran
Coburn	Harman	Morella
Collins (GA)	Hastert	Myers
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Condit	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Cooley	Hefley	Ney
Cox	Heineman	Norwood
Crane	Herger	Nussle
Crapo	Hilleary	Oxley
Cremeans	Hobson	Packard
Cubin	Hoekstra	Paxon
Cunningham	Hoke	Peterson (MN)
Davis	Horn	Petri

Pombo	Schiff
Porter	Seastrand
Portman	Sensenbrenner
Pryce	Shadegg
Quillen	Shaw
Quinn	Shays
Radanovich	Shuster
Ramstad	Skeen
Regula	Smith (MI)
Riggs	Smith (NJ)
Roberts	Smith (TX)
Roemer	Smith (WA)
Rogers	Solomon
Rohrabacher	Souder
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence
Roth	Stearns
Royce	Stockman
Salmon	Stump
Sanford	Talent
Saxton	Tate
Scarborough	Tauzin
Schaefer	Taylor (NC)

NOES—181

Abercrombie	Gordon
Ackerman	Green (TX)
Baesler	Hall (OH)
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Hefner
Becerra	Hilliard
Beilenson	Hinchey
Bentsen	Holden
Bevill	Hoyer
Bishop	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee
Bonior	(TX)
Borski	Jacobs
Boucher	Jefferson
Browder	Johnson (SD)
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Johnston
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)
Clayton	Kennelly
Clement	Kildee
Clyburn	Klecza
Coleman	Klink
Collins (IL)	LaFalce
Collins (MI)	Lazio
Conyers	Levin
Costello	Lewis (GA)
Coyne	Lipinski
Cramer	Lofgren
Cummings	Lowe
Danner	Luther
de la Garza	Maloney
DeFazio	Manton
DeLauro	Markey
Dellums	Martinez
Deutsch	Mascara
Dicks	Matsui
Dingell	McCarthy
Dixon	McDermott
Doggett	McHale
Doyle	McKinney
Durbin	McNulty
Edwards	Meehan
Engel	Meek
Eshoo	Menendez
Evans	Millender-
Farr	McDonald
Fattah	Miller (CA)
Fazio	Minge
Fields (LA)	Mink
Filner	Moakley
Flake	Mollohan
Flake	Molloy
Foglietta	Montgomery
Frank (MA)	Murtha
Frank (NJ)	Nadler
Frost	Neal
Furse	Neumann
Gejdenson	Oberstar
Gonzalez	Obey

NOT VOTING—14

Clay	Gutierrez
Dunn	Hayes
Ford	Lantos
Gephardt	Lincoln
Gibbons	Longley

Thomas	Thornberry
Tiahrt	Trafficant
Torkildsen	Upton
Walden (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Weller	White
Whitfield	Wicker
Wolf	Young (AK)
Zeliff	Zimmer

Ms. Dunn of Washington for, with Mr. Clay against.

Mr. Longley for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Ms. FURSE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. MONTGOMERY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CHABOT and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 248, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—172

Allard	Geren	Meyers
Baker (CA)	Gillmor	Mica
Baldacci	Goodlatte	Minge
Barcia	Gordon	Montgomery
Barr	Goss	Moorhead
Barrett (WI)	Graham	Myrick
Bartlett	Green (TX)	Neumann
Barton	Gutknecht	Norwood
Bentsen	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Blute	Hamilton	Orton
Browder	Hancock	Parker
Brownback	Harman	Pastor
Bryant (TN)	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Bunning	Hayworth	Peterson (MN)
Burton	Hefley	Petri
Camp	Heineman	Pombo
Campbell	Herger	Portman
Chabot	Hilleary	Poshard
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Quinn
Chenoweth	Hoke	Radanovich
Christensen	Holden	Ramstad
Chrysler	Hostettler	Roberts
Coble	Hutchinson	Roemer
Coburn	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Combest	Jacobs	Roth
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Cooley	Jones	Royce
Cox	Kasich	Salmon
Cramer	Kelly	Sanford
Crane	Kim	Scarborough
Crapo	Klecza	Schaefer
Cremeans	Klug	Schumer
Cubin	LaHood	Seastrand
Cunningham	Largent	Sensenbrenner
Danner	Latham	Shadegg
Davis	Laughlin	Shays
Deal	Leach	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Linder	Smith (WA)
Doyle	LoBiondo	Solomon
Dreier	Lofgren	Souder
Duncan	Lucas	Spence
Ensign	Luther	Stearns
Ewing	Maloney	Stenholm
Fawell	Manzullo	Stockman
Flanagan	Martini	Stump
Foley	Mascara	Stupak
Fox	McHale	Talent
Franks (CT)	McHugh	Tanner
Franks (NJ)	McInnis	Tate
Funderburk	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Furse	Meehan	Taylor (NC)
Ganske	Metcalf	Thornberry

