United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1996 No. 101

# House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of the 105th Psalm:

*O give thanks to the Lord, call on his name, make known his deeds among the people.*

*Sing to him, sing praises to him, tell of all his wonderful works.*

*Glory in his holy name; let the hearts of those who seek the Lord rejoice.*

*Seek the Lord and his strength, seek his presence continually.*

*Remember the wonderful works that he has done, his miracles, and the judgments he uttered,*

*O offspring of Abraham his servant, sons of Jacob, his chosen ones. Amen.*

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. FORBES. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FORBES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 27, 1996, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0948

## JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY BINYAMIN NETANYAHU, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency, Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, into the Chamber: The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER]; the gentleman from California [Mr. COX]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON]; the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]; the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX]; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]; the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST]; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]; the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS]; the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN]; and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency, Binyamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, into the House Chamber: The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT]; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK]; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG]; the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO]; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE]; the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD]; the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER]; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD]; the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN]; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG]; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY]; the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE]; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN]; and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

The assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the acting dean of the diplomatic corps, the Honorable Nuzhet Kandemir, Ambassador of Turkey.

The acting dean of the diplomatic corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m., the assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Prime Minister of Israel.

The Prime Minister of Israel, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and a personal pleasure to present to you His Excellency, Binyamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

## ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, BINYAMIN NETANYAHU, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Prime Minister NETANYAHU. If I can only get the Knesset to vote like this.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, this is not the first time that a Prime Minister of Israel addresses a joint meeting of Congress. My immediate predecessor, Shimon Peres, addressed this body, and before him, the late Yitzhak Rabin, who fell, tragically cut down by a despicable, savage assassin. We are grateful that Israeli democracy has proved resilient enough to overcome this barbaric act, but we shall always carry with us the pain of this tragedy.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the great honor you have bestowed on me is not personal. It is a tribute to the unshakable fact that the unique relationship between Israel and the United States transcends politics and parties, governments and diplomacy. It is a relationship between two peoples who share a total commitment to the spirit of democracy, an infinite dedication to freedom. We have a common vision of how societies should be governed, of how civilizations should be advanced. We both believe in eternal values; we both believe in the Almighty; we both follow traditions hallowed by time and experience.

We admire America not only for its dynamism and for its power and for its wealth. We admire America for its moral force, as Jews and as Israelis. We are proud that this moral force is derived from the Bible and the precepts of morality that the Jewish people have given the world.

Of course, Israel and the United States also have common interests. But our bonds go well beyond such interests. In the 19th century citizens for all free states viewed France as the great guardian of liberty. In the 20th century every free persons looks to America as the champion of freedom.

Yesterday my wife and I spent a very moving hour at Arlington National Cemetery, and we saw there the evidence of the price you paid for that freedom in the lives of your best and brightest young men, and it is a toll that is exacted from you, from all of us, but from you these very days.

I think it was the terrible misfortune of the Jewish people that in the first half of this century the United States had not yet assumed its pivotal role in the world, and it has been our great fortune that in the second half of this century, with the miraculous renewal of Jewish nationhood, the United States became the preeminent power in the world. You, the people of America, offered the Jewish state, a fledgling Jewish state, succor and support. You stood by us time and time again against the forces of tyranny and totalitarianism, and I know that I speak for every Israeli and every Jew throughout the world when I say to you today: Thank you, people of America.

Perhaps our most demanding joint effort has been the endless quest to achieve peace and stability for Israel and its Arab neighbors. American Presidents have joined successive Israeli Governments in an untiring effort to obtain this peace. The first historic breakthrough was led by Prime Minister Begain and Presidents Carter and Sadat at Camp David, and the most recent success was the pact with Jordan under the auspices of President Clinton. These efforts, I believe, are clear proof of our intentions and our direction. We want peace.

We want peace with all our neighbors. We have no quarrel with them which cannot be resolved by peaceful means, nor, I must say, do we have a quarrel with Islam. We reject the thesis of inevitable clash of civilizations. We do not subscribe to the idea that Islam has replaced communism as the new rival of the West, because our conflict is specific. It is with those militant fanatics who pervert the central tenets of a great faith, toward violence and world domination. Our hand is stretched out in peace for all who would grasp it.

We do not care about the religion. We do not care about their national identify. We do not care about their ideological beliefs. We care about peace, and our hand is stretched out for peace.

Every Israeli wants peace. I do not think there is a people who has yearned or prayed or sacrificed more for peace than we have. There is not a family in Israel that has not suffered the unbearable agony of war and, directly or indirectly, the excruciating, everlasting pain of grief. The mandate we have received from the people of Israel is to continue the search for an end to wars and an end to grief. I promise you, we are going to live up to this mandate.

We will continue the quest for peace, and to this end, we are ready to resume negotiations with the Palestinian Authority on the implementation of our interim agreement.

I want to say something about agreements. Some of you speak Latin, or at least study Latin. Pax est summa servanda. We believe agreements are made to be kept. This is our policy. We expect the Palestinian side to abide by its commitments. On this basis, we will be prepared to begin final status negotiations as well. We are ready to engage Syria and Lebanon in meaningful negotiations. We seek to broaden the circle of peace to the whole Arab world and the rest of the countries of the Middle East.

But I want to make it clear that we want a peace that will last. We must have a peace based on security for all. We cannot, and I might say we dare not, forget that more men, women, and children have lost their lives through terrorist attacks in the last 3 years, than in the entire previous decade.

I know that the representatives of the United States sitting here, the people of the United States, are now becoming tragically familiar with this

experience. You have experienced it in places as far afield as New York's World Trade Center and, most recently, in Daharan. I notice also the recent torchings of the Afro-American churches in America, which I must tell you strike a familiar and chilling note among Jews. But I want to try to put the Israeli experience in perspective, and one has to imagine, to do so, to imagine such attacks occurring time and time again in every city, in every corner of this great country.

So what we are saying here today is as simple as it is elementary: Peace means the absence of violence. Peace means not fearing for your children every time they board a bus. Peace means walking the streets of your town without the fearful shriek of Katyusha rockets overhead.

We just visited with the wife of a friend of mine, the deputy mayor of Kir yat shemona, who was walking the streets of Kir yat shemona when the fearful shriek of a rocket overhead burned her car, nearly burned her, and she was miraculously saved, and she is alive and she is getting better. But peace means that this does not happen, because peace without personal safety is a contradiction in terms. It is a hoax. It will not stand.

What we are facing in the Middle East today is a broad front of terror throughout the area. Its common goal is to remove any Western, and primarily any American, presence in the Middle East. It seeks to break our will, to shatter our resolve, to make us yield.

I believe the terrorists must understand that we will not yield, however grave and fearful the challenge. Neither Israel nor any other democracy, and certainly not the United States, must ever bend to terrorism. We must fight it. We must fight it resolutely, endlessly, tirelessly. We must fight it together until we remove this malignancy from the face of the Earth.

For too long the standards of peace, used throughout the world, have not been applied to the Middle East. Violence and despotism have been excused and not challenged. Respect for human freedoms has not been on the agenda. It has been on the agenda everywhere else, everywhere else: In Latin America, in the former Soviet Union, in South Africa. And that effort has been led by successive American administrations and by this House.

I think it is time to demand a peace based on norms and on standards. It is not enough to talk about peace in abstraction. We must talk about the content of peace. It is time, I believe, for a code of conduct for building a lasting Middle East peace. Such a peace must be based on three pillars, the three pillars of peace.

Security is the first pillar. There is no substitute for it. To succeed, the quest for peace must be accompanied by a quest for security.

Demanding an end to terrorist attacks as a prerequisite for peace does not give terrorists veto power over the peace process, because nearly all of the terrorist acts directed against us are perpetrated by known organizations whose activities can be curbed, if not altogether stopped, by our negotiating partners. This means that our negotiating partners, and, indeed, all of the regimes in the region, must make a strategic choice: either follow the option of terror, follow the option of terror as an instrument of policy or diplomacy, or follow the option of peace. But they cannot have it both ways.

This choice means that the Palestinian Authority must live up to its obligations it has solemnly undertaken to prevent terrorist attacks against Israel. This choice also means that Syria must cease its policy of enabling proxy attacks against Israeli cities, and undertake to eliminate threats from Hizbollah and other Syrian-based groups. This means that the fight against terror cannot be episodic, it cannot be conditional, it cannot be whimsical, it cannot be optional. It must become the mainstay of a relationship of trust between Israel and its Arab partners.

The second pillar of peace is reciprocity. This means an unshakeable commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes—including the border disputes between Israel and its neighbors.

The signing of a peace treaty should be the beginning of a relationship of reciprocal respect and recognition, and the fulfillment of mutual obligations. It should not trigger round after round of hostile diplomacy. Peace should not be the pursuit of war by other means.

A peace without pacification, a peace without normalization, a peace in which Israel is repeatedly brought under attack, is not a true peace.

But reciprocity, reciprocity means that every line in every agreement turns into a sinew for reconciliation. Reciprocity means that an agreement must be kept by both sides. Reciprocity is the glue of mutual commitment that upholds agreements, and this is the second pillar of peace.

The third pillar of lasting peace is democracy and human rights. I am not revealing a secret to the Members of this Chamber when I say that modern democracies do not initiate aggression. This has been the central lesson of the 20th century. States that respect the human rights of their citizens are not likely to provoke hostile action against their neighbors. No one knows better than the United States, the world's greatest democracy, that the best guarantor against military adventurism is accountable, democratic government.

The world has witnessed the bitter results of policies without standards in the case of Saddam Hussein. Unless we want more Saddams to rise, we must apply the standards of democracy and human rights in the Middle East. I believe that every Muslim and every Christian and every Jew in the region is entitled to nothing less.

I do not think we should accept the idea that the Middle East is the latest or the last isolated sanctuary that will be democracy-free for all time except the presence of Israel. I realize that this is a process. It may be a long-term process, but I think we should begin it.

It is time for the states of the Middle East to put the issue of human rights and democratization on their agenda. Democratization means accepting a free press and the right of a legal opposition to organize and express itself. It is very important for the opposition to be able to express itself, Mr. Speaker. I have just learned that, and we will accord that same right, as you know.

This is democracy. It is to be able to disagree, to express our disagreements, and sometimes to agree after disagreements. It means tolerance. It means an inherent shift away from aggression toward the recognition of the mutual right to differ.

I will admit, the Middle East as a whole has not yet effected this basic shift, this change from autocracy to democracy. But this does not mean that we cannot have peace in the region now, peace with nondemocratic regimes. I believe we can. It is a fact that we have had such peace arrangements. But such peace arrangements as we can now arrive at can only be characterized as a defensible peace in which we must retain assets essential to the defense of our country and sufficient to deter aggression.

Until this democratization process becomes a mainstay of the region, the proper course for the democratic world, led by the United States, is to strengthen the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel, and to encourage moves to pluralism and greater freedom in the Arab world. I want to make something clear. We do not want merely peace in our time. We want peace for all time.

□ 1030

To the message of peace now, we do not just want peace now. We want peace now and later. We want peace for generations. There is no divide. That desire is heartfelt. It should be a point of unity, not of disunity. I believe this is why we must make the pursuit of human rights and democracy a cornerstone of our quest.

So these, then, I believe are the three pillars of peace: security, reciprocity, and the strengthening of democracy.

I believe that a peace based on these three pillars can be advanced. Yet, ladies and gentlemen, I would be remiss if I did not refer to a major challenge facing all of us.

I have touched on the problem of the Middle East that is largely undemocratic, and part of it is strongly antidemocratic. Specifically, it is being radicalized and terrorized by a number of unreconstructed dictatorships whose governmental creed is based on tyranny and intimidation.

The most dangerous of these regimes is Iran, that has wed a cruel despotism

to a fanatic militancy. If this regime, or its despotic neighbor Iraq, were to acquire nuclear weapons, this could presage catastrophic consequences not only for my country and not only for the Middle East but for all of mankind.

I believe the international community must reinvigorate its efforts to isolate these regimes and prevent them from acquiring atomic power. The United States and Israel have been at the forefront of this effort, but we can and we must do much more. Europe and the countries of Asia must be made to understand that it is folly, nothing short of folly, to pursue short-term material gain while creating a long-term existential danger for all of us.

I believe that only the United States can lead this vital international effort to stop the nuclearization of terrorist states. But the deadline for attaining this goal is getting extremely close.

In our own generation, we have witnessed how the United States averted, by its wisdom, tenacity and determination, the dangerous expansion of a totalitarian superpower equipped with nuclear weapons. The policy it used for that purpose was deterrence. Now we see the rise of a similar threat, similar and in many ways more dangerous, against which deterrence by itself may not be sufficient. Deterrence must now be reinforced with prevention, immediate and effective prevention.

We are confident that America, once again, will not fail to take the lead in protecting our free civilization of this ultimate horror. But, ladies and gentlemen, time is running out. We have to act, responsibly, in a united front, internationally. This is not a slogan. This is not overdramatization. This is the life of our world, of our children and of our grandchildren. And I believe that there is no greater, no more noble, no more responsible force than the united force of democracy led by the greatest democracy, the United States. We can overcome this challenge. We can meet it successfully.

Let me now say a word about a subject that has been on your mind and ours, and that subject is the city of Jerusalem.

Countless words have been written about that city on the hill, which represents the universal hope for justice and peace. I live in that city on the hill. And in my boyhood I knew that city, when it was divided into enemy camps, with coils of barbed wire stretched through its heart.

Since 1967, under Israeli sovereignty, united Jerusalem has, for the first time in 2,000 years, become the city of peace. For the first time, the holy places have been open to worshipers from all three great faiths. For the first time, no group in the city or among its pilgrims has been persecuted or denied free expression. For the first time, a single sovereign authority has afforded security and protection to members of every nationality who sought to come and pray there.

There have been efforts to redivide this city by those who claim that peace can come through division, that it can be secured through multiple sovereignties, multiple laws, multiple police forces.

This is a groundless and dangerous assumption, and it impels me to declare today: There will never be such a redivision of Jerusalem. Never. We shall not allow a Berlin Wall to be erected inside Jerusalem. We will not drive out anyone, but neither shall we be driven out of any quarter, any neighborhood, any street of our eternal capital.

Finally, permit me to briefly remark on our future economic relationship. The United States—how can I tell it to this body? The United States has given, apart from political and military support to Israel, munificent and magnificent assistance in the economic sphere. With America's help, Israel has grown to be a powerful, modern state. I believe that we can now say that Israel has reached childhood's end, that it has matured enough to begin approaching a state of self-reliance.

We are committed to turning Israel's economy into a free market of goods and ideas. I believe that such a free market of goods and ideas is the only way to bring ourselves to true economic independence; and this means free enterprise, privatization, open capital markets, an end to cartels, lower taxes, deregulation.

There is not a Hebrew word for deregulation. By the time this term of office in Israel is over, there will be a Hebrew word for deregulation.

But may I say something that unites all of us across the political divide? I am committed to reducing the size of government; and I am quoting Speaker GINGRICH, quoting President Clinton, saying that the era of Big Government is over. It is over in Israel, too.

I believe that a market economy is the only way to effectively absorb immigrants and realize the dream of ages, the ingathering of the Jewish exiles.

To succeed, we must uphold the market economy as the imperative of the future. It is a crucial prerequisite for the building of the promised land.

We are deeply grateful for all that we have received from the United States, for all that we have received from this Chamber, from this body. But I believe there can be no greater tribute to America's long-standing economic aid to Israel than for us to be able to say: We are going to achieve economic independence. We are going to do it.

In the next 4 years, we are going to begin the long-term process of gradually reducing the level of your generous economic assistance to Israel, and I am convinced that our economic policies will lay the foundation for total self-reliance and great economic strength. In our Hebrew scriptures, which spread from Jerusalem to all of mankind, there is a verse, ''HaShem oz l'eamo yiten; HaShem yevarech et amo bashalom.'' ''God will give strength to His people; God will bless His people with peace.'' This is the original, inspired source for the truth that peace derives from strength.

In the coming years, we intend to strengthen the Jewish people in its land. We intend to build an Israel of reciprocal dialog and peace with each and every one of our neighbors. We will not uproot anyone, nor shall we be uprooted. We shall insist on the right of Jews to live anywhere in the land, just as we insist on the right of Jews to live anywhere in any other place of the world. We will build an Israel of self-reliance. We will build an Israel with an undivided and indivisible city of hope at its heart. We will build a peace founded on justice and strength and amity for all men and women of good will.

And I know that the American people will join us in making every effort to make our dream a reality, as I know that the American people will join us in prayer: ''God will give strength to his people, God will bless his people with peace.'' Thank you very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of Israel, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The acting dean of the diplomatic corps.

## JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until the hour of 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

□ 1130

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EWING] at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 419. An act for the relief of Benchmark Rail Group, Inc.; and

H.R. 701. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey lands to the city of Rolla, MO.

## PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize 15 1-minutes on each side.

## WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, today is the deadline this administration imposed on itself for granting Wisconsin the freedom to reform its welfare system. Two-thirds of the Wisconsin Legislature approved a welfare reform plan that requires work and restores the values of responsibility and family. President Clinton endorsed the Wisconsin reforms in a radio address to the Nation and eventually agreed to approve the plan by today, July 10,

Remember President Clinton's campaign promise to end welfare as we know it? That promise energized the Nation's Governors, who have put forward ambitious plans to reward work over dependency. But State legislators eager to end welfare as we know it have been forced to sit on their hands, waiting for permission from Washington, only to have bureaucrats rewrite their welfare reform plans and make them ineffective.

Welfare as we know it continues, despite enormous effort from our Nation's Governors.

The President has vetoed welfare reform twice, despite his campaign promise. Today he has a chance to keep another welfare reform promise, this one made to the people of Wisconsin—or, Mr. Speaker, is this not one of the promises the President meant to keep?

## FILEGATE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, at first, it was a handful. We then had 300, then 400. The number grew to 700. Today, Federal law enforcement groups estimate the number of illegally obtained secret FBI files by the White House to exceed 1,000. One thousand private lives of Americans invaded, 1,000 workers, all Republicans, who worked for Presidents Reagan and Bush, their rights violated. And, after all this, to add insult to injury, the new political spin is, Vincent Foster did it.

What is next? Will some political spinmaster accuse Richard Nixon here?

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem, whether you are a Democrat or Republican. This cannot and must not be tolerated. There is one question that must be answered: Who ordered this criminal act? And that criminal should be put in jail. And, by God, let Vincent Foster rest in peace.

## REINFORCEMENTS NEEDED IN WAR ON DRUGS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for months President Clinton promised to protect our children from the addiction of cigarettes, but what about drugs? When Clinton got in office, he slashed the drug czar's staff by 83 percent, he eliminated 200 to 400 DEA agents, and he took the priority of drugs from top on the national security list to bottom. At the same time, marijuana use went up for 12- to 13-year-olds by 13 percent.

Sunday, the Dallas Morning News reported Mexican drug smugglers seized ranches on the Texas border for smuggling marijuana, cocaine, and heroin.

Our border is at risk. Our ranchers are helpless. County and city officials are corrupted. President Clinton's all-talk-and-no-action drug policy has led to an invasion of our borders.

It is time we responded. Mr. Speaker, we need our Armed Forces to stop the invasion of the United States of America.

## DOLE REJECTS NAACP INVITATION

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I has happy that Bob Dole was in my district last night for the All Star game, but there are direct flights from Philadelphia to Charlotte, NC. I say this because America should know why Bob Dole has rejected the invitation of the NAACP to speak at their convention.

His campaign repudiated the invitation based on scheduling conflicts, but I think other conflicts are involved. Could it be that Bob Dole has nothing to say to the NAACP? Could it be that Bob Dole can't do anything or say anything that would offend the far right wing of his party? That's the answer. Whatever happened to the big tent? These are the same folks who talk about their commitment to what they have called the safety net for the very poor. But isn't it interesting that both of these metaphors speak in terms of fabric. The Republican majority, led by Bob Dole and Speaker GINGRICH, they are tearing up this fabric. The safety net is in tatters. And the big tent is full of holes. With Bob Dole's rejection of the NAACP, the big tent is getting smaller and smaller.

## THE CLINTON YEARS: A LEGACY OF FAILURE IN THE WAR ON DRUGS

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is hosting a 2-day drug summit in El Paso, but 2 days hardly make up for his administration's 3½ years of neglect. But let's see what the numbers really say: Total drug-related cases are up 30 percent; cocaine use is up 33 percent; heroin use is up 77 percent; marijuana use is up 108 percent; and methamphetamine use is up an alarming 308 percent.

No rhetoric, just the facts.

But, Mr. Speaker, these facts have a brutal impacts on our society, especially our Nation's children.

I've worked in the emergency rooms where these children come in. I've seen how these drugs can destroy generations of families.

How has our President responded? He cut the DEA agents by 227.

He shortened mandatory minimum sentences for convicted drug traffickers.

And he even mothballed nine Coast Guard ships and seven aircraft that were needed to stem the flow of drugs into this country.

No, Mr. Speaker, 2 days cannot make up for lapses of this magnitude. President Clinton has abandoned our Nation's drug control efforts and it is our children who will bear this heavy burden.

## MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE WILL NOT HAPPEN

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a big day for a lot of low-income American people that are hard working. The other body passed the minimum wage increase bill overwhelmingly. All the media talked about it, what a great thing it was for the low-income American people that work very hard right now for $4.25.

Folks, I have got something to tell you. You have seen the last of it. NEWT GINGRICH, dictator NEWT GINGRICH, the Speaker of the House, and the leader of the Senate, both oppose that minimum wage.

One of two things is going to happen. They are either not going to appoint conferees or they are going to wait until September or October, right before we adjourn, to appoint them. Or if they appoint conferees the conferees are never going to come to an agreement.

The same thing is happening on health care reform. They did not like it

the way it was, so they are not going to have it.

That is what happens when you have a dictator as a Speaker. NEWT GINGRICH is not going to permit the minimum wage bill to ever come up for a vote in the House and Senate again. Why? The National Restaurant Association is opposed to it, and they have given NEWT GINGRICH thousands and thousands of dollars. That is why.

## THE PRESIDENT AND WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, last May, Bill Clinton clearly stated that the Wisconsin welfare reform plan was a solid, commonsense plan for moving people from welfare dependence to work. Here is what he said on May 18 during his weekly radio address, ''I pledge that my administration will work with Wisconsin to make an effective transition to a new vision of welfare based on work * * *.''

Today, the 30-day public comment period expires and yet we hear nothing from the White House about the Wisconsin welfare waivers. Not a peep.

Mr. Speaker, clearly there is a complete and total disconnect between what Bill Clinton does and what he says. As George Will once said, Bill Clinton believes everything he emphatically says, right up until the second he totally repudiates it.

The same applies to welfare reform. Bill Clinton will say anything to make people believe he wants to change welfare, but when it comes time for action, he will come to the defense of the liberal status quo.

## REPUBLICAN-LED CONGRESS OF INACTION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when I spoke on the floor I was encouraged by the fact that the Senate was finally taking up the minimum wage hike; and I was hopeful that a crippling amendment that would have delayed implementation for 6 months and exempted many small businesses so that half the people on minimum wage would not benefit from the hike would not pass. Fortunately, that amendment did not pass; and so now I am hoping that somehow we are going to get this minimum wage to the President's desk.

But what we have found out today is that the Republican leadership in the Senate as well as in the House continues to want delay. They do not want the minimum wage to pass. They are saying they are not going to appoint conferees, and they will only appoint conferees to work out the differences on the minimum wage bill if the health care reform bill also moves.

What we are seeing again is an effort by the Republican leadership to stop the minimum wage hike just like they are trying to stop health insurance reform. They are going to let this drag on between now and November so that this Congress once again will be the Congress of inaction. Nothing happens here. It is not happening because the Republican leadership does not want it to happen.

## CASUALTIES IN THE WAR ON EDUCATION

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, yet again the majority has failed to make education a priority in this year's appropriations bill. Education cuts included in the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations measure, H.R. 3755, total $400 million from last year's level. And these cuts are in addition to the $1.1 billion already cut by the 104th Congress.

In this most recent battle in the war on education, casualties include Goals 2000, Byrd scholarships, student incentive grants, and Eisenhower teacher training funds. Those wounded in this battle included title I funds for disadvantaged students, special education, safe and drug free schools, bilingual education, and others.

this bill makes it clear that in the eyes of this Congress, access to higher education is not a priority, safe and drug free schools are unimportant, and improving our educational system is unnecessary.

If we want our students to grow into a competitive work force and continue our leadership in the global marketplace, education is the engine that will take us there. Education is not expendable, it is vital to our future, and the appropriations bill that passes this House should reflect this reality.

## FAT LADY HAS NOT SUNG ON MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, as they say in sports, ''It ain't over till it's over.'' ''It ain't over till the fat lady sings.''

Bipartisan majorities in both Houses have passed the minimum wage increase which would help 11.8 million Americans, 40 percent of whom are sole breadwinners and 58 percent of whom are women. But it ain't over. Because special interests and NEWT GINGRICH and the Republican leadership are already in the back room working out delays.

They do not want to appoint a conference committee to move this bill to the President's desk despite the fact that 80 percent of the American public, American taxpayers, want an increase in the minimum wage. They are saying if we do not get our special interest provision in the health care bill, you cannot have minimum wage.

That is the way it goes around here now, and it is flat-out wrong. The people deserve better. The people deserve minimum wage increases and a clean health care bill.

Would somebody give the fat lady a sheet of music? We need to pass this legislation. We do not need to knuckle under to special interests.

□ 1145

## MINIMUM WAGE HELD HOSTAGE BY SENATE REPUBLICANS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate passed the minimum wage. Normally it would be on its way to President Clinton for his signature and in a short time—Americans everywhere would be benefiting. But not in this Congress—unfortunately here the will of the American people is consistently being undermined.

Eighty percent of the American people support a minimum wage increase, today we learn that Republicans in the Senate are holding the minimum wage hostage. According to Congress Daily, ''Coming off a defeat on a controversial pro-business amendment, Senate Republicans further jeopardized final approval of a minimum wage hike by threatening to block conference action unless Democrats unleash their grip on health care insurance reform legislation.''

As my colleague before me said, they want to put in their special-interest medical savings account into the health care bill. This sounds a lot like, ''If you do not play by my rules, then I am going to take my ball and go home.'' This is a refrain that is heard in sandboxes. It has no place in the U.S. Congress. The Senate needs to get out of the sandbox, pass the minimum wage today.

## REPUBLICANS PUT FAMILIES LAST

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Democrats are insisting that we put families first. Republicans are insisting that we put families last. Republicans have continued their attack on American families, but now with a double-barreled shotgun. They are attacking minimum wage again. The Senate is threatening to derail the passage of minimum-wage increase. They have loaded up the bill with poison pills to guarantee that it will not be signed by the President.

The Senate passed a bill yesterday, but it is a hoax. It will not lead to a minimum wage increase in America.

On the other hand, education is being attacked again by the Republicans. The education cuts we fought so hard against last fall, and the American people made it quite clear that they do not want cuts in education, again we have millions of dollars being cut in education by this Republican House majority. We do not need to attack families with a double-barreled shotgun. Do not go after them with education cuts and at the same time go after them with minimum wage cuts.

Nobody can live on $8,400 a year for minimum wage, and our students cannot meet the challenges of this high-tech economy unless they have every possible opportunity to get an education. Let us support American families. Put families first.

## MINIMUM WAGE: ''WHAT IS THE BIG DEAL?''

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I was called by a constituent yesterday, Mr. Lou Kasing, who runs an automobile dealership in my district. In fact, in Butler County, he is known as Mr. Republican. And he is a good businessman, understands business and has a great heart. He says, ''I do not understand something.'' He says, ''This business about raising the minimum wage, if we raise the minimum wage, are all Federal workers going to get an automatic increase?'' I said, ''No.'' He said, ''What about the labor unions, do they get an automatic increase?'' I said, ''No.'' He said, ''Then what is the big deal?''

As the previous speaker said, no one can raise a family on $8,500 a year. We cannot do it. And so, he knows, as a businessperson, the wise thing is to have employees who are happy. The wise thing is to have employees that can meet their financial obligations while working a commensurate amount of time that still allows them to give a portion of their time, quality time, to their families and to their communities. So we must stop playing games. We must make sure that minimum wage goes to the President, he can sign it, and that the poorest workers in this country can get a raise.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. MCDADE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOSEPH M. MCDADE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, July 9, 1996.*

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Teresa Baker, a Senior Legislative Assistant in my Washington Office, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *United States* v. *McDade.*

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
*Member of Congress.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, July 9, 1996.*

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that Michael L. Stern of the Office of General Counsel has been served with a subpoena for records issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
*Clerk.*

## PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on House Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Resources; Committee on Science; Committee on Small Business; and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3754, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 473

*Resolved,* That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3754) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch 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 of 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour 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 and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. 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 Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H.R. 3754, the fiscal year 1997 legislative branch appropriations bill, under a modified closed rule.

I would like to commend my California colleague, Chairman RON PACKARD, and the rest of my colleagues on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee for their tremendous work in bringing what has historically been a very difficult bill to the House floor.

Given that there may be some who would go so far as to recommend zero funding for the legislative branch, I believe this is a very responsible rule for what is a very responsible bill. As the reading clerk noted, the rule waives a number of points of order against consideration of the bill to permit timely consideration and to address some technical fund transfers in the bill.

The rule makes in order eight amendments printed in the report on the rule to be offered only in the order printed by the Member specified and debatable for time specified in the report. The amendments are considered as read and are not subject to amendment or subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole. All points of order are waived against the amendments.

Further, the rule provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follows another recorded vote and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

PERMISSION TO OFFER AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN MODIFIED FORM TO H.R. 3754, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3754, pursuant to House Resolution 473, it may be in order to consider the amendment numbered 6 in House Report 104–663 in the modified form that I have placed at the desk.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO OFFER AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–663 AT ANY TIME DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3754, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the order prescribed by House Resolution 473 that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] be allowed to offer his amendment No. 1 at any time during the consideration of H.R. 3754 in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, last year's legislative branch appropriations bill was instrumental in reforming this institution to make this place more open, accountable, and cost effective. By adopting this rule, we can continue those important reforms while further streamlining and updating the operations of Congress through privatization and investment in new information technologies. Updating the technological infrastructure of the White House is an enormous challenge, but thanks to this bill we will continue the tremendous progress that we have made over the past 18 months.

The Thomas system at the Library of Congress is being upgraded to provide an expanded list of documents to the public and to simplify the retrieval of information. The CyberCongress plan which will bring in state-of-the-art communication networking and computer technology to dramatically improve the work of committees is moving forward under this bill.

Also by the end of this year, every House committee should have the capability to provide immediate on-line access to legislative documents, transcripts, schedules, and other information. The goal is to provide Members of Congress with more comprehensive and accurate information while facilitating the exchange of information with our constituents back home. While information technologies offer us tremendous opportunities to be better public servants, we must be mindful of the need to maintain many of the practices, procedures, and precedents of this institution. With respect to the issue of minority committee Web sites, let me say that I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague from Sacramento, CA, Mr. FAZIO, that the public should be able to conveniently access information put on a committee Web site by the minority. I hope the Committee on House Oversight can come to some compromise on the committee Internet policy that will provide sufficient safeguards in that regard.

But I disagree that the minority should be allowed to maintain completely separate committee Web sites. It would set an unfortunate precedent because the Rules of the House rightfully do not differentiate between minority and majority committees. They simply refer to committees. A committee minority may not file alternative committee reports or control separate committee rooms or conduct separate official hearings. Minority views are provided for in official committee reports, and they should be provided for on committee Web sites as well.

I would also like to say to those Members who feel they have worthwhile reform ideas but were not able to offer them under this rule, the Rules Committee has announced that it will begin holding hearings to consider reform proposals for the 105th Congress. Members with proposals for changing the organization procedures or legislative process in the House are welcome to participate. A letter of invitation to all Members was sent out just yesterday by my friend from Glens Falls, our committee chairman.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, this is a very responsible rule for a very responsible legislative branch spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD certain extraneous materials.

The materials referred to are as follows:

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, July 9, 1996.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Today the Rules Committee is announcing a series of hearings designed to examine further congressional reform proposals. This project is entitled ''Building on Change: Preparing for the 105th Congress.''

As you know, on Opening Day of the 104th Congress the House passed the most sweeping reform package since 1946. The Committee on Rules, through its committee-adopted oversight agenda, has committed to a continuing study of the rules and procedures of the House with an eye toward future reforms. Members with proposals addressing the rules, procedures, or the legislative process generally are welcome to participate in this project. The Rules Committee is not at this time taking further testimony on budget process reform.

On Wednesday, July 17 at 10AM, the Committee will hold an ''Open Day'' for Members to testify on proposals to further amend the standing rules of the House. Members who wish to testify at this hearing should submit 35 copies of their testimony to the Rules Committee office in H–312 of the Capitol by 5PM on Tuesday, July 16.

In late July and early September, the Rules Subcommittees on Rules and Organization of the House and the Legislative and Budget Process will hold joint hearings on specific reform efforts (e.g. majority and minority party task forces). The joint subcommittees will hear testimony from select groups of Members and from public witnesses. Dates, times, and subject areas for these hearings will be announced later.

If Members have questions on this hearing schedule, please feel free to contact me or Dan Keniry in my Rules Committee office at 225–9191.

Sincerely,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,
*Rules Committee Chairman.*

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 9, 1996]

| Rule type | 103d Congress | | 104th Congress | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Open/Modified-Open [2] | 46 | 44 | 77 | 60 |
| Structured/Modified Closed [3] | 49 | 47 | 34 | 27 |
| Closed [4] | 9 | 9 | 17 | 13 |

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 9, 1996]

| Rule type | 103d Congress | | 104th Congress | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Total | 104 | 100 | 128 | 100 |

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A structured or modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 9, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Res. 38 (1/18/95) | O | H.R. 5 | Unfunded Mandate Reform | A: 350–71 (1/19/95). |
| H. Res. 44 (1/24/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 17 | Social Security | A: 255–172 (1/25/95). |
| | | H.J. Res. 1 | Balanced Budget Amdt | |
| H. Res. 51 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 101 | Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians | A: voice vote (2/1/95). |
| H. Res. 52 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 400 | Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve | A: voice vote (2/1/95). |
| H. Res. 53 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 440 | Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif | A: voice vote (2/1/95). |
| H. Res. 55 (2/1/95) | O | H.R. 2 | Line Item Veto | A: voice vote (2/2/95). |
| H. Res. 60 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 665 | Victim Restitution | A: voice vote (2/7/95). |
| H. Res. 61 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 666 | Exclusionary Rule Reform | A: voice vote (2/7/95). |
| H. Res. 63 (2/8/95) | MO | H.R. 667 | Violent Criminal Incarceration | A: voice vote (2/9/95). |
| H. Res. 69 (2/9/95) | O | H.R. 668 | Criminal Alien Deportation | A: voice vote (2/10/95). |
| H. Res. 79 (2/10/95) | MO | H.R. 728 | Law Enforcement Block Grants | A: voice vote (2/13/95). |
| H. Res. 83 (2/13/95) | MO | H.R. 7 | National Security Revitalization | PQ: 229–199; A: 227–197 (2/15/95). |
| H. Res. 88 (2/16/95) | MC | H.R. 831 | Health Insurance Deductibility | PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95). |
| H. Res. 91 (2/21/95) | O | H.R. 830 | Paperwork Reduction Act | A: voice vote (2/22/95). |
| H. Res. 92 (2/21/95) | MC | H.R. 889 | Defense Supplemental | A: 282–144 (2/22/95). |
| H. Res. 93 (2/22/95) | MO | H.R. 450 | Regulatory Transition Act | A: 252–175 (2/23/95). |
| H. Res. 96 (2/24/95) | MO | H.R. 1022 | Risk Assessment | A: 253–165 (2/27/95). |
| H. Res. 100 (2/27/95) | O | H.R. 926 | Regulatory Reform and Relief Act | A: voice vote (2/28/95). |
| H. Res. 101 (2/28/95) | MO | H.R. 925 | Private Property Protection Act | A: 271–151 (3/2/95). |
| H. Res. 103 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 1058 | Securities Litigation Reform | |
| H. Res. 104 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 988 | Attorney Accountability Act | A: voice vote (3/6/95). |
| H. Res. 105 (3/6/95) | MO | | | A: 257–155 (3/7/95). |
| H. Res. 108 (3/7/95) | Debate | H.R. 956 | Product Liability Reform | A: voice vote (3/8/95). |
| H. Res. 109 (3/8/95) | MC | | | PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95). |
| H. Res. 115 (3/14/95) | MO | H.R. 1159 | Making Emergency Supp. Approps | A: 242–190 (3/15/95). |
| H. Res. 116 (3/15/95) | MC | H.J. Res. 73 | Term Limits Const. Amdt | A: voice vote (3/28/95). |
| H. Res. 117 (3/16/95) | Debate | H.R. 4 | Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (3/21/95). |
| H. Res. 119 (3/21/95) | MC | | | A: 217–211 (3/22/95). |
| H. Res. 125 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 1271 | Family Privacy Protection Act | A: 423–1 (4/4/95). |
| H. Res. 126 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 660 | Older Persons Housing Act | A: voice vote (4/6/95). |
| H. Res. 128 (4/4/95) | MC | H.R. 1215 | Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 | A: 228–204 (4/5/95). |
| H. Res. 130 (4/5/95) | MC | H.R. 483 | Medicare Select Expansion | A: 253–172 (4/6/95). |
| H. Res. 136 (5/1/95) | O | H.R. 655 | Hydrogen Future Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (5/2/95). |
| H. Res. 139 (5/3/95) | O | H.R. 1361 | Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (5/9/95). |
| H. Res. 140 (5/9/95) | O | H.R. 961 | Clean Water Amendments | A: 414–4 (5/10/95). |
| H. Res. 144 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 535 | Fish Hatchery—Arkansas | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 145 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 584 | Fish Hatchery—Iowa | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 146 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 614 | Fish Hatchery—Minnesota | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 149 (5/16/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution FY 1996 | PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95). |
| H. Res. 155 (5/22/95) | MO | H.R. 1561 | American Overseas Interests Act | A: 233–176 (5/23/95). |
| H. Res. 164 (6/8/95) | MC | H.R. 1530 | Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996 | PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95). |
| H. Res. 167 (6/15/95) | O | H.R. 1817 | MilCon Appropriations FY 1996 | PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95). |
| H. Res. 169 (6/19/95) | MC | H.R. 1854 | Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95). |
| H. Res. 170 (6/20/95) | O | H.R. 1868 | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95). |
| H. Res. 171 (6/22/95) | O | H.R. 1905 | Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/12/95). |
| H. Res. 173 (6/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 79 | Flag Constitutional Amendment | PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95). |
| H. Res. 176 (6/28/95) | MC | H.R. 1944 | Emer. Supp. Approps | PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95). |
| H. Res. 185 (7/11/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95). |
| H. Res. 187 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2 | PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95). |
| H. Res. 188 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1976 | Agriculture Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95). |
| H. Res. 190 (7/17/95) | O | H.R. 2020 | Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95). |
| H. Res. 193 (7/19/95) | C | H.J. Res. 96 | Disapproval of MFN to China | A: voice vote (7/20/95). |
| H. Res. 194 (7/19/95) | O | H.R. 2002 | Transportation Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95). |
| H. Res. 197 (7/21/95) | O | H.R. 70 | Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil | A: voice vote (7/24/95). |
| H. Res. 198 (7/21/95) | O | H.R. 2076 | Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/25/95). |
| H. Res. 201 (7/25/95) | O | H.R. 2099 | VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996 | A: 230–189 (7/25/95). |
| H. Res. 204 (7/28/95) | MC | S. 21 | Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia | A: voice vote (8/1/95). |
| H. Res. 205 (7/28/95) | O | H.R. 2126 | Defense Approps. FY 1996 | A: 409–1 (7/31/95). |
| H. Res. 207 (8/1/95) | MC | H.R. 1555 | Communications Act of 1995 | A: 255–156 (8/2/95). |
| H. Res. 208 (8/1/95) | O | H.R. 2127 | Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996 | A: 323–104 (8/2/95). |
| H. Res. 215 (9/7/95) | O | H.R. 1594 | Economically Targeted Investments | A: voice vote (9/12/95). |
| H. Res. 216 (9/7/95) | MO | H.R. 1655 | Intelligence Authorization FY 1996 | A: voice vote (9/12/95). |
| H. Res. 218 (9/12/95) | O | H.R. 1162 | Deficit Reduction Lockbox | A: voice vote (9/13/95). |
| H. Res. 219 (9/12/95) | O | H.R. 1670 | Federal Acquisition Reform Act | A: 414–0 (9/13/95). |
| H. Res. 222 (9/18/95) | O | H.R. 1617 | CAREERS Act | A: 388–2 (9/19/95). |
| H. Res. 224 (9/19/95) | O | H.R. 2274 | Natl. Highway System | PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95). |
| H. Res. 225 (9/19/95) | MC | H.R. 927 | Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity | A: 304–118 (9/20/95). |
| H. Res. 226 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 743 | Team Act | A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95). |
| H. Res. 227 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 1170 | 3-Judge Court | A: voice vote (9/28/95). |
| H. Res. 228 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 1601 | Internatl. Space Station | A: voice vote (9/27/95). |
| H. Res. 230 (9/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 108 | Continuing Resolution FY 1996 | A: voice vote (9/28/95). |
| H. Res. 234 (9/29/95) | O | H.R. 2405 | Omnibus Science Auth | A: voice vote (10/11/95). |
| H. Res. 237 (10/17/95) | MC | H.R. 2259 | Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines | A: voice vote (10/18/95). |
| H. Res. 238 (10/18/95) | MC | H.R. 2425 | Medicare Preservation Act | PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95). |
| H. Res. 239 (10/19/95) | C | H.R. 2492 | Leg. Branch Approps | PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95). |
| H. Res. 245 (10/25/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 109 | Social Security Earnings Reform | PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95). |
| | | H.R. 2491 | Seven-Year Balanced Budget | |
| H. Res. 251 (10/31/95) | C | H.R. 1833 | Partial Birth Abortion Ban | A: 237–190 (11/1/95). |
| H. Res. 252 (10/31/95) | MO | H.R. 2546 | D.C. Approps. | A: 241–181 (11/1/95). |
| H. Res. 257 (11/7/95) | C | H.J. Res. 115 | Cont. Res. FY 1996 | A: 216–210 (11/8/95). |
| H. Res. 258 (11/8/95) | MC | H.R. 2586 | Debt Limit | A: 220–200 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 259 (11/9/95) | O | H.R. 2539 | ICC Termination Act | A: voice vote (11/14/95). |
| H. Res. 262 (11/9/95) | C | H.R. 2586 | Increase Debt Limit | A: 220–185 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 269 (11/15/95) | O | H.R. 2564 | Lobbying Reform | A: voice vote (11/16/95). |
| H. Res. 270 (11/15/95) | C | H.J. Res. 122 | Further Cont. Resolution | A: 249–176 (11/15/95). |
| H. Res. 273 (11/16/95) | MC | H.R. 2606 | Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia | A: 239–181 (11/17/95). |
| H. Res. 284 (11/29/95) | O | H.R. 1788 | Amtrak Reform | A: voice vote (11/30/95). |
| H. Res. 287 (11/30/95) | O | H.R. 1350 | Maritime Security Act | A: voice vote (12/6/95). |
| H. Res. 293 (12/7/95) | C | H.R. 2621 | Protect Federal Trust Funds | PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95). |
| H. Res. 303 (12/13/95) | O | H.R. 1745 | Utah Public Lands | PQ: 221–197 A: voice vote (5/15/96). |
| H. Res. 309 (12/18/95) | C | H. Con. Res. 122 | Budget Res. W/President | PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95). |