□ 1601

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

McDade	Young (FL)
Rangel	
Watt (NC)	

Tiaht  
Torrice  
Upton  
Ward

Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
White

Whitfield  
Zimmer

□ 1610

Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. PORTMAN, MCINTOSH, and BROWDER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3754) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 473, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, I am.

□ 1615

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FAZIO of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3754 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 4, line 7, strike "\$22,577,000" and insert "\$22,427,000" and

On page 4, line 8, strike "\$16,577,000" and insert "\$16,427,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, the motion I am offering instructs the bill being reduced by \$150,000 through the account of HIR. This is the amount that is necessary for the Republican majority to implement their new Internet policy which we believe denies Democrats our own independently accessed Web site. This amount of money is a relatively small amount.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] who could explain how this could easily

be attained by more efficient policy procurement.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to recommit because its intent is to avoid a policy that I believe will have the effect of stifling voices of dissent, which will not serve this body or our country well.

As the House is aware, every office will soon be getting a computer as part of our new CyberCongress initiative. I was interested on the details on it and did get the cost for the computer, which is \$5,367.12. I took the specs for that computer and went to a normal vendor outside of the favorite inside vendor and asked them for an estimate. They came in with a cost that is \$900 per computer, less for a better machine, 120 megahertz as compared to the 100 megahertz that the House has purchased. If that were expanded to all 435 offices, that would be nearly \$400,000 that this House would save.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to do that whether or not the motion to recommit is approved, but clearly if this motion is approved, we can save at least \$150,000 just by making a better purchase on the new computers for each House office.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, my motion concerns the Internet policy set by the Committee on House Oversight on May 23. It will prevent funds from being spent to implement this policy. But I believe it is a policy of sufficient importance that it needs to be reevaluated as we consider funding for House operations. This is the only opportunity allowed by the Committee on Rules.

A restricted Internet policy is certainly one we are going to all have to explain to our constituents, so we should all have a chance here today to make a judgment on this policy, not simply majority of seven within the Committee on House Oversight, all Republicans.

The policy, as issued, prevents access to Democratic pages, Web pages, unless a user goes to the Republican page first. As was said in the earlier debate, it is like requiring, when we put out a press release, that we staple on top of it a press release from the other point of view. Our constituents may have to scroll through literally hundreds of screens of Republican information to even discover that the Democrats have a Web site at all.

In fact, when we made this policy, the chairman made it clear at the hearing that if a committee Chair unilaterally did not want a minority Web page at all, he or she could simply refuse to have a Web page for the majority. This is, pure and simple, a restriction on access to information. The effect of this policy is that users of the Internet and the World Wide Web, our constituents, cannot get the information they want.

It would be similar to this analogy: The freshmen have a Web site; the Republican freshmen. Should the public have to access the Democratic freshmen Web site through the Republican

NOES—248

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Archer  
Arney  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barrett (NE)  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Billirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Burr  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cummings  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta

Forbes  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gilchrist  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Greene (UT)  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hobson  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
King  
Kingston  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lowe  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meek  
Menendez  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler

Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Rogers  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (TX)  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Tauzin  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Turman  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Townes  
Traficant  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weldon (PA)  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—13

Clay  
Dunn  
Ford  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gutierrez  
Hayes  
Lantos  
Lincoln  
Longley  
McDade  
Watt (NC)  
Young (FL)

freshmen Web site? It would be, I think, ludicrous. Of course not. But it illustrates, I think, how ridiculous this policy can really be.

It is a bad policy to restrict information for. It flies in the face of all the discussion of a vaunted open Congress. It perverts the whole idea behind the free flow of electronic information that is inherent in the idea behind the Internet and the World Wide Web itself.

So I want to prevail upon the reason, the wisdom, the common sense of my colleagues and ask them to reject this policy, support this minimal reduction in the HIR budget, one we could easily make up with a tighter procurement policy, and strike a blow for open information regardless of whether one is with the minority or the majority.

After all, we all must anticipate during our careers we will share the experience in both categories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] opposed to the motion to recommit?