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 9, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Res. 313 (12/19/95) | O | H.R. 558 | Texas Low-Level Radioactive | A: voice vote (12/20/95). |
| H. Res. 323 (12/21/95) | C | H.R. 2677 | Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge | Tabled (2/28/96). |
| H. Res. 366 (2/27/96) | MC | H.R. 2854 | Farm Bill | PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96). |
| H. Res. 368 (2/28/96) | O | H.R. 994 | Small Business Growth | Tabled (4/17/96). |
| H. Res. 371 (3/6/96) | C | H.R. 3021 | Debt Limit Increase | A: voice vote (3/7/96). |
| H. Res. 372 (3/6/96) | MC | H.R. 3019 | Cont. Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96). |
| H. Res. 380 (3/12/96) | C | H.R. 2703 | Effective Death Penalty | A: 251–157 (3/13/96). |
| H. Res. 384 (3/14/96) | MC | H.R. 2202 | Immigration | PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/19/96). |
| H. Res. 386 (3/20/96) | C | H.J. Res. 165 | Further Cont. Approps | PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96). |
| H. Res. 388 (3/21/96) | C | H.R. 125 | Gun Crime Enforcement | A: 244–166 (3/22/96). |
| H. Res. 391 (3/27/96) | C | H.R. 3136 | Contract w/America Advancement | PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96). |
| H. Res. 392 (3/27/96) | MC | H.R. 3103 | Health Coverage Affordability | PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96). |
| H. Res. 395 (3/29/96) | MC | H.J. Res. 159 | Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt. | PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96). |
| H. Res. 396 (3/29/96) | O | H.R. 842 | Truth in Budgeting Act | A: voice vote (4/17/96). |
| H. Res. 409 (4/23/96) | O | H.R. 2715 | Paperwork Elimination Act | A: voice vote (4/24/96). |
| H. Res. 410 (4/23/96) | O | H.R. 1675 | Natl. Wildlife Refuge | A: voice vote (4/24/96). |
| H. Res. 411 (4/23/96) | C | H.J. Res. 175 | Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (4/24/96). |
| H. Res. 418 (4/30/96) | O | H.R. 2641 | U.S. Marshals Service | PQ: 219–203 A: voice vote (5/1/96). |
| H. Res. 419 (4/30/96) | O | H.R. 2149 | Ocean Shipping Reform | A: 422–0 (5/1/96). |
| H. Res. 421 (5/2/96) | O | H.R. 2974 | Crimes Against Children & Elderly | A: voice vote (5/7/96). |
| H. Res. 422 (5/2/96) | O | H.R. 3120 | Witness & Jury Tampering | A: voice vote (5/7/96). |
| H. Res. 426 (5/7/96) | O | H.R. 2406 | U.S. Housing Act of 1996 | PQ: 218–208 A: voice vote (5/8/96). |
| H. Res. 427 (5/7/96) | O | H.R. 3322 | Omnibus Civilian Science Auth | A: voice vote (5/9/96). |
| H. Res. 428 (5/7/96) | MC | H.R. 3286 | Adoption Promotion & Stability | A: voice vote (5/9/96). |
| H. Res. 430 (5/9/96) | S | H.R. 3230 | DoD Auth. FY 1997 | A: 235–149 (5/10/96). |
| H. Res. 435 (5/15/96) | MC | H. Con. Res. 178 | Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997 | PQ: 227–196 A: voice vote (5/16/96). |
| H. Res. 436 (5/16/96) | C | H.R. 3415 | Repeal 4.3 cent fuel tax | PQ: 221–181 A: voice vote (5/21/96). |
| H. Res. 437 (5/16/96) | MO | H.R. 3259 | Intell. Auth. FY 1997 | A: voice vote (5/21/96). |
| H. Res. 438 (5/16/96) | MC | H.R. 3144 | Defend America Act | |
| H. Res. 440 (5/21/96) | MC | H.R. 3448 | Small Bus. Job Protection | A: 219–211 (5/22/96). |
| | MC | H.R. 1227 | Employee Commuting Flexibility | |
| H. Res. 442 (5/29/96) | O | H.R. 3517 | Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997 | A: voice vote (5/30/96). |
| H. Res. 445 (5/30/96) | O | H.R. 3540 | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/5/96). |
| H. Res. 446 (6/5/96) | MC | H.R. 3562 | WI Works Waiver Approval | A: 363–59 (6/6/96). |
| H. Res. 448 (6/6/96) | MC | H.R. 2754 | Shipbuilding Trade Agreement | A: voice vote (6/12/96). |
| H. Res. 451 (6/10/96) | O | H.R. 3603 | Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/11/96). |
| H. Res. 453 (6/12/96) | O | H.R. 3610 | Defense Appropriations, FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/13/96). |
| H. Res. 455 (6/18/96) | O | H.R. 3662 | Interior Approps, FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/19/96). |
| H. Res. 456 (6/19/96) | O | H.R. 3666 | VA/HUD Approps | A: 246–166 (6/25/96). |
| H. Res. 460 (6/25/96) | O | H.R. 3675 | Transportation Approps | A: voice vote (6/26/96). |
| H. Res. 472 (7/9/96) | MC | H.R. 3755 | Labor/HHS Approps | |
| H. Res. 473 (7/9/96) | O | H.R. 3754 | Leg. Branch Approps | |

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; S/C-structured/closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], the chairman of the Legislative Process and Budget Process Subcommittee.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this rule.

I thank my friend from greater San Dimas for this time, and I rise in support of this rule for the fiscal year 1997 legislative branch appropriations bill. Mr. Speaker, this is the first appropriations bill this year that has not been given an open rule—and in all likelihood it will be the only structured rule we see for a spending bill this year. Yet this is a fair rule making in order a mix of eight amendments from both sides of the aisle. In fact, most of the amendments that the Rules Committee did not make in order would not have been allowed under an open rule process.

That is not to say that I disagree with much of what Members sought to do in those amendments. For instance, I strongly support reforms in the area of Congressional pensions, and I am a cosponsor of legislation to cap the accrual of pension benefits at 12 years. I think this would demonstrate in good faith to the American taxpayer that personal financial gain is not an incentive to run for office. However, there is simply no funding in this to address this issue through an amendment to this bill. I look forward to making progress in this area through the appropriate authorizing committees in the future.

That having been said, I would like to congratulate Chairman PACKARD and the members of the Appropriations Committee for building on the reforms we began last year. We have seen dramatic changes in the way this Congress has been run—we are doing more with less, and we are committed to living within our means after decades of expansion. I am particularly pleased that the bill before us cuts a further 2.2 percent from last year's appropriated levels—a savings of over $37 million. These reforms, and others in the bill, are very important to restoring Americans' faith in Congress and our commitment to accountability and a balanced budget.

I would urge my colleagues to support this fair rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding me the customary half hour of debate time.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us is, in general, fair, and appropriate for consideration of a legislative branch appropriations bill. It makes in order eight amendments, three of which are to be offered by Members from this side of the aisle. Each of the eight amendments would be debatable for specified amounts of time.

However, we have one serious disagreement with the majority over this rule, in that it does not make in order a very important amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] would like to offer. Mr. FAZIO's amendment would reverse the unfair and unwise policy adopted by the House Oversight Committee on May 23 which prohibits minority members of a committee from establishing their own World Wide Web site on the Internet, separate from the Web site established and controlled by the committee's majority members.

Prohibiting minority members of a committee from establishing their own Web site restricts the right of members to present materials in the manner they wish, and to make that information as accessible as possible for Internet users. Rather than being able to find Democratic committee members' materials directly, Internet users may have to scroll through long committee tables of contents before reaching the minority's listing.

Even worse, if majority members of a committee decide not to establish a Web site at all, or decide to terminate an existing Web site, minority members of the committee will be unable to post information on the Internet themselves.

At the Rules Committee meeting on this rule yesterday, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] argued that the House Oversight Committee's policy on committee use of the Internet was analogous to the handling of committee reports, where minority members do not issue separate reports, but rather may include their views at the end of the majority's report.

But in fact, Mr. Speaker, the two venues are not analogous at all. Committee reports are issued for a designated purpose—usually to explain a bill—and have content requirements. And minority views can be found quickly and easily by turning to the end of the report.

World Wide Web sites, on the other hand, are completed free-form. Those

who establish sites are able to put anything they want on them, and in any fashion. Typically, committees post background information and pictures of committee members, committee rules and procedures, press releases, speeches by the chairman—all sorts of things. If minority Web pages are inserted somewhere in the mix of all that, they are likely to receive much less attention than they would if they were presented on a separate Web site, where the format could be designed as the minority wishes.

We ask our Republican friends to consider whether this is the policy they would want to live under if they were in the minority, as they were during the last Congress and will be again, sooner or later, in the future. Our guess is that it is not.

On more point on this matter: the majority has argued that even if they believe the membership should consider this amendment, it would not be appropriate to allow it as part of the debate on this appropriations, bill, since the committee of jurisdiction—in this case, the House Oversight Committee—objects to making it in order. As a general rule, we agree with the policy, which was established when Democrats controlled the House, of not allowing amendments in such cases.

However, in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, there will not be an opportunity to address this issue, since the policy is one that exists as a directive from the House Oversight Committee, and does not require the approval of the full House. The legislative branch appropriations bill is thus the only vehicle we see for resolving this matter.

There is one further matter I would like to point out about the rule, if I may, Mr. Speaker, and that is that it waives two important provisions of the Budget Act: section 302, which prohibits consideration of legislation which exceeds a committee's allocation of new entitlement authority, and section 308, which requires a cost estimate in committee reports on new entitlement authority. These waivers cover the bill's provisions dealing with the pay of the director of the Congressional Budget Office.

While there are legitimate reasons for providing these waivers, we mention this matter because we have noticed that Budget Act waivers seem to be increasingly common in the rules that are being issued by the Rules Committee. We want to take this opportunity to urge committees to make every effort to comply with the provisions of the Budget Act and the Rules of the House, and to urge the majority members of the Rules Committee to avoid getting into the habit of waiving these important safeguards on a routine basis.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the bill that this rule makes in order, we believe that it deserves the support of the House. In general, it provides an adequate, though not generous, amount of funding for Congress to fulfill its responsibilities. After 4 years of cutting positions to a point where we now have almost 20 percent fewer staff members in the legislative branch than we had in fiscal 1992, we believe that the Appropriations Committee has acted responsibly by not reducing funding for staff further, except with respect to the General Accounting Office, where a 2-year, 25-percent reduction in staffing is continued through this legislation.

□ 1200

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the rule, and an ''aye'' vote on the bill, which will be beautifully managed by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 473.

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

There was no objection.

## COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 193.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 193, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 23, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—376

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NAYS—23

Becerra
Beilenson
Brown (FL)
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Dingell
Foglietta
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Meek
Miller (CA)
Mollohan
Oberstar
Pelosi
Stark
Thompson
Volkmer
Waters
Waxman

NOT VOTING—34

Bishop
Clay
Clayton
Dickey
Dunn
Everett
Foley
Ford
Gibbons
Hall (OH)
Hayes
Hilleary
Hobson
Johnston
Kaptur
Lincoln
Manton
McDade
McKinney
Meehan
Norwood
Obey
Petri
Quinn
Roukema
Sabo
Tejeda
Torricelli
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Williams
Wise
Young (FL)
Zimmer

□ 1227

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BECERRA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, I was absent because of the malfunction of my beeper. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon and was therefore unable to cast my vote in support of House Concurrent Resolution 193, the Cost of Government Day Resolution.

House Concurrent Resolution 193 expresses the sense of Congress that the cost of Government spending should be reduced so that American families will be able to keep more of what they earn. Throughout my tenure in the House of Representatives, I have been committed to balancing the budget by eliminating wasteful Government spending. I therefore would like to express my strong support for this resolution which commemorates July 3, 1996, as Cost of Government Day.

It is an injustice that western New Yorkers and all Americans are forced to give up more than 50 percent of what they earn to the Government. Out of 366 days in 1996, the average American will work 184.6 days to support the total cost of Government, leaving 181 days of work to support their families.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 342, noes 53, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—342

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOES—53

Abercrombie
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
DeFazio
Dingell
English
Ensign
Fazio
Filner
Fox
Funderburk
Gephardt
Geren
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Latham
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Longley
Martinez
Martini
Meek
Menendez
Oberstar
Pallone
Pickett
Pombo
Rush
Schroeder
Slaughter
Stockman
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Torkildsen
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weller
Wolf

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—37

Bishop
Brewster
Bunn
Clay
Clayton
Coburn
Dickey
Dunn
Everett
Foley
Ford
Gibbons
Hall (OH)
Hayes
Hilleary
Istook
Johnston
Kaptur
Lincoln
McDade
McIntosh
McKinney
Meehan
Norwood
Obey
Petri
Quinn
Sabo
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Torricelli

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Watt (NC) | Williams | Young (FL) |
| Weldon (FL) | Wise | Zimmer |

□ 1235

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294. I was absent because of the malfunction of my beeper. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

## PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3754, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997, NOTWITHSTANDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 473

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3754, pursuant to House Resolution 473, it may be in order at any time to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] as though it were an amendment printed in House Report 104–663 and that the time for debate be limited to 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACKARD: On page 32, at the end of line 17, add the following: (c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise to inquire of the chairman if this is the amendment which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] discussed with me and with the gentleman before?

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. This is a buy American amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3754, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material and charts.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 3754.

□ 1240

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 3754) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

This bill continues the program we began last year to right size the legislative branch of government. We are trying to become more efficient with a smaller work force and by using technology wherever possible as long as it helps to do our job better.

The bill cuts legislative spending for 1997 by $37.4 million. That continues the tone set in the 1996 bill over the last 2-year period. The size of the legislative branch has been reduced by $262 million over the last 2 years.

We have also reduced our work force by 1,753 jobs over the last 2-year period, 726 in this year's bill alone. That is a reduction of 6.8 percent of the entire legislative branch work force in a 2-year period.

The CBO has indicated through their calculations that, if the entire Federal budget were to be reduced in the same proportion as this committee has reduced the legislative branch budget, we would have a $100 billion surplus in our Federal budget and it would be balanced already. We would make a $100 billion down payment on the national debt, if all other agencies and programs were cut the same level that we have cut ourselves. This is just based on a straightforward extrapolation, but it indicates, I think, the magnitude of the efforts that we have taken in reducing the size and the cost of the legislative branch of government.

In specifics, this bill will make permanent law the 90-day prohibition on mass mailing, unsolicited mass mailing before elections. The bill also will fund the CyberCongress, in other words, the computer and telecommunications and information services of Congress. We will be spending about $211 million in this bill in that area. That is 12.5 percent of the entire legislative budget on this whole area of information and telecommunications and the CyberCongress.

Also, in this year's bill we are completing the downsizing of the General Accounting Office by 25 percent. That is a 2-year process, this being the final year of that process.

We have also converted the permanent edition of the bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a 26-volume document, to CD ROM. That will expedite the research possibilities for Members of Congress and researchers in general, and it will also save about $1 million a year. We are also converting the congressional serial set, a 60-volume document, to the CD ROM, the electronic information process. That, too, will save about $1 million a year.

We are also outsourcing the custodial work at the Ford House Office Building. We are conducting studies to outsource our maintenance and operational work at the powerplant, the congressional powerplant. We are also looking to privatize the Government Printing Office plant more, and the Botanic Garden.

□ 1245

We are also looking to further the public-private collaboration of the National Library Digital Program.

All in all we have made great strides in the right direction to bring about fiscal responsibility to the Congress of the United States and to those agencies that are here to support the Congress of the United States.

We also are funding the mandatories in this bill; that is, the COLA's for staff, salary and the benefit packages for staff and Federal workers in the Congress. And that, I think, is a must.

We are also funding the 1997 inaugural ceremonies at the Capitol, the joint inaugural committee, which we must do every 4 years after the election of a new President.

All in all we are very proud of this bill; we think it moves in the right direction.

Laster on today we will be hearing amendments, one of which is to cut

this bill by almost 2 percent, 1.9 percent. I urge the Members of Congress to realize that this bill already makes major cuts, and has over the last 2 years. No appropriations bill has cut to the level that the legislative branch has cut themselves. It would be irresponsible, I think, to cut ourselves across the board. That would include books for the blind, that would include the staff, the cost of staffing our offices. It would include the CyberCongress, it would include the police, the physicians, and every phase, every part, of this bill would be cut by almost 2 percent after we have already cut ourselves over the last 2 years by almost 12 percent, and that is 12 percent of the dollar amount of the 1995 budget year.

Mr. Chairman, it would be absolutely irresponsible, I believe, for us to inflict upon ourselves further cuts when we have set the pattern for cutting back the size of government. And, frankly, it would hurt deeply the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, which has accepted a 25 percent cut already over the last 2 years. To ask them to absorb another 2 percent cut again would be a bad-faith effort on the Congress after I have negotiated with the General Accounting Office to work toward this 25 percent. It would be, I think, catastrophic, and I would hope that all Members of Congress would resist this amendment of across-the-board cutting of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation to the new ranking member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON]. He has been a member of the committee and been an extremely active and very, very faithful member of the committee. He has now moved to become the ranking member, and it is a great pleasure on my part to work with him. He has been a great help in crafting this bill and been very supportive of the general efforts that we have tried to make in this bill, and it is a pleasure to work with him.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] who is the former chairman of this subcommittee, but also the former ranking member. He has been a great help over the years in this bill, and I wish to thank him for his cooperation.