Mr. PACKARD. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican Internet system. This is a bipartisan, bicameral system. The Members of the CyberCongress roster, the Internet Caucus roster, is made up of 50 Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle, and they strongly urge that we proceed forward with the Web page and the Internet system.

This motion to recommit will mean that the team of computer experts who are helping individual Members, each of us, put their Web site on the Internet will be eliminated in this motion to recommit. This team not only helps the committees install their own Web pages, but it helps train our colleagues and their staff on how to use the Internet for their Web sites.

Mr. Chairman, this recommittal will harm the House's ability to use the Internet and make information available to our constituents. This funding is for two or three people who support Members and committee staff to present material in a clear and relevant way to the American people.

This is a policy issue, not an issue of funding, and should be dealt with in the policy forum, not through this bill. Currently 12 inquiries are received daily by HIR which reflect a growing demand on this service.

I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way to reject this motion to recommit because it will hurt our colleagues' individual offices as they move toward the Internet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if anyone ever wondered what was meant by the old phrase, "cut off your nose to spite

your face," we have got exhibit A in front of us in this motion to recommit.

The gentleman from California talked about the committee Web sites, that we have to go through hundreds of pages. Just a short time ago I showed our colleagues the pages. It is right on the front page. They even use an icon of a donkey for those who are not sure where they are supposed to go. We provide a book mark, go to that site once, and then in the software the return user can go directly to the minority site. Every committee has it except the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. What he proposes to do is cut out the employees in HIR that assist in the more than 180 Web sites.

Democrats and Republicans, we heard speech after speech about wanting an open Congress, wanting a House that was more willing to work with people on the outside, and we were not willing to do that by having the committees with the majority and the minority tied together like it is everywhere else.

I say to my colleagues, "This amendment cuts off your nose to spite your face. You are going to deny support services to Democrats as well as Republicans, to groups like freshmen Democrats and freshmen Republicans so you can make a point backed up by facts that simply are not so."

I would urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PACKARD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge on a bipartisan basis that we, for our own good and for the good of our CyberCongress and our individual offices, vote this motion to recommit down, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 230, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—191

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Bishop
Ackerman	Becerra	Blumenauer
Andrews	Beilenson	Bonior
Baessler	Bentsen	Borski
Baldacci	Berman	Boucher
Barcia	Bevill	Brewster

Browder	Holden	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Payne (VA)
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (FL)
Bryant (TX)	(TX)	Pickett
Cardin	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Chapman	Jefferson	Poshard
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clyburn	Johnston	Reed
Coleman	Kanjorski	Richardson
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Rivers
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Conyers	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Kildee	Rush
Coyne	Kleczka	Sabo
Cramer	Klink	Sanders
Cummings	LaFalce	Sawyer
Danner	Levin	Schroeder
de la Garza	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
DeLauro	Lipinski	Scott
Dellums	Lofgren	Serrano
Deutsch	Lowe	Sisisky
Dicks	Luther	Skaggs
Dingell	Maloney	Skelton
Dixon	Manton	Slaughter
Doggett	Markey	Spratt
Dooley	Martinez	Stark
Doyle	Mascara	Stenholm
Durbin	Matsui	Stokes
Edwards	McCarthy	Studds
Engel	McDermott	Stupak
Eshoo	McHale	Tanner
Evans	McKinney	Tauzin
Farr	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	Meehan	Tejeda
Fazio	Meek	Thompson
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Thornton
Filner	Millender-	Thurman
Flake	McDonald	Torres
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Torricelli
Frank (MA)	Minge	Towns
Frost	Mink	Traficant
Furse	Moakley	Velazquez
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Vento
Gephardt	Montgomery	Visclosky
Geren	Moran	Volkmer
Gonzalez	Murtha	Ward
Gordon	Nadler	Waters
Green (TX)	Neal	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Williams
Hall (TX)	Obey	Wilson
Hamilton	Olver	Wise
Harman	Ortiz	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Wynn
Hefner	Owens	Yates
Hilliard	Pallone	
Hinche	Pastor	

NOES—230

Allard	Christensen	Franks (NJ)
Archer	Chryslers	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Clinger	Frisa
Bachus	Coble	Funderburk
Baker (CA)	Coburn	Galleghy
Baker (LA)	Collins (GA)	Ganske
Ballenger	Combest	Gekas
Barr	Cooley	Gilchrest
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Gillmor
Bartlett	Crane	Gilman
Barton	Crapo	Goodlatte
Bass	Cremeans	Goodling
Bateman	Cubin	Goss
Bereuter	Cunningham	Graham
Bilbray	Davis	Greene (UT)
Bilirakis	Deal	Greenwood
Bliley	DeFazio	Gunderson
Blute	DeLay	Gutknecht
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Hancock
Boehner	Dickey	Hansen
Bonilla	Doolittle	Hastert
Bono	Dornan	Hastings (WA)
Brownback	Dreier	Hayworth
Bryant (TN)	Duncan	Hefley
Bunn	Ehlers	Heineman
Bunning	Ehrlich	Herger
Burr	English	Hilleary
Burton	Ensign	Hobson
Buyer	Everett	Hoekstra
Callahan	Ewing	Hoke
Calvert	Fawell	Horn
Camp	Fields (TX)	Hostettler
Campbell	Flanagan	Houghton
Canady	Foley	Hunter
Castle	Forbes	Hutchinson
Chabot	Fowler	Hyde
Chambliss	Fox	Inglis
Chenoweth	Franks (CT)	Istook

Johnson (CT)	Morella	Shadegg	Cramer	Hutchinson	Pelosi			
Johnson, Sam	Myers	Shaw	Crane	Inglis	Peterson (FL)			
Jones	Myrick	Shays	Crapo	Istook	Pickett	Andrews	Jacobs	Sabo
Kasich	Nethercutt	Shuster	Creameans	Jackson (IL)	Pombo	Brown (FL)	Johnston	Sanford
Kelly	Neumann	Skeen	Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Bryant (TX)	LoBiondo	Schroeder
Kim	Ney	Smith (MI)	Cummings	(TX)	Porter	Chenoweth	Lofgren	Sensenbrenner
King	Norwood	Smith (NJ)	Cunningham	Jefferson	Portman	Coble	Markey	Slaughter
Kingston	Nussle	Smith (TX)	Davis	Johnson (CT)	Poshard	Collins (IL)	McDermott	Solomon
Klug	Oxley	Smith (WA)	de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Pryce	Collins (MI)	Meehan	Souder
Knollenberg	Packard	Solomon	Deal	Johnson, E.B.	Quillen	Condit	Meek	Stark
Kolbe	Parker	Souder	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Conyers	Metcalf	Stearns
LaHood	Paxon	Spence	DeLauro	Jones	Radanovich	Cooley	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Largent	Peterson (MN)	Stearns	DeLay	Kanjorski	Rahall	Danner	Minge	Stockman
Latham	Petri	Stockman	Deutsch	Kaptur	Rangel	Dellums	Moran	Stump
LaTourette	Pombo	Stump	Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Reed	Doggett	Neumann	Talent
Laughlin	Porter	Talent	Dickey	Kelly	Regula	Engel	Oberstar	Tanner
Lazio	Portman	Tate	Dicks	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson	Fattah	Obey	Torricelli
Leach	Pryce	Taylor (NC)	Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Riggs	Ganske	Orton	Volkmer
Lewis (CA)	Quillen	Thomas	Dixon	Kennelly	Rivers	Green (TX)	Peterson (MN)	Yates
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Thornberry	Dooley	Kildee	Roberts	Hamilton	Petri	Zimmer
Lightfoot	Radanovich	Tiaht	Doolittle	Kim	Rogers	Hancock	Roemer	
Linder	Ramstad	Torkildsen	Dornan	King	Rohrabacher	Hilliard	Royce	
Livingston	Regula	Upton	Doyle	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen			
LoBiondo	Riggs	Vucanovich	Dreier	Klecza	Rose	Clay	Hayes	McDade
Lucas	Roberts	Walker	Duncan	Klink	Roth	Dunn	Hyde	Smith (TX)
Manzullo	Rogers	Walsh	Durbin	Klug	Roukema	Ford	Lantos	Watt (NC)
Martini	Rohrabacher	Wamp	Edwards	Knollenberg	Roybal-Allard	Gibbons	Lincoln	Waxman
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)	Ehlers	Kolbe	Rush	Gutierrez	Longley	Young (FL)
McCrery	Roth	Weldon (FL)	Ehrlich	LaFalce	Salmon			
McHugh	Roukema	Weldon (PA)	English	LaHood	Sanders			
McInnis	Royce	Weller	Ensign	Largent	Sawyer			
McIntosh	Salmon	White	Eshoo	Latham	Saxton			
McKeon	Sanford	Whitfield	Evans	LaTourette	Scarborough			
Metcalf	Saxton	Wicker	Everett	Laughlin	Schaefer			
Meyers	Scarborough	Wolf	Ewing	Lazio	Schiff			
Mica	Schaefer	Young (AK)	Farr	Leach	Schumer			
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Zeliff	Fawell	Levin	Scott			
Molinari	Seastrand	Zimmer	Fazio	Lewis (CA)	Seastrand			
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner		Fields (LA)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano			
			Fields (TX)	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg			
			Filner	Lightfoot	Shaw			
			Flake	Linder	Shays			
			Flanagan	Lipinski	Shuster			
			Foglietta	Livingston	Sisisky			
			Foley	Lowe	Skaggs			
			Forbes	Lucas	Skeen			
			Fowler	Luther	Skelton			
			Fox	Maloney	Smith (MI)			
			Frank (MA)	Manton	Smith (NJ)			
			Franks (CT)	Manzullo	Smith (WA)			
			Franks (NJ)	Martinez	Spence			
			Frelinghuysen	Martini	Spratt			
			Frisa	Mascara	Stokes			
			Frost	Matsui	Studds			
			Funderburk	McCarthy	Stupak			
			Furse	McCollum	Tate			
			Gallegly	McCrery	Tauzin			
			Gejdenson	McHale	Taylor (MS)			
			Gekas	McHugh	Taylor (NC)			
			Gephardt	McInnis	Tejeda			
			Geren	McIntosh	Thomas			
			Gilchrest	McKeon	Thompson			
			Gillmor	McKinney	Thornberry			
			Gilman	McNulty	Thornton			
			Gonzalez	Menendez	Thurman			
			Goodlatte	Meyers	Tiaht			
			Goodling	Mica	Torkildsen			
			Gordon	Millender-	Torres			
			Goss	McDonald	Towns			
			Graham	Miller (FL)	Traficant			
			Greene (UT)	Mink	Upton			
			Greenwood	Moakley	Velazquez			
			Gunderson	Molinari	Vento			
			Gutknecht	Mollohan	Visclosky			
			Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Vucanovich			
			Hall (TX)	Moorhead	Walker			
			Hansen	Morella	Walsh			
			Harman	Murtha	Wamp			
			Hastert	Myers	Ward			
			Hastings (FL)	Myrick	Waters			
			Hastings (WA)	Nadler	Watts (OK)			
			Hayworth	Neal	Weldon (FL)			
			Hefley	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)			
			Hefner	Ney	Weller			
			Heineman	Norwood	White			
			Herger	Nussle	Whitfield			
			Hilleary	Olver	Wicker			
			Hinchev	Ortiz	Williams			
			Hobson	Owens	Wilson			
			Hoekstra	Oxley	Wise			
			Hoke	Packard	Wolf			
			Holden	Pallone	Woolsey			
			Horn	Park	Wynn			
			Hostettler	Pastor	Young (AK)			
			Houghton	Paxon	Zeliff			
			Hoyer	Payne (NJ)				
			Hunter	Payne (VA)				