Under leave I have already obtained, I would like to insert a tabulation of the amounts in the bill:

## FY 1997 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3754)

| | FY 1996 Enacted | FY 1997 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS | | | | | |
| HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | | | | | |
| House Leadership Offices | | | | | |
| Office of the Speaker | 1,478,000 | 1,621,000 | 1,535,000 | +57,000 | -86,000 |
| Office of the Majority Floor Leader | 1,470,000 | 1,561,000 | 1,526,000 | +56,000 | -35,000 |
| Office of the Minority Floor Leader | 1,480,000 | 1,574,000 | 1,534,000 | +54,000 | -40,000 |
| Office of the Majority Whip | 928,000 | 976,000 | 957,000 | +29,000 | -19,000 |
| Office of the Minority Whip | 918,000 | 963,000 | 949,000 | +31,000 | -14,000 |
| Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities | 376,000 | 385,000 | 376,000 | ..... | -9,000 |
| House Republican Steering Committee | 664,000 | 681,000 | 664,000 | ..... | -17,000 |
| House Republican Conference | 1,083,000 | 1,146,000 | 1,130,000 | +47,000 | -16,000 |
| House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee | 1,181,000 | 1,211,000 | 1,191,000 | +10,000 | -20,000 |
| House Democratic Caucus | 566,000 | 616,000 | 603,000 | +37,000 | -13,000 |
| Nine minority employees | 1,127,000 | 1,155,000 | 1,127,000 | ..... | -28,000 |
| Subtotal, House Leadership Offices | 11,271,000 | 11,889,000 | 11,592,000 | +321,000 | -297,000 |
| Members' Representational Allowances | | | | | |
| Expenses | 360,503,000 | 398,898,000 | 363,313,000 | +2,810,000 | -35,585,000 |
| Committee Employees | | | | | |
| Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations) | 78,629,000 | 80,524,000 | 80,222,000 | +1,593,000 | -302,000 |
| Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations) | 16,945,000 | 18,430,000 | 17,580,000 | +635,000 | -850,000 |
| Subtotal, Committee employees | 95,574,000 | 98,954,000 | 97,802,000 | +2,228,000 | -1,152,000 |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees | | | | | |
| Office of the Clerk | 13,807,000 | 15,370,000 | 15,074,000 | +1,267,000 | -296,000 |
| Office of the Sergeant at Arms | 3,410,000 | 3,889,000 | 3,638,000 | +228,000 | -251,000 |
| Office of the Chief Administrative Officer | 53,556,000 | 70,464,000 | 55,209,000 | +1,653,000 | -15,255,000 |
| Office of Inspector General | 3,954,000 | 4,048,000 | 3,954,000 | ..... | -94,000 |
| Office of Compliance | 858,000 | ..... | ..... | -858,000 | ..... |
| Transfer to new Office of Compliance | -500,000 | ..... | ..... | +500,000 | ..... |
| Office of the Chaplain | 126,000 | 128,000 | 126,000 | ..... | -2,000 |
| Office of the Parliamentarian | 1,180,000 | 1,036,000 | 1,036,000 | -144,000 | ..... |
| Office of the Parliamentarian | (775,000) | (713,000) | (713,000) | (-62,000) | ..... |
| Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives | (405,000) | (323,000) | (323,000) | (-82,000) | ..... |
| Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House | 1,700,000 | 1,817,000 | 1,767,000 | +67,000 | -50,000 |
| Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House | 4,524,000 | 4,763,000 | 4,687,000 | +163,000 | -76,000 |
| Other authorized employees | 837,000 | 1,000,000 | 768,000 | -69,000 | -232,000 |
| Former Speakers [1] | (666,000) | (825,000) | (594,000) | (-72,000) | (-231,000) |
| Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician | (171,000) | (175,000) | (174,000) | (+3,000) | (-1,000) |
| Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees | 83,452,000 | 102,515,000 | 86,259,000 | +2,807,000 | -16,256,000 |
| Allowances and Expenses | | | | | |
| Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims | 994,000 | 2,301,000 | 2,374,000 | +1,380,000 | +73,000 |
| Official mail (committees, leadership, administrative and legislative offices) | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Reemployed annuitants reimbursements | 68,000 | 71,000 | 71,000 | +3,000 | ..... |
| Government contributions | 117,541,000 | 122,508,000 | 120,779,000 | +3,238,000 | -1,729,000 |
| Miscellaneous items | 658,000 | 641,000 | 641,000 | -17,000 | ..... |
| Subtotal, Allowances and expenses | 120,261,000 | 126,521,000 | 124,865,000 | +4,604,000 | -1,656,000 |
| Total, House of Representatives | 671,061,000 | 738,777,000 | 683,831,000 | +12,770,000 | -54,946,000 |
| JOINT ITEMS | | | | | |
| Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1997 | ..... | 950,000 | 950,000 | +950,000 | ..... |
| Joint Economic Committee | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Joint Committee on Printing | 750,000 | 777,000 | 777,000 | +27,000 | ..... |
| Joint Committee on Taxation | 5,116,000 | 7,716,000 | 5,470,000 | +354,000 | -2,246,000 |
| Office of the Attending Physician | | | | | |
| Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances | 1,260,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,225,000 | -35,000 | ..... |

[1] For FY 1996 and previous years, non-personnel expenses for this item were included under "Allowances and Expenses, supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims". Beginning in FY 1997, these expenses have been consolidated under "Salaries, Officers and Employees, other authorized employees". The FY 1996 enacted amounts have been adjusted to reflect the revised funding consolidation.

## FY 1997 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3754)—Continued

| | FY 1996 Enacted | FY 1997 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Capitol Police Board | | | | | |
| Capitol Police | | | | | |
| Salaries: | | | | | |
| Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives | 34,213,000 | 37,286,000 | 32,927,000 | -1,286,000 | -4,359,000 |
| Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate | 35,919,000 | 39,108,000 | 35,465,000 | -454,000 | -3,643,000 |
| Subtotal, salaries | 70,132,000 | 76,394,000 | 68,392,000 | -1,740,000 | -8,002,000 |
| General expenses | 2,560,000 | 7,606,000 | 2,685,000 | +125,000 | -4,921,000 |
| Subtotal, Capitol Police | 72,692,000 | 84,000,000 | 71,077,000 | -1,615,000 | -12,923,000 |
| Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office | 1,991,000 | 1,991,000 | 1,991,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Statements of Appropriations | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Joint Items | 84,839,000 | 99,689,000 | 84,520,000 | -319,000 | -15,169,000 |
| OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 2,000,000 | 3,268,000 | 2,609,000 | +609,000 | -659,000 |
| Transfer from House of Rep. Office of Compliance | 500,000 | ..... | ..... | -500,000 | ..... |
| Total, Office of Compliance | 2,500,000 | 3,268,000 | 2,609,000 | +109,000 | -659,000 |
| OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 3,615,000 | ..... | ..... | -3,615,000 | ..... |
| Reappropriation | 2,500,000 | ..... | ..... | -2,500,000 | ..... |
| Total, Office of Technology Assessment | 6,115,000 | ..... | ..... | -6,115,000 | ..... |
| CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 24,288,000 | 24,775,000 | 24,288,000 | ..... | -487,000 |
| ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL | | | | | |
| Office of the Architect of the Capitol | | | | | |
| Salaries | 8,569,000 | 8,714,000 | 8,454,000 | -115,000 | -260,000 |
| Travel (limitation on official travel expenses) | (20,000) | (20,000) | (20,000) | ..... | ..... |
| Contingent expenses | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Subtotal, Office of the Architect of the Capitol | 8,669,000 | 8,814,000 | 8,554,000 | -115,000 | -260,000 |
| Capitol Buildings and Grounds | | | | | |
| Capitol buildings | 22,882,000 | 23,679,000 | 23,255,000 | +373,000 | -424,000 |
| Capitol grounds | 5,143,000 | 5,020,000 | 5,020,000 | -123,000 | ..... |
| House office buildings | 33,001,000 | 32,556,000 | 32,556,000 | -445,000 | ..... |
| Capitol Power Plant | 35,518,000 | 34,749,000 | 34,749,000 | -769,000 | ..... |
| Offsetting collections | -4,000,000 | -4,000,000 | -4,000,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant | 31,518,000 | 30,749,000 | 30,749,000 | -769,000 | ..... |
| Subtotal, Capitol buildings and grounds | 92,544,000 | 92,004,000 | 91,580,000 | -964,000 | -424,000 |
| Total, Architect of the Capitol | 101,213,000 | 100,818,000 | 100,134,000 | -1,079,000 | -684,000 |
| LIBRARY OF CONGRESS | | | | | |
| Congressional Research Service | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 60,084,000 | 63,056,000 | 62,641,000 | +2,557,000 | -415,000 |
| GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE | | | | | |
| Congressional printing and binding | 83,770,000 | 83,770,000 | 81,669,000 | -2,101,000 | -2,101,000 |
| Total, title I, Congressional Operations | 1,033,870,000 | 1,114,153,000 | 1,039,692,000 | +5,822,000 | -74,461,000 |

## FY 1997 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3754)—Continued

| | FY 1996 Enacted | FY 1997 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES | | | | | |
| BOTANIC GARDEN | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 3,053,000 | 2,902,000 | 2,902,000 | -151,000 | ..... |
| LIBRARY OF CONGRESS | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 211,664,000 | 226,235,000 | 215,007,000 | +3,343,000 | -11,228,000 |
| Authority to spend receipts | -7,869,000 | -7,869,000 | -7,869,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses | 203,795,000 | 218,366,000 | 207,138,000 | +3,343,000 | -11,228,000 |
| Copyright Office, salaries and expenses | 30,818,000 | 34,566,000 | 33,402,000 | +2,584,000 | -1,164,000 |
| Authority to spend receipts | -19,830,000 | -22,278,000 | -22,269,000 | -2,439,000 | +9,000 |
| Net subtotal, Copyright Office | 10,988,000 | 12,288,000 | 11,133,000 | +145,000 | -1,155,000 |
| Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses | 44,951,000 | 46,057,000 | 44,964,000 | +13,000 | -1,093,000 |
| Furniture and furnishings | 4,882,000 | 4,882,000 | 4,882,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Library of Congress (except CRS) | 264,616,000 | 281,593,000 | 268,117,000 | +3,501,000 | -13,476,000 |
| ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL | | | | | |
| Library Buildings and Grounds | | | | | |
| Structural and mechanical care | 12,428,000 | 9,003,000 | 9,003,000 | -3,425,000 | ..... |
| GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE | | | | | |
| Office of Superintendent of Documents | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 30,307,000 | 30,827,000 | 29,077,000 | -1,230,000 | -1,750,000 |
| GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 382,806,000 | 377,773,000 | 338,425,000 | -44,381,000 | -39,348,000 |
| Offsetting collections | -8,400,000 | -6,100,000 | -5,905,000 | +2,495,000 | +195,000 |
| Total, General Accounting Office | 374,406,000 | 371,673,000 | 332,520,000 | -41,886,000 | -39,153,000 |
| Total, title II, Other agencies | 684,810,000 | 695,998,000 | 641,619,000 | -43,191,000 | -54,379,000 |
| Grand total | 1,718,680,000 | 1,810,151,000 | 1,681,311,000 | -37,369,000 | -128,840,000 |

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying how much I have enjoyed the privilege of working with the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. It has truly been a bipartisan effort. We have tackled a difficult task, and we have come through it with a very austere recommendation which we bring to the floor of the House in the form of the legislative appropriation bill. If every other agency in Government as the chairman said, had done the same degree of cutting that the legislative branch has done, we would have a Federal budget surplus today in the United States.

This effort did begin under the chairmanship of my colleague from California, Mr. FAZIO, who in 1992 instituted a program for the reduction of FTE's for the legislative branch. As a result of continuing that policy under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], we have reduced more than 5,500 employees from the Federal legislative branch of Government.

I also want to join my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], in opposing a further across-the-board cut of 1.9 percent. Such a cut would decimate many of the activities of the legislative branch, and the legislative branch of Government has serious responsibilities of oversight to check and balance the operations of the executive branch and of the judicial branch. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment when it comes before the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is an exemplary bill. It is not a perfect bill. We have cut areas where I personally would rather have not seen us cut. I was very saddened last year when the Office of Technology Assessment, which was instituted under the Presidency of Richard Nixon and supported for all the years in between, was brought to an end. But it was one of the cuts that had to be made in order to bring the legislative branch to this meeting today having already accomplished its entire goal in 2 years of reductions needed to reach a balanced budget in 7 years.

I commend the subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, for their work.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] who serves on the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this appropriation bill. It has been a pleasure to serve on this particular subcommittee because we have accomplished what our goals have been, which are reducing the size and scope of the Government and reducing the amount of money we spend here in Washington.

This bill sends an immensely important signal to our constituents back home. Our efforts to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government starts with ourselves, and for the second year in a row we cut the taxpayer burden of running Congress.

This bill is significant because it continues to build on the successes previously achieved. We not only continue to cut spending, but we also continue to bring the House of Representatives into the 21st century.

In this subcommittee last year we cut over 9 percent from the legislative branch appropriation. This is $154 million that we saved the American taxpayers, and that is a very significant contribution. If every subcommittee had been able to cut their budgets proportionately, as the previous speaker said, the Federal budget would show a surplus today.

The decisions for cutting last year were not easy. We had to eliminate certain agencies that outlived their usefulness and remove many of the perks that have become institutional here in Congress. This bill continues the momentum that was established last year by cutting an additional $37.4 million, a reduction from last year of 2.2 percent. The committee goes further than any other appropriation committee in the House. Once again we have undertaken a review of how to reduce the costs of operating Congress to demonstrate our commitment not only to cutting spending but also learning how to spend our tax dollars wisely.

While we have cut the cost of Congress, we have also moved into the 21st century and made this a more efficient institution. The importance of this year's legislative branch bill extends beyond merely the funding issue. Within the bill are several provisions which embody much of the new congressional spirit, proposals for privatizing, streamlining and modernization.

One example is the report language requesting a study of the possibilities of privatizing or transferring the botanic gardens. I understand there is a lot of support for the gardens here in Congress, but why should Congress be running this agency? It should be transferred out of the Congress budget into Agriculture. We have the arboretum and other areas that can address this issue very effectively. So at least we are asking for further study of what to do with this.

Another proposal that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has requested is for the Chief Administrative Officer to review other ideas for privatizing various functions. Many other agencies and departments and businesses have privatized their in-house services from payroll to cleaning with great success.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] that it is time for the Congress to become competitive and look for cost-effective ways to provide the most basic services.

Additionally, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] once again promotes modernization. Bill language compels the Government Printing Office to reduce the number of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, instead of printing them in bound copies, to use CD–ROM copies. We would continue to produce a limited number of printed copies, but now we can make available on CD–ROM the entire CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This would provide significant space and savings in both time and space.

Just think. Instead of having to pull down from the shelf a large bound volume and have to read through to find a passage, we can just put a disk in the computer and do a word search to find what we are looking for.

What we have here is a balanced bill which embodies much of the spirit of the new House of Representatives. We continue to reduce the level of expenditures within this account. We move to privatization and streamlining many of the functions of Congress which we have promoted in other government agencies. As we begin the process of modernization, which like all the changes takes time but reaps great rewards, it has been an honor on serve on this committee, and I commend our chairman for his insight and diligence and urge support of my colleagues for this bill.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the Committee on Science.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time, and I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Subcommittee if he is agreeable.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, during the full committee markup of this bill the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] offered an amendment from me which called for an independent evaluation of the General Accounting Office's processes and procedures, building upon previous independent reports that have compelled important changes at the Agency. The amendment failed, but since then the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I have had a chance to talk further about this study and reached an understanding.

Specifically, I am concerned about the procedures that GAO uses to vet its reports to begin congressionally requested studies and to gauge its success. The independent study would

have taken an outsider look at these insider's processes to suggest needed improvements.

In addition, GAO has undergone a rapid period of change, including significant downsizing and restructuring. As the Agency evolves further, outside advice could prove very useful to the Agency in its leadership. It is a very important arm of the Congress and should be supported. However, there are important problems, and I believe the chairman shares these concerns.

Mr. PACKARD. I do, Mr. BROWN. I do share the gentleman's concerns, and I also understand and recall the amendment that was offered, and I believe the amendment was offered in full committee with the best interests of the GAO and the new Comptroller General in mind.

However, I am concerned that a study performed now before the new Comptroller General is appointed, which should be later this year, would interfere with the ability of that person to institute their own reforms in the Agency. In deference to the new Comptroller General, whoever that may be, I did ask the gentleman from California to withhold his amendment today. After the new Comptroller General is appointed, we will discuss with him or her whatever studies may be useful. If such a study remains useful for the Agency in the Congress, I would gladly join with the gentleman to invite a reprogramming of funds for that purpose.

In addition, a new Comptroller General has not been appointed, and if the subject of the independent study has not been addressed by the time the subcommittee prepares the legislative branch appropriation bill for next year, then I will re-examine this request from the gentleman.

In the meantime I would gladly work with the gentleman to try to resolve any problems at the Agency and again will cooperate in every way I can.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his statement. In deference to his judgment I will not offer my amendment at the appropriate time. The gentleman and I would both like to see a strong GAO operating with an unparalleled standard of excellence, and I look forward to working together with him to reach that goal.

□ 1300

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to talk about what is not in this bill and not in the rule, rather than what is in it. What ought to be on the floor this afternoon would be an amendment to end cyber censorship in the House, to end the restriction on information available to the American public about the work and positions of the minority members of the House's committees.

Unfortunately, a decision, an absolutely incredible, astounding, un-American decision, was taken by the House Reform Committee back in May that puts the majority here in control of information flow about the activities and positions of the minority members of House committees.

I know that may be impossible for rational, reasonable Americans to believe to have happened in this home of democratic principles and traditions, the people's House. It is absolutely un-American. It should offend our basic sense of fair play, that the American public cannot get to information about what the minority in this place is doing without passing through gates that are kept and controlled by the majority, and which can essentially be shut so that you cannot find out what you may need to know about major activities of your U.S. Congress.

If this happened anywhere else in this country, other than being buried in the House rules, it would be a patent, patent violation of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. But because we have a special status under the Constitution and one that is clearly subject to our own abuse, we can impose this kind of censorship on ourselves, and then put it off limits by not permitting a rule today that would even enable us to debate and vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, we should have had that opportunity because, in good faith and good will, we believed when we debated this bill in the full Committee on Appropriations that such an amendment would be made in order, if this issue were not earlier resolved. The assurances that were offered in full committee and that prompted the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] to withdraw an amendment at that time, have not been kept, unfortunately.

So here we are today in this predicament, unable to have a vote on an issue that goes to the absolute core values of any democratic institution and any democratic process.

This is not just a passive matter, either. Evidently the HIR, House Information Office, has been directed to so engineer access to web sites, Internet sites for the House, that users from the outside will not even be able to put what is called a bookmark on a particular site so they can get back to it the next time without having to go through all the rigamarole that the majority feels it is appropriate to put in the way of, again, access to information.

Mr. Chairman, does anyone here really believe that the American people, the American public, should not have free and equal access to both majority and minority points of view? Does anybody believe minority committee members should not be able to get their thoughts and positions before the American public without this form of direct and indirect censorship being put in the way?

I truly do not understand how we could have gotten into a situation like this. It is absolutely insulting to the integrity and the intelligence of Members of those body as well as the American people.

For all of the proud rhetoric that we got from the majority about an open Congress, an open process, a free flow of information through cyperspace, that is now shown to be a cynical and empty promise. This is an extremely disappointing performance by our colleagues on the majority side, an absolute insult to democratic traditions and principles. We should be ashamed to see it stand.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about what is in this bill. Coming from Silicon Valley, I have very strong concerns about what is not happening with technology and how we are very foolishly trying to censor ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I got the information about the CyberCongress, and that we were all going to get a computer. Mine arrived at my office 6 months late, and what we did was we called just a regular vendor out of the phone book, not anybody politically connected. They will sell these machines to us for $900 less than we paid for them and they will deliver them in 4 days. So we are going to spend $400,000 more on these computers than we needed to spend. It makes me very suspicious, I will say that. It makes me very uncomfortable.

I am also concerned that for those of us who use the Internet frequently, as I do, one of the things you cannot get from the CyberCongress is the voting records, how we voted every day. You can get extension of remarks, you can get tributes to Little League coaches, but you cannot find out how your Congress Member voted on the Internet. I have introduced a bill to require us to post that information. It has not had a hearing. It seems to me if we can print votes every day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they ought to be posted on the Internet too. I think this bill should address that.

Finally, I want to talk about web pages the previous speaker mentioned before. I just came back here from some time at home. Everywhere I went, my constituents and neighbors would say, ''Do they not get it back there? Do any of them use the Internet?'' I had to say, actually, probably they do not get it. I think the new policy on web pages is proof that the leadership of this body does not get it yet. To suggest that for security reasons, which is ludicrous, that the URL has to be only with the majority instead of the minority is foolish indeed.

Mr. Chairman, what has really evolved here is not only censorship, which Americans object to. Technologically it is foolish. Ultimately, to try to prevent web users from actually accessing minority web pages is a very bad precedent, and technically, in the end, I think it will fail. We would not

suggest that it is OK to prohibit Members of Congress from issuing a statement, from putting a differing point of view in writing and sending that to other Americans. That is what this policy on web pages does. I object to it strongly, and I hope we will be able to change the current policy on minority web pages administratively or through this bill. I think there should be an amendment allowed to deal with it, and I hope that when I go home next, I can say yes, they finally got it here.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute simply to respond to the last two speakers.

It is the Committee on House Oversight that has jurisdiction over the operations of the cyber Congress and the information services, and also has jurisdiction over the web page. This is not the vehicle, the bill, that should be used to establish those kind of legislative policies. That committee has dealt with these things and is continuing to deal with them, and to put it in this bill would fly in the face and really be offensive, I think, to the authorizing committee. That is why we have resisted putting those items onto this bill. It would simply be inappropriate.

If the committee had agreed to the web page, the committee of jurisdiction, then we would, at their instructions, put it in the bill. But for us to put it in our bill over the objections of the authorizing committee I think would not be appropriate.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the chairman of the subcommittee, who is a gentleman of great integrity and who does appreciate the technical rules of the House. Indeed it would be difficult to bring the amendment, which would correct the terrible abuse of lack of direct Internet access, to the floor on this bill. However, the Committee on Rules has allowed other bills which legislate upon an appropriations measure to come before the House, and this is the only way an appeal could be made to the full House in this policy.

I do recognize that the chairman has a great tradition on his side in not wishing to offend the authorizing committee which dealt with this, but I think that in this instance it would have been a very appropriate and fair thing for the Committee on Rules to allow the House as a whole to vote on the question of access to Web sites.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This is an important matter in terms of adequately funding the resources and staff we need to competently do our work. Quite frankly, it is evident from some of the products coming out of the Oversight Committee in terms of policies dealing with the web site that they are not doing their job in a competent and bipartisan manner.

It is an egregious action that was taken on a partisan matter which prohibited or prevented direct access by the minority committees to in fact have access through the Internet by our constituencies. In fact, as late as May 28, several committees, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means, did not even have a web site. By virtue of that, the minority was precluded from access to the Internet, while the Republican majority caught up.

In fact, the majority had gone through the initiative in terms of providing a web site on the Internet from the Democratic Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and were in fact subsumed by the Republican majority committee by virtue of the Oversight Committee rule. Now in order to get access to that Democratic minority web site you have to go through the Republican material, wonderful photograph of our chairman, and you have to go through a lot of other window dressing in terms of explanation as to what is going on. As the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, you may not even put an electronic bookmark in place, so once you have done that, you could gain access again. That would obviously be helpful—but certainly the issue goes beyond that point.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be censoring, the House should not be censoring the speeches of Members on this floor, nor should they be censoring the information on the Internet that is providing direct access and communication on a democratic basis. We should not be afraid of the competition of ideas in this Congress and expressing those and sharing that information on the Internet. Yet, that is what this action has achieved—our constituents can only achieve access to minority views and news in the context that the Republican majority deems appropriate.

What are the GOP Members afraid of in terms of communication in this sense? We talk about the Internet in terms of various other improper materials, and the courts have held those limits improper. It is not a matter of space, it is not a matter of security, it is a matter of GOP censorship of the minority Democratic views on these web sites. This substantive amendment is not being permitted to be offered on the floor today, and this Congress has repeatedly provided for authorization legislation on appropriations bills and riders that go far beyond this point, and there is no other opportunity to vote on this subject to be addressed by a vote of the full House.

Today we have to take a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] which tries to transfer some money. I hope Members will rise to vote for that and send a signal, at least, to the Oversight Committee in terms of the abuse that is going on, that this decision and limit is inappropriate and uncalled for.

The fact is that we have to go through what really amounts to censorship and editorializing by the GOP majority of the Democratic minority views. I think that this is wrong, it is patently wrong to have moved in this particular direction. This bill would be the proper vehicle, this legislative appropriation measure, to in fact deal with that issue, but it has been rejected by the Committee on Rules, again on a partisan basis.

I appeal to my colleagues to vote for and support the Fazio amendment, and at least symbolically to deal with this issue of GOP once more trying to control the voices of dissent in this House in such an inappropriate manner.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to beat this subject to death, but I think we really have to understand what we are talking about here. The new way that this Congress and everyone in this country will put forth information is through the Internet. Right in this Hall today, in the Capitol today, throughout Washington, DC, there are young people, for instance, who are visiting during summer vacation. These young people will go back in September and begin school once again. More and more every day they get their information through the Internet.

One of the things that I tell people about my web page is that I want to reach a point where they can get as much information about government as possible from the Library of Congress to the Smithsonian to local institutions in my district to how I vote and how I think and what I feel about certain issues. To now tell people that they can visit the majority party but that they have no access to the minority party on its own with a different view is really from the beginning of this procedure to set out censorship rather than freedom. What kind of a message are we sending? This is totally improper.

The best way to see what this is like is to look at it this way. Imagine if visitors were allowed to visit the chairman of the committee but were not allowed to visit the office of the minority leader of the committee. They visit the chairman but they are not allowed to visit the other person, and if they are going to speak to that ranking member, they have to speak to them in the presence of the chairman. They cannot exchange views on a private and separate basis. That is what we are talking about.

Rather than doing this, we should be thinking about the future. I would like to see the day when the Internet for the House of Representatives personally reaches out to the world, not only in English but in different languages, so people could learn about us, learn about our democracy, read about us. How nice it would be if Latin American countries and students could read in Spanish about the House of Representatives of this, the greatest democracy

on earth. Instead of thinking about that, you are saying no, you cannot put your words out, and if you put them out you have to check with us first.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of this amendment and I commend my colleagues from Michigan, Mr. SMITH, and Indiana, Mr. ROEMER, for offering it.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of streamlining and working more efficiently, I returned $100,000 from my 1995 office budget back to the Treasury Department for reducing the deficit. Combined with similar cost savings in 1993 and 1994, I have returned a total of $500,000. I am very proud of this record.

However, without the language of this amendment again added to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, the tax dollars I and other Members save from the efficient operation of our offices could not be returned to the Treasury. Instead those savings would be reallocated to other spending priorities.

Thus, I was pleased to have been a cosponsor of last year's successful amendment to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, and I am pleased to join again this year.

Mr. Chairman, we need to send a message to the American public that Congress is working more efficiently and with greater accountability. And just as we ask other agencies of Government, Congress needs to reduce spending and make its contribution to reducing the deficit.

Vote for the Smith-Roemer-Harman-Zimmer-Klug-Goss-Browder-Minge and Camp amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support for the legislative branch appropriations bill before us. I have enjoyed working with Mr. PACKARD on this bill, as well as the other members of the subcommittee. We are tasked with an important, but often anonymous role, that of drafting the legislation that allows our branch of Government to function effectively. This measure continues the spending reductions begun in past Congresses and deserves our support.

Since fiscal year 1992, Congress has reduced total legislative branch staffing by 5,500 full-time equivalent positions—a reduction of nearly 20 percent. While these cuts are necessary to reduce bloated staffing and inefficient operations, we must not reduce spending merely for the sake of reduction.

The Congress, as a coequal branch of our Government, is charged with a fundamentally important mission. Without adequate resources to check and balance the other branches, we are abdicating this constitutionally mandated responsibility.

This bill contains an appropriation of $1.68 billion for congressional operations and related agencies. I am pleased that operating funds for the House of Representatives have been increased under this bill to $683.8 million and that committee staffing has been held at current levels. The overall reduction of $37 million in this year's bill is financed from the reduction to the GAO to fulfill a staffing reduction commitment of the Comptroller General.

While I am generally pleased with this year's bill, I remain troubled by the restrictive Internet policy adopted by the House Oversight Committee. The policy would require all Internet and World Wide Web users to access information on Democratic Committee Web page counterparts.

There are good reasons for a Web page policy, but I believe that the policy decided upon by the chairman of the Oversight Committee unnecessarily restricts the free flow of information so vital to our democracy. For example, if the Republican leadership of a given committee refuses to create, or decides to terminate, its home page, the Democratic minority must automatically follow suit.

I find it ironic that the other party—which has received so much credit for instituting an information-based ''Cyber-Congress''—would make the first congressional policy regarding the Internet such a restrictive one. The World Wide Web is a forum for communicating information of every conceivable type. It is the ''town crier'' of the 21st century. To bury the valuable committee information of the minority party beneath pages of photos, biographies, and press releases from the majority party flies in the face of an open Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Fazio amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. This amendment attempts to revisit action taken in the Appropriations Committee that deserves the light of full debate.

The majority has brought this appropriations bill to the floor with an onerous provision that restricts public access to congressional information. Most House committees have both majority and minority Web sites that the public can access to seek legislative information, committee schedules, and other relevant committee material. Since these sites first went on-line, they have been accessible to the public without restriction. The Republican majority would like to see this changed.

The same majority that claims to have a commitment to a ''cybercongress'' and the information infrastructure has placed limits on what information the public can access. They want to make all committee home pages controlled by the majority. The public will not be able to read the minority information without reading the majority information first.

This is not the way to open up Congress to an ever-increasing electronic electorate. By limiting the information the public can access, the Republican majority is blocking freedom of speech, and limiting debate on issues the public has a right to be informed about.

The minority, regardless of party, has a right to be heard. It is not a question of Republican versus Democrat, it is a clear question of what the public has a right to read.

The committee refused to hear an amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO in committee that questioned this arrangement, and then claimed that since it was a regulation and not a law, that the committee need not discuss the provision. Last night the Rules Committee made a similar amendment by Mr. FAZIO out of order.

What are they afraid of? Individuals should be able to realize their freedom to access information, and the Republican majority should not define the way in which that information is available. What happens if a committee chairman decides not to put up a Web page, the minority is automatically cut off from the Internet? This is our Nation's highest democratic body, but this process is anything but democratic.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and support a free and open government.

□ 1315

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 3754 is as follows:

H.R. 3754

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $683,831,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $11,592,000, including: Office of the Speaker, $1,535,000, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $1,526,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $1,534,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $957,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $949,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, $376,000; Republican Steering Committee, $664,000; Republican Conference, $1,130,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, $1,191,000; Democratic Caucus, $603,000; and nine minority employees, $1,127,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $363,313,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $80,222,000.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $17,580,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $86,259,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than $3,500, of which not more than $2,500 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, $15,074,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and

including not more than $750 for official representation and reception expenses, $3,638,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, $55,209,000, including salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Resources, $22,577,000, of which $16,577,000 is provided herein: *Provided,* That House Information Resources is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $3,954,000; Office of the Chaplain, $126,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, $1,036,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $1,767,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $4,687,000; and other authorized employees, $768,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $124,865,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $2,374,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $1,000,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursement, $71,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $120,779,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $641,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 107A of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (109 Stat. 522) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''For fiscal year 1996, subject'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(a) Subject'';

(2) by striking out ''of the total amount'' and all that follows through ''cost of inventory'' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ''the amounts deposited in the account specified in subsection (b) from vending operations of the House of Representatives Restaurant System shall be available to pay the cost of goods sold''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) The account referred to in subsection (a) is the special deposit account established for the House of Representatives Restaurant by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (40 U.S.C. 174k note).''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 102. (a) Section 3210(a)(6)(A) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting ''(or, in the case of a Member of the House, fewer than 90 days)'' after ''60 days''; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking out ''60 days'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''90 days''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1996, and shall apply with respect to any mailing postmarked on or after that date.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1997

For construction of platform and seating stands and for salaries and expenses of conducting the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States in January 1997, $950,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That such funds shall be available for payment, on a direct or reimbursable basis, for such purposes whether incurred on, before, or after, October 1, 1996.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $3,000,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, $777,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $5,470,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of $1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of $500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of $500 per month to one assistant and $400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) $867,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $1,225,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than $600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $68,392,000, of which $32,927,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, and $35,465,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided,* That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, not more than $2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and $85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, $2,685,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1997 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 103. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the Capitol Police Board for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings ''SALARIES'' and ''GENERAL EXPENSES'' upon the approval of—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives under the heading ''SALARIES'';

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate under the heading ''SALARIES''; and

(3) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the case of other transfers.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, $1,991,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided,* That no part of such amount may be used to employ more than forty individuals: *Provided further,* That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the second session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, $30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $2,609,000.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), including not more than $2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the

Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $24,288,000: *Provided,* That no part of such amount may be used for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 104. (a) Any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease to the Congress subject to section 903 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983 (2 U.S.C. 111b).

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 105. (a) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by inter-agency transfer, donation, or discarding.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 106. (a) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority to make lump-sum payments to separated employees of the Congressional Budget Office for unused annual leave.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law, $8,454,000.

TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of $20,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, $100,000.

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, $23,255,000, of which $2,950,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $5,020,000, of which $25,000 shall remain available until expended.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $32,556,000, of which $4,825,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $30,749,000: *Provided,* That not more than $4,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1997.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $62,641,000: *Provided,* That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $81,669,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the ''Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1997''.

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $2,902,000.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $215,007,000, of which not more than $7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1997, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided,* That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further,* That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the $7,869,000: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, $8,458,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including $40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, $33,402,000, of which not more than $17,340,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1997 under 17 U.S.C. 708(d), and not more than $4,929,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1997 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided,* That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $22,269,000: *Provided further,* That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further,* That not more than $2,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $44,964,000, of which $11,694,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, $4,882,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be

available, in an amount of not more than $194,290, of which $58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS–15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ''manager or supervisor'' means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 203. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 204. Of the amounts appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 205. Of the amount appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 206. (a) For fiscal year 1997, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $108,275,000.

(b) The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

SEC. 207. (a)(1) Subject to subsection (b), for fiscal year 1997, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in paragraph (2) may not exceed $2,000,000.

(2) The activities referred to in paragraph (1) are non-expenditure transfer activities in support of parliamentary development that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

(b) The obligational authority under subsection (a)—

(1) shall be available only with respect to Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Slovakia, and Romania; and

(2) shall expire on December 31, 1996.

SEC. 208. (a) Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the Library of Congress under the headings specified in subsection (b) may be transferred among such headings, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(b) The headings referred to in subsection (a) are as follows: (1) in title I, ''CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE'', ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES''; and (2) in this title, ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES''; ''COPYRIGHT OFFICE'', ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', ''BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED'', ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES''; and ''FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS''.

SEC. 209. From and after October 1, 1996, the Disbursing Officer of the Library of Congress is authorized to disburse funds appropriated for the Office of Compliance, and the Library of Congress shall provide financial management support to the Office of Compliance as may be required and mutually agreed to by the Librarian of Congress and the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance. The Library of Congress is further authorized to compute and disburse the basic pay of all personnel of the Office of Compliance pursuant to the provisions of section 5504 of title 5.

All vouchers certified for payment by duly authorized certifying officers of the Library of Congress shall be supported with a certification by an officer or employee of the Office of Compliance duly authorized in writing by the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance to certify payments from appropriations of the Office of Compliance. The Office of Compliance certifying officers shall (1) be held responsible for the existence and correctness of the facts recited in the certificate or otherwise stated on the voucher or its supporting paper and the legality of the proposed payment under the appropriation or fund involved, (2) be held responsible and accountable for the correctness of the computations of certifications made, and (3) be held accountable for and required to make good to the United States the amount of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate made by them, as well as for any payment prohibited by law which did not represent a legal obligation under the appropriation or fund involved: *Provided,* That the Comptroller General of the United States may, at his discretion, relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for any payment otherwise proper whenever he finds (1) that the certification was based on official records and that such certifying officer or employee did not know, and by reasonable diligence and inquiry could not have ascertained the actual facts, or (2) that the obligation was incurred in good faith, that the payment was not contrary to any statutory provision specifically prohibiting payments of the character involved, and the United States has received value for such payment: *Provided further,* That the Comptroller General shall relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for an overpayment for transportation services made to any common carrier covered by section 3726 of title 31, whenever he finds that the overpayment occurred solely because the administrative examination made prior to payment of the transportation bill did not include a verification of transportation rates, freight classifications, or land grant deductions.

The Disbursing Officer of the Library of Congress shall not be held accountable or responsible for any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate, the responsibility for which is imposed upon a certifying officer or employee of the Office of Compliance.

## ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

### LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $9,003,000, of which $560,000 shall remain available until expended.

## GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

### OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $29,077,000: *Provided,* That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed $150,000: *Provided further,* That amounts of not more than $2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for 1995 and 1996 to depository and other designated libraries.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided,* That not more than $2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further,* That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than twelve passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further,* That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further,* That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further,* That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings ''OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS'' and ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,700 workyears: *Provided further,* That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further,* That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS–15: *Provided further,* That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed $75,000.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not more than $7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries

in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries; $332,520,000: *Provided,* That not more than $100,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than $5,805,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further,* That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further,* That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further,* That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further,* That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Oversight and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 1997 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 303. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided,* That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 306. During fiscal year 1997 and fiscal years thereafter, amounts appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol (including amounts relating to the Botanic Garden) may be transferred among accounts available to the Architect of the Capitol upon the approval of—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation for Capitol buildings and grounds under the heading ''HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS'';

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation for Capitol buildings and grounds under the heading ''SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS''; and

(3) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from any other appropriation.

SEC. 307. (a) Upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in accordance with conditions determined by the Committee on House Oversight, positions in connection with House public address sound system activities and related funding shall be transferred from the appropriation for the Architect of the Capitol for Capitol buildings and grounds under the heading ''CAPITOL BUILDINGS'' to the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives for the Office of the Clerk under the heading ''SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES''.

(b) For purposes of section 8339(m) of title 5, United States Code, the days of unused sick leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) shall be included in the total service of such employee in connection with the computation of any annuity under subsections (a) through (e) and (o) of such section.

(c) In the case of days of annual leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a), the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make a lump sum payment to each such employee for that annual leave. No such payment shall be considered a payment or compensation within the meaning of any law relating to dual compensation.

SEC. 308. (a) Effective October 1, 1996, the responsibility for maintenance of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds is transferred from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police Board. Such maintenance shall be carried out under the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. On and after October 1, 1996, any alteration to a structural, mechanical, or architectural feature of the Capitol buildings and grounds that is required for security system maintenance under the preceding sentence may be carried out only with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

(b)(1) Effective October 1, 1996, all positions specified in paragraph (2) and each individual holding any such position (on a permanent basis) immediately before that date, as identified by the Architect of the Capitol, shall be transferred to the Capitol Police.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1996, are—

(A) under the Architect of the Capitol;

(B) within the Electronics Engineering Division of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; and

(C) related to the maintenance of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

(3) All annual leave and sick leave standing to the credit of an individual immediately before such individual is transferred under paragraph (1) shall be credited to such individual, without adjustment, in the new position of the individual.

SEC. 309. Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of Public Law 104–1 to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1997''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments shall be in order except amendments printed in House Report 104–663, which shall be considered in the order printed, may be offered only by a member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Pursuant to the previous orders of the House, amendment No. 6 by the gentlemen from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] may be considered in modified form; amendment No. 1 by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] may be considered at any time; and an amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] may be considered at any time as though printed in the report, and debatable for 10 minutes.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 104–663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] whose amendment is printed in the report?

Mr. KLUG. I am, Mr. Chairman. The gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], unfortunately, was called back to her district offices because of a health problem with one of her staffers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 28, beginning on line 9, strike out ''3,700 workyears'' and insert in lieu thereof ''3,600 workyears by the end of fiscal year 1997''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

Is the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] opposed?

Mr. THORNTON. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today again on behalf of JENNIFER DUNN, who unfortunately had to be back in her district because of a health problem affecting one of her staffers, and also Chairman PAT ROBERTS.

Mr. Chairman, both Ms. DUNN, Chairman ROBERTS, and I believe that the Government Printing Office needs to continue to privatize and downsize.

Mr. Chairman, much of the debate over the last year has been about what level of government is capable of doing service the best, whether the Federal Government or the State government should run welfare, whether the State government or the Federal Government should run Medicaid, the health care program aimed at women and children.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, there is an additional question involved, which is to say what business is the Federal Government involved in today that we should not be involved in any longer whatsoever? I cannot think of a better example than the Government Printing Office, established essentially and maintained today in order to print Government documents that are needed on an emergency basis. Mr. Chairman, as soon as I find a Government document that needs to be printed on an emergency basis, I will be happy to share it with you and everybody else in the Chamber.

The fact of the matter is the Government Printing Office remains in business today for the most part to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Chairman, there are 115,000 private printers in the United States, and I think they are certainly capable of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD overnight. If the Wall Street Journal can have a story filed in Johannesburg, sent to New York where it is edited, sent up on a satellite dish in the Midwest, and it plops on my doorstep in Madison, WI, at 5:30 in the morning, assuredly somebody, one of the 115,000 private printers in the United States, can manage to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD overnight.

We continue to invest, I think foolishly, in printing equipment which is essentially out of date the minute it is put in place and into operation at the Government Printing Offices over on North Capitol Street.

This amendment today will reduce the full-time equivalent workyears by 100 which will save taxpayers about $5 million. While that is a kind of a marginal savings on the outside, the bottom line is we continue to cut Government Printing Office staffing levels down from 4,500 where it was several years ago, below 4,000, now on the way to 3,500.