## NAYS—58

## NOT VOTING—15

□ 1652

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 472 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 472

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declared the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 302 or 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. The Chairman of the Committee of the

## NOT VOTING—12

Clay	Gutierrez	Longley
Dunn	Hayes	McDade
Ford	Lantos	Watt (NC)
Gibbons	Lincoln	Young (FL)

□ 1644

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Linder with Mr. Longley against.  
Mr. Clay with Ms. Dunn of Washington against.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 58, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—360

Abercrombie	Bevill	Buyer
Ackerman	Bilbray	Callahan
Allard	Bilirakis	Calvert
Archer	Bishop	Camp
Armye	Biley	Campbell
Bachus	Blumenauer	Canady
Baesler	Blute	Cardin
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Castle
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Chabot
Baldacci	Bonilla	Chambliss
Ballenger	Bonior	Chapman
Barcia	Bono	Christensen
Barr	Borski	Chrystler
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Clayton
Barrett (WI)	Brewster	Clement
Bartlett	Browder	Clinger
Barton	Brown (CA)	Clyburn
Bass	Brown (OH)	Coburn
Bateman	Brownback	Coleman
Becerra	Bryant (TN)	Collins (GA)
Beilenson	Bunn	Combest
Bentsen	Bunning	Costello
Bereuter	Burr	Cox
Berman	Burton	Coyne