Let me make clear I know that our chairman's biggest fight in this entire battle is not necessarily in this House. We last year passed an amendment that passed by two-thirds. The fight will be in the conference committee. I think again we need to send a signal to the Senate that we want a Government Printing Office that essentially will contract out work and will procure work and serve as a clearinghouse for the Government but not to essentially be a Government printing press. Last year's amendment, as I said, received bipartisan support with a vote of 293 to 129.

The bottom line in all of this, and one more point, Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, in 1991 the GPO lost over $1 million, in 1992 it lost almost $5.5 million, in 1993 it lost $14 million, in 1994 it lost $21 million, in 1995 its loss was $3 million, and the fiscal year 1996 loss to date is $13 million. Every place you look, the Government Printing Office loses money because the Government should not be in the business of running printing presses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it would be of interest to the Congress to note that in this bill, we have provided funds for a study that would help to determine whether the GPO would be better off contracting out or privatizing the printing of the daily journal. So we are moving in the same direction, I believe, that the offeror of the amendment would like us to go.

It is true that the Government Printing Office has lost money, about $60 million over the last 6 years, that the inplant work load has declined by about 17 percent, and that the printing procurement work load has declined by about the same, 17 percent, and that it is realistic to assume that we can reduce the work force further in GPO. Therefore, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The GPO has already had a series of cuts, leading to 3,700 employees at this time. Much of the work of the GPO is already contracted out. The efficiencies and effectiveness which were designed to be brought into the Government Printing Office have been successful and are on a right track. GPO should be allowed to continue on this track into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a continuing effort to, I think, precipitously reduce the FTE'S at GPO. Very frankly, it is my feeling that, until it is reduced to zero, that the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentlewoman from Washington State will continue to offer amendments to reduce it. I understand that. That may not be completely accurate, but that is my sense.

This reduces an additional 100 FTE's. This amendment, in my opinion, does not take into account the hard work that continues to occur at the GPO to downsize its work force. I think they have gotten the message—in a manner, however, that is consistent with the requirements placed on it by Congress. That is the key. Consistent with the requirements placed on it, not by some third party, but by Congress itself.

There is a point, Mr. Chairman, when the essential demands of the House and the Senate to put a RECORD of word-for-word proceedings on the desk of each Representative and Senator the next morning and, frankly, at the request of every citizen in our country, to print the Federal Register in a timely fashion, to print bills for committees and subcommittees, there is a point when this kind of reduction in personnel will cause the GPO to become unable to react satisfactorily.

Since 1993, the GPO has reduced its work force by over 1,000 persons. This is not an agency that is growing or is bloated. It is an agency that has been reduced, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTION] have reduced it further by an additional 50 in this bill.

The Committee on Appropriations in this bill has already adopted, as I say, the reductions after examining the process carefully; and the GPO management has a program to continue downsizing its work force in a managed framework.

I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], because I have been at some of his hearings, is keenly aware of the questions arising by GPO's activities and is looking at it very closely.

I submit that this additional FTE cut will make the process of downsizing

even more difficult for the GPO and should not be adopted.

This amendment attempts to micromanage the Government Printing Office by an arbitrary reduction of its work force. That is no way to run a very successful printing operation on which the Congress depends heavily and on which the American public depends.

I would urge that this amendment be defeated, Mr. Chairman, and for the House to permit GPO to continue its orderly program of downsizing.

Why is that important? It is important, first of all, because we have people that we have asked to perform duties for the Congress and for the American public.

If management is given a figure to reduce to, they can effect that if you give them sufficient time to let attrition and a change in the undertakings, the responsibilities of that agency, to occur. If, however, you do it precipitously, there is no alternative but to RIF people. As everybody knows, a reduction in force under the Federal work rules is a very costly endeavor indeed, which is why even in the private sector they try to avoid that if at all possible.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the House would support the action of the committee which has already reduced based upon its judgment of what can be done within the time frame available in the fiscal year 1997 budget. I commend the committee for its actions, and I would hope that they would be sustained by the House.

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dunn amendment which would reduce the Government Printing Office by 100 full-time employees.

Some Members may say, what is the big deal about reducing 100 full-time employees from this office. If you take into consideration that in 1976 there were 8,000 employees at the GPO and presently there are 3,800 employees at the GPO, that becomes a big deal. One thousand of these cuts have occurred since 1993. These reductions were accomplished through attrition and improved computer technology. The GPO has managed the transition to electronic technologies and downsized without interrupting services to the Congress, other Federal agencies and, most importantly, to the public. They have done an excellent job.

As computer technology changes the way the Federal Government does its business, we should be sensitive to reducing the work force, the people, which produce government documents. The futurist, John Nesbitt, in his book ''Megatrends'' wrote that as society becomes more high tech, it should remain high touch. I believe that can be interpreted to mean that as a computer society becomes bigger and more important in our lives, we should not let this advancement influence the way we treat our fellow human beings.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment may be high tech, but it sure is not high touch. Vote against the Dunn amendment, please.

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

Let me just respond briefly to the gentleman from North Carolina, in talking about concerns and feelings and a sense of having empathy. My empathy goes out to the taxpayers of America who continue to fund an organization that I think largely is out of date and I think the gentleman from North Carolina brings up a very good point. With the increasing use of the Internet, the Government is less reliant on paper than ever before. CD roms can now replace entire volumes of hard-bound documents.

The point is in the current environment we are going into, it does not call for a continual support of the GPO. It essentially says that GPO has an even tougher job in the future justifying their existence, period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

□ 1330

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

In the recent past I was the ranking Republican member serving on the House-Senate Joint Committee on Printing. That is the congressional entity with oversight of the GPO's operation. I have been over there many times and talked with many employees and many of the administrative folks down there as well. I think the basic problem here is the financial loss. In 1991, as has been stated in the debate, when the GPO lost $1.2 million, 1992 losses began to increase to $5.2 million; in 1994, losses topped out at $21.8 million. Even during this fiscal year, the GPO has already lost $13 million. Only the Federal Government, it seems to me, would continue to run an agency at a total loss to the taxpayer. There is a lot of red ink down there, we have to fix it.

The first question that comes to mind is, where does all the money go in regard to the GPO? Every study that we have had in regard to this operation says about 80 percent of all the GPO costs are dedicated to personnel costs.

Now, the second question that comes to mind is this: Why is so much money being lost? Well, I do not think we can blame the employees. That is not the intent. They are doing their jobs and they are doing them well, for that matter. Rather, it is the advanced technology that has been discussed on the floor in this regard and the move toward something called electronic printing that has changed the way that the GPO does business.

The entire Government is using less paper and shifting to on-line services to gather and disperse information. The traditional customers of the GPO are simply turning to these alternatives to get their information much more quickly and in a cost-efficient manner. This amendment simply reflects the future of government as dictated by technology and as demanded by taxpayers. That is what the amendment is about. With this trend continuing toward less paper and more reliance on web sites and CD–ROM's, we will need fewer people to produce the government documents.

I have said many times in the last few years, at many hearings, the world is changing and the GPO must change as well. While I recognize and appreciate the efforts of the GPO, I believe we must continue to guide the GPO down the path to a smaller, more efficient Government. We have a responsibility to the taxpayer to reduce costs, just as all of the printing businesses on America's Main Streets do in the same situation.

I would point out that last year this amendment or a very similar amendment received bipartisan support and the vote was 293–129. It reduced the FTE's by 350. That was down from 3,900 to 3,550. Then 250 FTE's were restored in conference. I believe the final conference version simply brought the FTE count to 3,800.

So, first we achieved the reform, and then it is taken away in conference. First we make the cuts, which are reasonable cuts, by a vote of 293 to 129. Then 250 are restored in conference. So we really did not even do what the House voted for in the last session of Congress. This has nothing to do about employees, nothing to do about the good work at the GPO. It is advanced technology and the way the Government does its job in regard to that technology.

So I am very happy to cosponsor the amendment on behalf of the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] and also my colleague from Wisconsin. I urge its support.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, we have a level of about 3,700 people in the Government Printing Office now. That is less than 50 percent of what it used to be. We used to have about 8,000 people in the Government Printing Office, and they had a reputation for doing a very good job. They still have a reputation for doing an excellent, professional job. If we talk to people in the private sector, the Printing Industries of America, whatever, they will say that they have a high level of respect for people in the Government Printing Office.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], our friend, said this is not about people, this is not about those employees. Well, the fact is, it is.

We are cutting another 100 people that are doing their job, have consistently done everything that the Congress has asked them to, have been subject to continuing downsizing. They accept the downsizing. They are on a glide path. They are reducing the number of people that work there, not as fast as they are reducing their workload.

The only thing that makes sense is that this is some kind of vendetta against the Government Printing Office and it does not make sense. We were reducing them. Let us do it in the way that we previously agreed to. Reject this amendment.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arkansas, a member of the committee, has the right to close.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], showing the bipartisan opposition to this amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It does indicate that there is bipartisan opposition, because opposition to this amendment is to really assist this Congress and the people of the United States.

This amendment that I oppose and many others oppose would arbitrarily reduce the Government Printing Office by 100 additional full-time employees. These are people who have worked for many years for the Government Printing Office for us. The legislative branch appropriation bill, it already reduces the Government Printing Office by 100 full-time employees, reducing its staff from 3,800 FTE's to 3,700 FTE's.

Twenty years ago, GPO had a staff of 8,000. Today it is less than half that amount. More than half of these cuts have occurred since 1993. The Government Printing Office has been able to accomplish these reductions by careful management, attrition and by updating their computer systems. An additional cut of 100 employees would disrupt the GPO's work. Between 75 and 80 percent of GPO's work is already being sent to outside bidders, and we know that GPO gets the best price around. The remaining work done in-house is often sent by the Congress to be done on a moment's notice and they do it.

This amendment would arbitrarily disrupt both the productivity of the Government Printing Office and the lives of its personnel. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Dunn amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a few brief points in closing because we are just about out of time on both sides. I simply want to make the point that, more so than anything else, if we are going to be interested in somebody's interest in this debate that is going on, the interest should be that of the American taxpayers. The General Accounting Office, which his the investigative arm of Congress, when it has done investigations in the past on the Government Printing Office, essentially says, whenever we print a document there, it costs 2½ times what it does in the private sector.

In response to the point earlier of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], I do not want to see the Government Printing Office be eliminated, but I think it should largely become a procurement arm of the government and get out of the printing industry itself.

Over the last 5 years, as we have pointed out, the Government Printing Office has lost $57 million. The gentleman on the other side are correct that the Government Printing Office does what Congress asks it to do. What we are trying to say on this side of the aisle is we have asked it to do so many things. We should ask it to do less, and we should ask it to do with fewer people than we see at the present time.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee has carefully reviewed this and has determined that the reductions, which are significant, which have been recommended by the committee, are appropriate and that the functioning of the GPO, which, among other things, has the responsibility of transferring authority to the electronic media, can be well carried out within the committee recommendation.

I believe that the adoption of the amendment will impair that function, and I urge opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 104–663.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] wish to offer his amendment?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 104–663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER: Page 31, after line 2, insert the following:

The aggregate amount otherwise provided under this heading is hereby reduced by $250,000, and the amount of such reduction shall be retained in the Treasury for purposes of deficit reduction and shall not be available for appropriation for any other purpose for fiscal year 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for two purposes. One is to show my dissatisfaction with the operations of the GAO, and especially for some of the studies that have come forth that I have been cognizant of, that I find less than professional. I wish to serve notice on the GAO that I believe they can do the job a lot better, and I feel more objective, than what I have seen in the past.

I acknowledge that the committee has already cut GAO by a significant figure and, therefore, my amendment really is not meaningful. But this amendment was drafted over a month ago in preparation. I told my staff that I wanted to be able to take this opportunity to suggest that the GAO can do a better job.

But the second purpose of me being here is to talk about the appropriation bill that is now before us.

Back last year during the Government shutdown, when Speaker GINGRICH decided that the Government should shut down in order to persuade the President to sign a balanced budget that they wanted, and other bills that they wanted, we had Federal employees, many of which are in my district, who did not know whether they were going to be able to work, did not know whether they were going to be paid if they did work. And many of them were very hurt by the actions of this Congress.

I had one lady who worked for a Federal agency who called me up, and she has children. She got a paycheck for 2 weeks' work that was around $5. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, every employee of the legislative branch, GAO, committee staff, my staff, everybody else was feeling great. They were getting paid right along because their appropriation bill had been signed in October.

Well, I called my friend over at the White House, not the President but somebody else, and talked to him at that time about it. I said, next year we will probably be ending up at the same place, and it looks to me like we are going there. When I look at the Interior bill, I look at the HUD and Independent Agencies bill, I look at Labor, HHS and Education bill, going down the same road, dead end, not going to get done.

I am not the only one that says that. Their own leader, the gentleman from Texas, is saying it. He is saying we are not going to get it done, we have got to have a continuing resolution until March to get by this. Well, my position is, and I think I would like to find out from the gentleman from California, who I consider a good friend. Ever since we have been here, we have worked together on things.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill should be the very last bill that gets signed by the President. If other Federal agencies, employees of this Federal Government are not going to know whether they are going to get paychecks or not, are not going to know whether they are going to be able to work or not at their jobs, I do not believe that my employees, that any committee staff, GAO, Library of Congress, police force, you name it, they should have the same problem.

My position is, if all that happens, maybe we will actually get it done, rather than having your own staff gripe at Members and saying, well, I do not have money for dinner, because those people out there, a lot of them did not have money for dinner. They might come along and ask: Can I come over to your house for dinner? I need something to eat, if it is on your own committee or your own personal staff.

So my suggestion is let us go slow on this bill. If we want to finish up here today and have the Senate take it up later when Members take it to conference, just do not come out of conference until everything else is done. Then, when all the other bills are out of the way and we know that the Government will not shut down again, because last time it was shut down because somebody in this House, the Speaker and a few other people on that side, decided they wanted to shut it down. They were going to teach the President a lesson. Well, that same thing could happen. Very easily, somebody does not get their way on that side, they decide, well, let us shut the Government down again.

If it does, why should our employees have the comfort, and that is what it is, a comfort of knowing that they are going to be able to go to work the next day. They are going to get their paycheck at the end of the month when all these other Federal employees do not have any idea at all about it.

□ 1345

We know what happened last year in that Government shutdown was terrible. I still have people in my district who went through that at the Veterans Hospital, at research centers and others, that still talk to me about it. They still do not know. There is no certainty to them. They are wondering right now whether they are going to be paid and they are going to be working or there is going to be another Government shutdown.

Well, if we want to try to ensure that there will not, let us say no. If there is going to be a shutdown, we shut down too.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from California. I want to know his position on that.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment has very little to do with what he has expressed.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that that is correct.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to take it out on the GAO as a means of trying to convey the gentleman's concerns for whether we shut the Government down again or not is probably not the appropriate thing to do.

I certainly am not, and this subcommittee is not, going to be making the decision as to whether we shut down or not.

Mr. VOLKMER. I agree with that.

Mr. PACKARD. My personal observation is that there is bipartisan agreement that shutting down the Government is not a good procedure, and I think we will use every effort to avoid that, and I assume we will avoid that.

I think, speaking directly to the gentleman's amendment, I have some real concerns because we have cut the GAO over the last year's bill and this year's bill to 25 percent of the dollar cut from the previous year, and a 37 percent cut in the staff. $250,000 is no significant amount of money in their large budget, but the fact is it would be a slap in the face for them, I think, after we have made an agreement that we would not ask them to sustain more than the 25-percent cut. They would have liked to have sustained less than the 25-percent cut this year, but they agreed to keep their word, and I would have a very red face to go back to them and say $250,000 we will cut further.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman has time to do all that, but I am trying to get an answer to a simple question and I have not got it yet.

Does the gentleman think that his should be the last bill to go until all the other bills are done or should he go ahead so all his workers and his committee staff, they get the comfort of knowing they are going to get paid while they go ahead and shut down the Government on the other people?

Mr. PACKARD. The President has the option to veto this bill. I think we should sent it to the President as quickly as we can.

Mr. VOLKMER. In other words, the gentleman believes that it is all right to tell other people in the Federal Government, others that they can be shut down, they do not get paid, but he is going to take care of his.

Mr. PACKARD. I think our job as appropriators is to appropriate the funds necessary to run Government, and that is what we are doing in my bill and that is what we are doing in the other bills. Certainly I am not suggesting that we shut the Government down.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is obvious to me that the gentleman from California is willing to shut down the Government on other people, like he did, and the gentleman participated in that. I can show him the votes where he agreed to shut down the Government and let it be shut down, and those people did not get paid for a long time. They went weeks without pay and then, at the same time, he had the comfort of knowing that this committee staff, sitting around him now, his personal staff, they all got their paychecks and everything else. That was comfort.

All I am saying is if there is going to be sacrifice, I think we should start with the sacrifice. I do not think that we should consider our people and the people that work for this legislative branch better than other Federal agencies. That is why I am asking the gentleman to hold off on this bill and not do it until every other appropriation bill for all Federal agencies are done.

If there is going to be a shutdown, and I think there is a possibility there will, then the gentleman should let his legislative staff and my legislative staff have to suffer also.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

It really is punitive to the GAO and the message and the signal that the gentleman wishes to convey to our leadership on both sides and the President as to whether we shut the Government down is totally extraneous to this issue. I would really invite the gentleman to withdraw his amendment because we have cut the GAO far more than I think he ever would have had he been chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this is the forum in which we debate the whole issue of whether we shut the Government down again or not. I do not anticipate that debate coming for several weeks or maybe several months, but the point is that will not be made by this bill.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to say it is obvious to me, because of what I have said before in my statement, that we are headed for a shutdown as far as certain agencies are concerned. Unless that side makes some changes, that shutdown will occur. And if it does occur the way the gentleman wants it to, there will be agencies out there that will not get paid while our people are paid.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There is no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PACKARD

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, I offer the Packard amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACKARD: On page 32, at the end of line 17, add the following: (c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person

intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell Members that this is the Traficant language regarding ''Buy America.'' I have no problem with the amendment and will accept it.

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

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

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I want to thank the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], for the great job he has done.

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

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's consideration and the committee staff who helped with this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

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

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the committee for its work in promoting the Books for the Blind Program. The Books for the Blind Program is funded through the Library of Congress and ensures that our blind and visually impaired populations will have continued access to printed reading materials.

This past week I had the pleasure of addressing the national convention of the National Federation of the Blind, an organization representing those members of our society who must rely almost exclusively on the Books for the Blind Program for reading materials of all kinds, whether educational, informational, or for the latest best seller. I therefore wish to commend my colleagues on the committee for increasing funding for this worthy program to nearly $45 million.

Due to the tremendous role this program plays in the lives of our blind and visually impaired fellow citizens, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California what effect, if any, would section 208 of the measure have on the Books for the Blind Program.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would be happy to speak to the gentleman's point.

Section 208 allows the Library of Congress to request that funds from the five-line-item appropriations funding the Library of Congress be shifted to meet its needs. The Books for the Blind Program is one of these five line items, but of course this committee has not legislatively decreased these funds for the blind. In fact, we increased funds in this year's bill.

As the gentleman pointed out, this program is the primary source of reading material for the blind, and the committee has been pleased to increase funds for this service in the bill that we are debating today. Under section 208 the Librarian could request, for instance, that funds be added to the Books for the Blind account and taken from the other four line items.

It is most unlikely, though possible, that the Librarian could request funds to be shifted out of this account; however, even were the Librarian to make such a request, it would have to be approved by the House and Senate appropriations committees before any transfer could take place. I personally have to approve that, and of course we have been very protective of the Books for the Blind. So section 208 provides a mechanism by which the efficiency of the Library of Congress and the Books for the Blind program can be maximized.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I applaud his efforts in ensuring that the Books for the Blind Program continues to provide services so desperately needed by the Nation's blind and visually impaired citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5, printed in House Report 104–663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Page 35, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 310. Any amount appropriated in this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances'' shall be available only for fiscal year 1997. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished cosponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and that he be allowed to control that 5 minutes of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, pending the arrival of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] on the floor, I might stand in his stead for the 5 minutes. When he arrives I will be pleased to yield that time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Many Members of this body who come to Congress come with the goal of saving taxpayers money, being frugal with their own office spending accounts as is possible. Since entering Congress, many of us try to save for the taxpayers and keep our office expenses to a minimum.

Over the last 3 years in our Michigan's 7th District office, we have saved $636,000. After my first year of cost cutting and making the effort to be conscious of spending. I was appalled and disturbed that a Member's savings did not save money; that the money would go automatically into other accounts and add to those accounts to expand spending.

In my first year in Congress, like many first-year Members, we were striving to make sure that we do not buy more than what is needed in stationery, that we do not waste the money by overspending on computers or any other items only to find out that someone else spent the money that was saved. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, like the amendment that we put in last year, for the first time allows the savings to go to the Department of the Treasury for deficit reduction.

This amendment is identical to the amendment that we passed last year, and I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment. Last year this amendment was passed by a vote of 423 to 21 margin as an amendment to the legislative appropriation bills to return these unspent funds to the Department of the Treasury. If we do not have some consideration, some incentive for Members to be careful on how they spend taxpayers' money, then we are not as apt to do it.

So I say let us pass this amendment, let us notify each office of how much they have under spent, how much they have saved taxpayers, and let us make sure with this amendment that that money will be going toward deficit reduction rather than simply into another account.

□ 1400

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was accepted last year and I would certainly be anxious to accept it this year. It expresses the very intent of our bill, and that is to return these funds to the Treasury.

It is the intent of the committee bill. It is the desire of the chairman and, I believe, the ranking member, that this be done. I do not think there is any opposition from any member of the subcommittee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be accepted and that we can move on to the following.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and do so for the following reasons. Mr. Chairman, as we look out across America and we see people working so hard, sometimes both people in the family are working to support their children. Sometimes small businesses are making very, very tough decisions to stay in a mode where they are growing and maybe just making it through that year. We here in the House of Representatives need to make decisions to help balance the budget and move toward a balanced budget sooner rather than later.

Now, if balancing the budget starts at home, it certainly should start in the House of Representatives here with our own accounts.

What this amendment simply does, it simply says that when you make some of those tough choices and those tough decisions in your own office to save money, do not let money be respent and go toward somebody else's office where they are spending more money on their office or on mail.

Last year we were able to pass this amendment 403 to 21. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and myself and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] and a host of other people, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], helped pass this amendment and say for the first time that when you are fiscally responsible as a Member of Congress, you are going to contribute to deficit reduction and not contribute to somebody else's office funds where they are spending too much of those funds on mail or staff or some other thing.

Let me say too, Mr. Chairman, that this language is identical to my bill, which is H.R. 26. I have 126 cosponsors on this legislation, both Republicans and Democrats, working together to find new innovative ways to help balance the budget and reduce the deficit that Congress and the Presidents have created over the past 20 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an innovative approach. It certainly is an approach where we say balancing the budget must start inside the Beltway. It must cut Washington, DC, spending first. It must say that it starts in the home, which is the House of Representatives. And it says, I think in a bipartisan way, the support of bipartisanship that so many people in this country want to see that, we have come up with a new idea, a new way to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to be an original sponsor and the sponsor of the bill H.R. 26. I am very, very happy to work with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and others.

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

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his leadership in this bipartisan effort and would like to state that certainly the amendment is acceptable to the minority. As the chairman has stated, it is acceptable to the majority. I hope that we will be able to get a good vote on this for the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a giant step in the way we are changing business in the United States Congress. Maybe it could be akin to the baby step forward. But still, if every Member of Congress knows how much they are spending for the carts, for the computers, for everything they buy in that office, and we start running our offices like a business, it will help save tazpayer dollars.

Last year, for the first time in history, we had made a decision in this Congress to return this money to Treasury to go toward deficit reduction. That is our goal. Balancing the budget needs to be ever on our minds as we strive to make sure that our economy and jobs expand. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just say in concluding my remarks, because we were hopeful that a number of the cosponsors such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] might show up to speak, but I know a number of Members have commitments and hearings and markups and so forth.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, the strong vote last time by the House, by the entire body here who controls how we spend our money and how we save our money, 403 to 21; 403 Democrats and Republicans coming up with a new idea, saying to this body and to taxpayers across the country, we will save money in our office accounts, tighten our own belts and contribute that money to reducing the deficit. That is a positive step forward, I think.

I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan intends to call for a rollcall vote. Certainly, with the bipartisan support from the Republican and Democratic sides, I will not call for a vote, especially in light of the strong vote that we had last time, but I would continue to urge Members to support this measure when they are talking to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], and that we may also look next year at including the leadership funds into this package of savings as well, so that everybody across the board contributes to deficit reduction.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and I have both offered freestanding bills on this. I hope we can move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and I want to commend my colleague from Indiana for working on this matter for a number of years, and I appreciate my colleague from Michigan's support on this as well. I think this is a positive amendment and I would urge my colleagues to vote for it. This would allow Members to return unspent office funds to the Treasury. It would allow them to use those funds returned for specifically deficit reduction and I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the 104th Congress has led a historic effort to reduce the deficit and incorporate fiscal responsibility into Federal spending.

Today, we again have the opportunity to lead by example. This amendment would allow Members to return unspent office funds to the U.S. Treasury for the specific purpose of deficit reduction. It would reaffirm our commitment to eliminating the Federal debt.

It is important that fiscal responsibility start at home. Since being elected to Congress in 1991, I have not spent over $565,000 of my office funds. Like most Americans, I have spent wisely and made do with what I had.

Naysayers claim that money can't be returned to the U.S. Treasury. Many Members, however, save taxpayer money by spending

less. These Members should be recognized for their efforts and taxpayers should be rewarded by allowing them to use unspent funds to reduce the deficit.

We should not abandon this effort because it requires some changes. This Congress has changed many things, and if need be, we can change to allow Members to contribute savings to deficit reduction.

By adopting this amendment we reaffirm our commitment to deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill, there is $363 million appropriated for legislative representative office expenses. Let us make a commitment today, now, that we are going to manage and safeguard those funds to the greatest extent of our managerial ability to make sure that taxpayers get their money's worth from the operations of our individual offices.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 104–664.

AMENDMENT NO. 6, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, 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. 6, as modified, offered by Mr. CAMPBELL: Before the short title at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 312. (a) In addition to any other estimates the Director is required to make pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, upon the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the ranking minority member of that committee), prepare an estimate for any major spending legislation, as designated by the majority leader of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the minority leader of the House), of the change in spending and revenues resulting from the legislation on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of such legislation, and shall include a statement identifying those assumptions. Such estimates shall be submitted to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget and of the committees of subject-matter jurisdiction, and, if timely submitted, shall be included in the reports on such legislation.

(b) In addition to any other estimates the Chief of Staff is required to make pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation shall, upon the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the ranking minority member of that committee), prepare an analysis of any major tax legislation, as designated by the majority of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the minority leader of the House), of the change in spending and revenues resulting from that legislation on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of such legislation, and shall include a statement identifying those assumptions. Such analyses shall be submitted to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the committees of subject-matter jurisdiction, and if timely submitted, shall be included in the reports on such legislation.

(c) Estimates and analyses made pursuant to this section are to be used for informational purposes only.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House resolution 473, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] oppose the amendment?

Mr. SABO. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The amendment that I offer would permit an additional form of understanding and analysis of the economic effect of legislation that we pass here.

I begin by emphasizing the amendment does not replace any existing method at all. But in addition to existing methods, occasionally it is appropriate to consider what is called a dynamic economic model, and this has application on the tax side as well as on the expenditure side. Most of the literature in the academic world of economics has dealt with the dynamic effects on taxes or tax cuts, but I have been careful in this amendment to specify that this additional method shall apply to the dynamic effect of expenditures as well.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important that we have that kind of information available. This amendment allows that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget can request CBO, in addition to all the other means of analysis of a fiscal spending bill, to perform a dynamic economic analysis as well; the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, similarly, in addition to all other forms of economic analysis, can request dynamic economic modeling on tax bills as well.

In each case the Chair is required to consult with the ranking minority member. I would point out that this methodology is used already in several of the United States, specifically I know of the one in my own State of California. That it is actually a more difficult process for a State because the leakage, if you will, from a State economy is a greater problem to estimate than the leakage from the U.S. economy. And yet dynamic economic modeling is being practiced and offering value in the analysis of the States of Massachusetts and California.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my opening remarks by observing that this amendment to the bill will provide additional information and does not supplant any other existing information. I cannot see how it would do anything but help our analysis and the job that we do on behalf of the citizens we represent. And I note in conclusion that the academic-economic research institutes that are engaged in this process so far include the National Bureau of Economic Research, which has offices at Harvard University and Stanford University, UCLA; the University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Michigan.

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This amendment does authorize the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to use the dynamic scoring model on spending and tax legislation for informational purposes only.

This is an issue that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget and the Joint Committee on Taxation, and I understand that it has been approved and has received agreement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation. And with that approval, I have no objections and would be more than pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, might I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, first let me commend the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] for the extremely diligent and hard work that he has done in bringing this amendment to the floor. I think it is of great importance, and I guess from the Joint Economic Committee point of view, the best I think to say is very simply that we talk about growth policy in taxes, and we talk about the negative aspects or the negative effects of high taxes, and I think on both sides of the aisle we share the belief that there is a stimulus that can be gained if we are smart about tax policy. And we also recognize, I think on both sides of the aisle, that bad tax policy can work as a wet blanket on the economy, a wet blanket on our revenue. And yet the rules that we operate under deny any of that takes place.

And so, the gentleman's amendment gives the chairman of the committee the opportunity, the choice to make as to whether or not they want to treat a particular item of tax policy and score it and figure out what is going to happen in terms of our revenue from a dynamic model, meaning that we accept the fact that there will be some changes positive or negative, and that that can be factored into the equation.

One of the things that happens around here to all of us in Congress is that people do not think that we know what we are doing. And I think sometimes that happens with good cause. If we, on the one hand, say that we are going to pass a certain tax because we want to make the economy grow and hence enhance our revenue stream, and yet our rules tell us that that cannot happen and we cannot consider those facts, then, in fact, the public is certainly entitled to think we do not know what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I was fishing the other day in the rain. This is a story that goes along with this static model, I think. I was fishing in the rain the other day and I got off the boat after having a wonderful day fishing and the skipper said, How did you like it? I said, it was wonderful, we caught fish, the company was good, but the only thing is my glasses kept fogging up because it was raining. And he said, You should be used to that; you are from Washington.

And this static rule is one of the things around here that perpetuates the knowledge, the belief among the American public, that we do not know what we are doing and that our glasses are, in fact, foggy.

So, Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from California will go a long way, in my view, toward unfogging our glasses and letting us know ahead of time what it is that our policy will produce.

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

□ 1415

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bizarre amendment in some ways yields incredible powers to the majority leader. Second, I would remind Members who eventually decides how things are scored here is the Committee on the Budget. CBO is advisory. This provides the option for the Committee on the Budget to use new, crazy, funny numbers to score a variety of proposals, either on the tax or the spending side. Lots of folks I have heard on my side of the aisle over the years come with proposals on the spending side that say, if we do this, this will save all this money in outyears. We have not followed that.

Mr. Chairman, this is another of those sort of ideological proposals. Part of it has had hearings. The hearings that relate to the tax side were held in January of 1995. There have not been any hearings on the spending side of this proposal. But those hearings were overwhelmingly against moving to this type of dynamic scoring.

Let us be clear, the current system is not pure static. Members do look at the impact of legislation. But let me read what Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan had to say before the Committee on the Budget of Congress on January 10, 1995, and I know my friend from California was not here then. Let me quote:

> Can we effectively create an econometric model which fully captures all the effects of a specific policy action? I would say to you, not in our lifetime.

Let me continue with another one:

> We should be especially cautious about adopting technical scoring procedures that might be susceptible to overly optimistic assessments.

Third quote:

> Should financial markets lose confidence in the integrity of our budget scoring procedures, the rise in inflation premiums and interest rates could more than offset any statistical difference between so-called static and more dynamic scoring.

This is an amendment that should not be adopted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It may be that my good friend and colleague has been referring to an earlier version of the bill because the majority leader is not in this bill at all. So the gentleman's opening comment worrying about the delegation of authority to the majority leader is not in this bill or in this amendment.

Let me repeat what the amendment does. It supplements, it never replaces. And regarding Alan Greenspan's testimony, what he was saying is absolutely right. Never in our lifetime will we know everything. But as a supplement to what we now do as opposed to a replacement for it, I do not believe he was speaking against this proposal.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Let me apologize. The version of the amendment that I saw had majority leader. Let me also indicate to the gentleman that it is the Committee on the Budget that eventually scores budgets and that adopts assumptions around here. This provides a mechanism for them to use this new untested and unproven method for purposes of both budgets and scoring bills.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I participated in hearings on the concept of dynamic scoring and acknowledge to the amendment's sponsor that, as a hypothetical matter, the dynamic impact of public policy decisions made by Congress in the spending and tax areas certainly has legitimacy. In fact, presently the CBO does contemplate changes in resulting behavior.

If my colleagues look at, for example, the varying CBO estimates on health policy expenditures, they see that there is a small element of dynamic scoring presently at play in CBO assumptions. The larger question though is, Does the methodology exist that allows dynamic scoring to proceed with a degree of legitimacy that would play in public policy debate?

On this exact question I put to Mr. Greenspan when he was before us, my question from the transcript: Reading your testimony, it seems to me to indicate, while there may be a conceptual legitimacy to concepts of a more dynamic approach in scoring, we simply do not have the tools, the ability at the present time to reasonably quantify in a way that would give anyone the certainty required under this deficit picture that we should move toward a more dynamic process; is that correct?

Mr. Greenspan's response: On the broader question of can we effectively create an economic model which fully captures all the effects of a specific policy action, I would say to you, not in our lifetime.

Now, what is so important here is that, literally, these dynamic assumptions, we would be asking Congress literally to bet the ranch on their legitimacy. Both parties have members that say, we cut taxes, we are going to make more money, or we increase spending and we will actually reduce government outlays. Of course, those very concepts are antithetical. Yet, on the other hand, using a dynamic scoring model, we may have some very erroneous partisan-driven assumptions placed on a dynamic model, and it would, I think, jeopardize seriously the budget debates of this Congress.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment as a member of the Committee on the Budget. In some of the debates we have already heard today, it needs to be pointed out to the House we already have dynamic scoring. That is already, when it is supportable it is used. That is the way it ought to be. The idea that CBO uses only static scoring is erroneous. If dynamic scoring is a good thing, it should be a good thing in all instances, not just when the Committee on the Budget chairman finds that it will serve his purpose to use it in consultation with the ranking minority.

Saying that the dynamic scoring is only informational ignores the fact that all CBO scoring is informational. It is the Committee on the Budget which ultimately decides which assumptions to use. And therein I want to close by again repeating the words that we should heed, those words of Alan Greenspan, when he testified earlier this year in the Committee on the

Budget. He stated, clearly, our political process has a bias to words deficit spending, a bias toward deficit spending. Accordingly, we should be especially cautious about adopting technical scoring procedures that might, might be susceptible to overly optimistic assessments of the budgetary consequences of fiscal actions. We must avoid resting key legislative decisions on controversial estimates of revenue and outlays. Should financial markets lose confidence in the integrity of our budget scoring procedure, the rise in inflation premiums and interest rates could more than offset any statistical difference between so-called static and more dynamic scoring.

We should oppose this amendment today. It does not serve a helpful purpose. At a time in which we clearly are needy, have got the deficit heading in the right direction. This is not a time to be experimenting with somebody's philosophical beliefs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, is it the case that because we cannot know everything, which was the burden of Alan Greenspan's comment, we must, therefore, know nothing? This is a very sound amendment. It would permit us some additional information only. Are we so frightened of information that we do not wish to know it?

Right now under our current arrangements, the Congressional Budget Office makes macroeconomic estimates of gross domestic product, unemployment, interest rates. And then the Joint Committee on Taxation, when it takes a look at our revenue legislation, finds that these things are fixed and immutable like the old stars in an Aristotelian firmament. Nothing that we do with revenues can affect unemployment. Nothing that we do with tax legislation can affect interest rates or gross domestic product. Those things are fixed.

Yes, we can take behavior into account, but only within this box that is already fixed in advance by CBO. We know this does not work. We know it produces false results.

When I was on the Committee on the Budget, I had a chance to ask the director of CBO, Robert Reischauer why it was that on average CBO's estimate of the deficit were in error by over 100 percent. That kind of estimating error would get you fired anywhere in the private sector. His answer was, we are not as far off as OMB, as the White House budget estimators. There is no way in the world that anyone can say that what presently we do makes sense or appreciates reality.

When we increased the rate of tax on capital gains by 40 percent in 1986, revenues to the Treasury dropped by a third. But CBO, using this model, and joint tax, using this model, told us that revenues were going to go up but we increased that stated rate.

We have a lot of real world evidence that tells us that the flat earth econometric model, if we can call it an econometric model, simply does not work as in use around here.

So what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], is telling us is, let us experiment, yes, by looking at this for informational purposes only. We will not use it. It will not supplant our current scoring system, but we can have the information. If Members want to bury their heads in the sand and follow flat earth economics forever into the future, vote no. But if they want an honest evaluation and new information, vote yes on this very sound amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 45 seconds to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from my friend, the gentleman from California. We have heard the technical reasons why to oppose this amendment. We have heard Dr. Greenspan quoted.

I recall the Committee on the Budget, Joint Committee on the Budget hearing we held early in the session with House and Senate Members. The conclusion broadly from every economist was that to the extent that we need dynamic scoring, they already can do it. But to suggest additional rosy scenarios be injected into it was a huge mistake.

Before we make this mistake again, let us just look back at the historical record. This amendment says that CBO should consider other impacts which would increase revenue projections, dynamic scoring of revenue provisions, beyond just the revenue coming in and so on.

Let us look at the record of CBO over the last 15 years. Look, every line above this median is a year in which the CBO underestimated the deficit. About half of each of these underestimates are they assumed that we would spend less than we actually did, but the other half is they assumed we would generate more revenues than we did.

The previous speaker said that in 1981, we made these changes. In 1986, we made tax changes. And if we had been able to dynamically score and increase the rosy scenario even greater, we would have suggested even more revenue come in.

Look at what happened right after 1981, when we assumed that all of these tax reductions would increase revenue. They overestimated revenues.

I submit that the facts suggest that CBO already overestimates. Let us not create even more rosy scenarios. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, offered by the distinguished gentleman from California.

I leave others to point out the technical reasons why this amendment should be opposed. I would like to focus on the practical impact.

The clear intent of this amendment is to encourage more optimistic assumptions about Federal revenues and expenditures, in the projections made by the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office.

Before we do so, let us look at the historical record. Over the last 15 years, we have seen our national debt soar from $1 to $5 billion. Annual deficits have been out of control.

Let us look at the accuracy of our projections by CBO over this period. With the exception of the last few years, the CBO has consistently and dramatically underestimated budget deficits. In fact, it did so for 13 consecutive years, with an average underestimate of $42 billion.

Some years, the difference was astounding. In 1990, CBO projections underestimated the deficit by $119 billion. In 1983, the underestimate was $91 billion. As CBO's annual Budget Outlook shows, these underestimates reflect both a consistent underestimate of spending and an overestimate of revenues.

Thus, in a period in which deficits have skyrocketed, and which CBO has chronically underestimated our deficits, we are contemplating an amendment which would exaggerate CBO's tendency to use overly rosy projections.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spent several months last year extolling the virtues of CBO projections, of using conservative estimates. They strongly attacked the administration for using less conservative assumptions.

Now, in a remarkable about face, we are considering a proposal to use less conservatives, less reliable projections of Federal spending and revenues. Budget expert after budget expert have criticized this approach.

With month's passage of a budget that actually increases the deficit each of the next 2 years, it is clear that we are retreating from a policy of fiscal discipline. Let us not turn this retreat into a rout.

Vote down the Campbell amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

To my friend from Utah, is it his statement, is the gentleman informing the body that CBO, under present estimation techniques, has gotten it wrong in every year that he has for us on the chart?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ORTON. What this chart shows is that in each year, the CBO has underestimated deficits up until 1993, which they overestimated the deficit. About half, look at 1990, they underestimated the deficit by $119 billion. Half of that was revenue.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, is not the point of the gentleman's chart that under present methods of estimation, CBO has it wrong every year that he shows us?

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, CBO has it wrong, but under the gentleman's proposal CBO would have it even more wrong and we would have even higher deficits.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, we are adding to the information store. There is no way we can do harm by providing additional sources of information.

As my good friend from Utah just admitted, the present system is so bad we have been estimating wrongly every time. In order to take account of both sides in this debate, this dynamic method is applicable to fiscal as well as tax policy. It is being used in three States.

□ 1430

The errors in the observations that have been made in opposition to this amendment are simply these. We cannot do worse by getting more information. We are not substituting dynamic modeling for the present system, and I have no better criticism of the present system than the words my colleague from Utah made clear to all of us: The present system has got it wrong every year we can measure.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes, the balance of my time, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what this is about is very simple. It is about giving away goodies without having found a way to pay for them. We have seen time and time again that our Republican friends in this Congress want to propose to cut taxes for the wealthy and for special interests. It has been their No. 1 priority. The problem is that they keep running into a situation in which the commonsense budget rules require them to pay for any tax reductions that they provide.

We saw last year how the Republicans would like to pay for those tax breaks. They wanted to cut Medicare, they wanted to cut education, they wanted to cut school lunches; the American people objected. And so now what are we back to? We are back to the resurrection of the David Stockman rosy scenario business.

I would remind my colleagues what happened the last time the country used dynamic scoring. We were promised by David Stockman, who ran the budget office for President Reagan, that if we passed his magic budget which cut taxes and raised defense spending, we would cut our deficit from $55 billion to zero within 4 years. Instead, using his dynamic scoring, that deficit went up from $55 billion to $208 billion, and finally they shaved it a bit to $185 billion.

I would simply suggest, if we were not paying for the added deficits that were added during those Reagan years, this budget would be in balance right now. That is the broblem, that is the problem, and this amendment will simply take us back to those good old rosy scenario days when we use phony estimates on revenue, and that allows us to spend more money on other things. We dare not do that if we want to remain fiscally responsible or even retain a pretension at fiscal responsibility.

I would simply say experience, as my colleagues know, is that quality which enables us to recognize a mistake when we make it again, and, if passed, this amendment today will be making the same mistakle again. I urge my colleagues not to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 104–663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT: Page 35 after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 310. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1.9 percent.

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

Is there a Member seeking time in opposition?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek that 10 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield 5 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today we heard a powerful speech from the new prime minister from Israel, Mr. Netanyahu. In it he said that real democracy allows dissent and honest debate, and we are here today to offer some dissent and honest debate. A few months ago, when we were adopting, in fact about a month ago when we were adopting, the budget resolution, we were rightly criticized by Members and leadership on the other side of the aisle for allowing the deficit to go up, and as one of the freshmen who came here promising to do what we could to balance this budget, to balance the people's budget, I was one who really felt we made a terrible mistake by allowing spending to go up more this year than we had agreed we would do just last year, and so, as a result, I and some of my freshmen colleagues sat down and said, well, what can we do? It is not enough just to vote no. We ought to have a constructive plan to help recover that fumble.

By our calculations what really happened is we have allowed ourselves to agree to spending levels that are about $4.1 billion more than we agreed to last year in our 7-year budget plan. What I am offering today is the same amendment that we have offered to virtually every appropriation bill since the adoption of the conference committee report on the budget resolution, and that is to reduce overall spending across the board 1.9 percent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is less than one notch in a belt. In fact, if I compare that to a haircut, and what we are asking the legislature to do is to reduce its expenditures by 1.9 percent, if we compare to that a haircut, that is a haircut of less than ⅛ of an inch.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, that is not much of haircut, and I think we should lead by example, and I would hope that we can get this amendment agreed to and that we can all agree to make at least some sacrifice in terms of balancing the people's books.

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 rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

If this subcommittee had not done its job effectively, I could probably agree to this amendment. But there is no subcommittee on appropriations that has done a better job of cutting itself and all the agencies that it represents better than this subcommittee. We have cut ourselves, the legislative branch of Government, almost 12 percent between last year and this year. We have gone far beyond what the intent of the author of this amendment would have asked us to do last year and this year, and to ask us now to absorb another 2 or almost 2 percent cut across the board I think would cut deeply into programs and agencies that simply the Congress would be ill advised to cut.

I think the first point I would like to make is that an across-the-board cut is not a good way to prioritize our spending programs. It is a lousy way to prioritize, frankly. But we have not used that as our procedure. We have funded those programs in this bill that ought to be funded at level funding. We have cut those programs that ought to be cut, and we have done a very responsible job, I believe, in doing it in an orderly way.

But this would cut the Library of Congress in ways we would have to have a hundred library employees fired. We have asked the library to cut back in their staffing, and they have done so, but they have done it in an orderly way, and this would eliminate the ability to fund the increases, the mandatory increases, for staff COLA's in our offices and in all of the agencies that

we represent in this bill. Some 28,000 copyrights would not be registered, and that would be unconscionable, I think, in the Library of Congress; 2,800 Braille books and 88,000 sound recordings would not be made available to the blind and handicapped patrons of the library.

The House Appropriation Committee has already eliminated unnecessary legislative funding and programs. We have cut ourselves $262 million over the past 2 years. I do not know why they are asking us to make further cuts when we are the model of cutting in the entire appropriating process.

I would hope that the House would reject this amendment. It will have, I think, personal effects upon our own offices and our staffs, but more importantly it will eliminate programs and cut programs deeper than what we feel is necessary and useful.

Incidentally, our bill comes in at 18 percent below the 602(b) outlay target and 23 percent below the 602(b) budget authority target, Senate items excluded. How can our colleagues ask us to do any better than that?

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I join the chairman of the committee in vigorous opposition to this amendment which transforms what is a studied, careful, and heavy reduction in appropriations into one which can have a very detrimental effect.

I am an airplane pilot, and I know that when I get up into the air in an airplane I pull back gently on the mixture control in order to get an efficient, good-running hot engine to pull me through the air while using the least amount of fuel. But there comes a point, Mr. Chairman, where by pulling that mixture control back just a little too far, there is silence—when the engine stops running because the fuel has been cut too much. We do not need to take that drastic measure with regard to the very important functioning of the legislative branch of Government.

We have cut this branch by over 20 percent in numbers of employees over the past 5 years. It is exemplary of what we should be doing throughout the Government, and the reason that we are upon this path of a balanced budget is because the legislative branch is doing its duty under the Constitution. We do not need to make across-the-board cuts which cut funds for books for the blind, which cut funds for COLA increases for valuable employees of the legislative branch of Government. This amendment would impose radical cuts across the board instead of singling out particular cuts that should be made.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], my freshman colleague.

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

Mr. COBURN. As my colleagues know, it is interesting. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and his committee have done a good job. This debate is not about whether or not they have done a good job. It is whether or not we can let us not do a better job.

We have the greatest respect for what the gentleman from California and his committee have done. But as my colleagues know, it is these 2 pennies. It is can we save 2 pennies? Can we be 2 percent more efficient? Can we do more?

I have been in Washington 19 months, and what I have heard is ''can't.'' The fact is that the debt that our children, our children and grandchildren, are going to get to pay back is rising at the rate of $2.785 billion a day, and what we are saying is: 2 percent. Now, if we were at war right now and we got together as a country and said we have an objective, the objective is to defeat the enemy, well, we have an enemy in front of us as a Nation, and that enemy is our deficit and our debt.

Two percent, 1.9 percent; 2 pennies out of every dollar to preserve opportunity for our children; it is not too much to ask. The two gentlemen that are speaking in favor of this amendment ran their offices for $100,000 less than the Congressmen before them in spite of the fact this past year, in spite of the fact that we had a reduction in the opportunity for more. So the point, I would say, is we can effectively represent our districts, we can effectively accomplish what we need to accomplish by being 2 percent more efficient.

The fact is in this bill spending goes up about 1.9 percent over last year, and what we are asking is to freeze the spending, essentially a 2-percent cut in the bill, pulling things down so that our children and our children's children will not be enslaved by debt. $2.785 billion a day because this Congress will not live within its limits of the money that comes to it.

When I leave this place, I want to be able to say that I did everything that I could to ensure opportunity and preserve opportunity for my children and the children that are from my district.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I think I need to correct one misunderstanding that apparently the gentleman has got in this amendment. We are cutting this year 2.2 percent in addition to last year's cuts of 9.5 percent. We are not increasing 1-point-something percent at all. In fact, we are cutting this bill. If every committee and every program in the Government cut to the extent this bill cuts, the Federal budget would be in balance this year and there would be a $100 billion surplus.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, that would be a great thing.

□ 1445

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding time to me, and I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. The fact is that this bill does cut 2.2 percent or $37.4 million already. We can pick up a pocket of change and say all we are talking about is 1 percent, 2 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent, it does not mean anything. When we look in terms of whether or not it is Library of Congress jobs, or jobs on the staff of your office or, in other bills it is Indian reservation jobs, or in other bills water project jobs, the fact is that we are talking about real and meaningful people who are going to be cut here. The question is, can we do the job?

Look, the U.S. Congress is paring down the discretionary budget in all 13 appropriations bills for the first time in modern times. We have saved $20 billion in fiscal year 1995, $23 billion in fiscal year 1996, and we are on the way to saving $15 billion to $20 billion in fiscal year 1997. If we look at where the President would have had us, if he had a Congress like he had 2 years ago, we are saving about $80 billion in the discretionary budget.

I heard the argument of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He is not concerned about the discretionary budget. We are doing the job. The problem is in the mandatory side of the equation. We have not done the first thing on mandatory. That is the problem. If Members want to do something constructive for their constituents, go back and tell them how we can figure out how to save our citizens, to save our children and the economy of this country by restraining the mandatory spending of this Government.

We are already doing the job here. For that reason, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my freshman colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend this subcommittee, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations, on their efforts on discretionary. It is indeed unfortunate that we are not dealing with the mandatory spending. But

the fact is that unless something miraculous happens, we are not going to deal with the mandatory spending, so we are forced to deal with the discretionary spending.

In the budget resolution many of us were concerned that there was a bump-up in the second year, so 1.9 percent off of all the appropriations bills would eliminate that bump-up. This is not aimed at any particular committee. It is very easy to demagog on House expenditures. Probably if we put this to a vote in the general public, they would cut us 80 percent.

At the same time, the truth is that there needs to be functions here, and 1.9 percent will not devastate our ability to communicate to our constituents, it will not devastate our ability to convert to computers. We are spending $211 million on that, 12 percent of the full funding. A 1.9-percent change there would not devastate our ability to do what we need to do, which is to be able to move into the age of the computer communications, the Internet.

We can deal with this. If we can deal with 1.9 percent changes and bigger changes in social spending, if we can deal with those 1.9 percent cuts in other areas, we can deal with it in legislative appropriations. It is inconsistent for this Congress to say that we will cut everybody else and we will put the pressure on everybody else, but we will not put that much on ourselves. A 2.2-percent cut is commendable and better than we have done in the past, but we can do more than that, and we need to be willing to sacrifice if we are going to eliminate the budget deficit.

In Indiana, they do not understand why it has taken us 7 years. We should be able to balance our budget in a lot shorter than that. To deal with that, unless we deal with mandatory, we have to do more out of discretionary. I do not believe 1.9 percent will devastate our ability to communicate.

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota, who has been persistent in spite of pressures with this. Persistence is one of the traits that Minnesotans develop because of the cold weather. I think the persistence in SPAN, which is in his district, are the two things which gave him that special courage.

We are going to continue to do this because we believe it is critical to our children and to this Nation to a move to a balanced budget. It is important that we in the legislative branch take the initiative. This 1.9 percent plus 2.2 is a 4.1 percent reduction. That is not going to cripple our ability to communicate, to do committees, or our personal work.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment. I do so reluctantly, because I feel I am a very strong fiscal conservative. I think my record, both on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget, will demonstrate that. But this is not the way to do it.

Across-the-board cuts did not work when we had Gramm-Rudman. We need to make the tough choices. That is what we are doing in the Committee on Appropriations, making tough choices in all the appropriations bills. We have made those tough choices. Going across the board in addition is not the way to go, especially for this specific appropriation bill, because in this appropriation bill we have cut over 10 percent from the 1995 numbers. We have cut in real dollars, not baseline cutting, but real dollar cuts. So to cut more, are we going to cut security in the Capitol? We have made those tough choices and decided how many security we are going to need. We do not need to have additional cuts like this. I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida just referred to Gramm-Rudman. I think that is a great example. That is an example of a plan that did not work. The reason it did not work is because Congress did not have the courage to stay with the plan. What this amendment is about and what all the amendments we have offered to all the other appropriations bills is about is keeping faith with the plan we offered last year.

The gentleman from California is absolutely right, they have done a good job. We are actually reducing the cost of operating this Congress. But the truth is that we are still increasing the amount we are going to spend on ourselves by 1.9 percent over what we said we were going to spend last year. This amendment is a good faith amendment. It is about keeping faith with the people of this country. It is about keeping faith with our kids.

Mr. Chairman, 1.9 percent, as I said earlier, is like getting a haircut of one-eighth of a inch. You would not even notice it. We would not notice it in this bill, frankly. We may have to buy less computers. Many of us are operating our budgets at $100,000 less than we were authorized to earlier.

I talked about Prime Minister Netanyahu. I do not always remember who gave this quote. I want to close with this quote. I do not remember who said it. He said, if you want to change the world, you have to first change your neighborhood. If you cannot change your neighborhood, at least you ought to be a good example.

This is about setting a good example. If we are serious about balancing the books of the people of the United States of America, if we are serious about saving the future and the American dream for our kids, then we have to be willing to tighten our belts. This is about setting a good example with the Congress itself, with our own legislative appropriation. It is only 1.9 percent, and I believe there is not a Member in this body who does not believe we cannot tighten our belts that small fraction.

Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped we would have had bipartisan support on this. I think this is a good example. I hope all Members will join us in supporting this simple and very, very innocuous amendment.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to yield my 1 remaining minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise very reluctantly in opposition to the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota. I do not know about the other areas of the appropriations package. I do know about the legislative branch. I worked very, very closely with the gentleman from California, and look at where we have gone.

I do want to correct slightly the gentleman's numbers. In fiscal year 1995 it was $1.9 billion. Last year it was $1.72 billion. This year it is $1.68. Those are declining real numbers every year. Last year, because it was larger, we cut $154 million. We cut the committees by one-third when we came in, saving $67 million. This year, notwithstanding one-third of a cut in committees, the gentleman from California sharpened his pencil and came up with an another $37.4 million reduction over last year. We are talking about real reductions over last year, not reducing the increase. We do not play that game. This is a new majority. It is an absolute reduction. It is not a mindless across the board. It was focused on where we could cut. I support the gentleman generally, but not in this particular instance.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], the former president of the freshman class, and also a very, very dedicated and useful member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] I recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although it is well intended. The legislative subcommittee has already done its work. The gentleman from Oklahoma held up two pennies and said, ''We are just asking for about a 2-percent cut.'' Mr. Chairman, we have made that 2 percent cut. As a matter of fact, this bill represents a 2.2-percent cut from last year's level as the gentleman from California pointed out, that is not a cut in the rate of increase or a cut in the percentage in which we are spending extra money, that is a real cut,

$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 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); 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 increases 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 stationery, 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 toot 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 decides 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 dissents 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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I was quoting an individual who spoke to me, not a Member of this body. And perhaps 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
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
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
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—181

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

NOT VOTING—14

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

☐ 1601

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

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

Tiahrt
Torricelli
Upton
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Zimmer

NOES—248

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
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
Gilchrest
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
Lowey
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
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
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)

□ 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 gentlewoman 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

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 electonic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 230, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
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)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—230

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

Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
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
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Clay
Dunn
Ford
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hayes
Lantos
Lincoln
Longley
McDade
Watt (NC)
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
Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Spence
Spratt
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NAYS—58

Andrews
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Chenoweth
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Danner
Dellums
Doggett
Engel
Fattah
Ganske
Green (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hilliard
Jacobs
Johnston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Markey
McDermott
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moran
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Orton
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Roemer
Royce
Sabo
Sanford
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Slaughter
Solomon
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Torricelli
Volkmer
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

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

□ 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

Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes. After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies always involves some controversy and usually involves much heated debate. Issues such as abortion, labor policy, the Federal role in education, stir passions and invite dialogue.

I am therefore, very pleased that the rule before us is completely open. Any Member who wishes to offer a germane amendment may do so.

Also, in the interest of comity and in recognition of the legitimate differences of opinion over some of the fundamental aspects of this bill, I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee to double usual time for general debate to 2 full hours, as requested by the ranking member the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and we acceded to that request.

In addition, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone or roll votes, a step we have taken on many bills recently which has helped, I think, provide for a smoother and more predictable schedule for Members in committee with important business taking place off the House floor.

Finally, the rule includes a preprinting option, I repeat, option, for the benefit of Members who file their amendments in advance. It is not mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, there will certainly be very comprehensive debate about the specifics of this bill. In fact, I think some of it has already started on the other side. I will not spend a lot of time previewing those discussions because this is about the rule.

I would, however, like to thank Chairman PORTER and his committee for the good work they have done to bring this bill to the floor. This legislation, as we will all recall, was indeed a lighting rod last year, and I think most of us will also remember it spent much time being stalled in the other body.

I think most Members will recognize the effort that has been made this year to produce a solid bill, one that is free from many of the controversial policy riders that hindered the progress in the fiscal year 1996 bill, a real effort that deserves our attention. While H.R. 3755 fully complies with the strict limits needed to reach a balanced budget by 2002, that is, it is on the budget glide path, discretionary funding is nevertheless up $2.4 billion, almost $2.5 billion in additional, increased spending in this bill.

□ 1700

Although we undoubtedly will hear the charge from the defenders of big government that we are not spending enough, we will never be spending enough for some people. Instead of the old approach of funding all government programs, those big and small, good and bad, at equally high levels, which was the way we did business around here for a long time, which got us into such fiscal problems as we are having now, this new Congress, under the new majority management, has set priorities for this bill this time, providing adequate funding for those programs that were effective and do the most good, programs such as Head Start, and reduced or eliminated the tax dollars going to wasteful or ineffective or out-of-date or off-the-mark programs; Goals 2000 is one that comes to mind.

This is simple, common sense, the same common sense exercised by families at the kitchen table every day as they plan their own family finances, or by shoppers at the supermarket as they go about the business of buying their necessities.

I am pleased that we have been able to instill some of that restraint here in this bill. Americans are asking for that restraint. Americans are used to that type of restraint in their own affairs, and they are demanding that type of restraint for the people who represent them in this, the House of the people, where all funding bills start.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule. It is a good rule. We do not ever get a better rule than this rule unless we are opposed to open rules.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has given us a good rule for a bad bill. But Mr. Speaker, giving the House an open rule for this appropriation is essentially a meaningless gesture because, for the second year in a row, there is simply no way to fix this bill by amendment. Piecemeal amendments will not turn this sow's ear into anything but a sow's ear.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has, in this appropriation, made a very bold statement about their priorities. For the second year in a row, the Republican majority want to cut, slash and eliminate programs that aid families, provide educational opportunity, ensure workplace safety, and protect our children's health.

For the second year in a row, the Republican majority has recommended appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education which ignore the priorities of the American people: jobs, education and training, and health and safety. The Republican majority wants to cut these critical programs to balance the budget. The Republicans want to reduce the number of Head Start slots available for disadvantaged children, to cut summer youth employment, to reduce the availability of student loans and grants, and to cut the funds that make computers and links to the information superhighway available to schools throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to balance the budget, but I do not want to do it on the backs of working families and school kids. But the Republican majority is asking us to do just that. The majority wants to make cuts that in the short term look good on paper, but in the long term will do great harm.

These cuts are not just shortsighted, Mr. Speaker, they are foolish. We cannot expect our economy to grow if our work force is undereducated. We cannot expect our businesses and industry to compete in the worldwide marketplace if our workers do not have adequate training. But, the cuts in job training in the bill will take away opportunities for displaced workers to retrain and for new workers to train for the jobs of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply no way to fix this bill. The Appropriations Committee ranking member, Mr. OBEY, stated this yesterday when the Rules Committee met to consider a rule for this appropriation. At his request, the Rules Committee has provided 2 hours of general debate so that the House can fully air the differences in priorities between the majority and the minority. This debate promises to be only a beginning of yet another long-term debate between the Republican majority in the House of Representatives and those of us who want to ensure that American priorities in jobs, education and training, and health and safety are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise and ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

I do so knowing that there are honorable people who serve on the Committee on Rules, and that by and large they try to do the right thing every time. But I can tell my colleagues in this instance the Committee on Rules acted somewhat out of character when a bill that has been sponsored by 8 of the 13 members of the Committee on Rules that I tried to offer as an amendment to this bill was defeated in the very same Committee on Rules, by and large, by the eight people who sponsored the bill.

The bill is all about keeping promises. The bill is all about changing the way Congress does business. First to the promises. When we think about it, the only people in America who were really promised free health care were those people who enlisted in the military when their recruiter told them, if you serve our country honorably for 20 years or more, at the end of that period of time, you will be given free care in a military health facility for you and your spouse for the rest of your life.

That promise was made in the 1930's. It was made in the 1940's. It was made in the 1950's. And I can assure my colleagues that on June 25, 1971, in the Customs House on Canal Street in New Orleans, LA, it was made to me. I did not serve for 20 years, and, therefore, I do not deserve free health care. But there are a heck of a lot of people who served for 20 years, 30 years, who fought in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, most recently Desert Storm, Panama and Grenada who had their enlistment officer tell them just that and who, effective on July 1 of this year, upon reaching the age of 65 when they showed up at the military hospital for the treatment they had been receiving for years were told we cannot take you anymore. You have to go to a private doctor. Medicare will reimburse some of those costs, but not all of those costs.

So, now at the point in their life where they cannot go back to work because they are over 65 and not very many people hire people over 65, where they thought they had been promised free health care for the rest of their lives, they were being told they are not. They are being told that now they have to dig into their pocket.

Now, sometimes it is not a whole lot of money if it is just a common cold. But what if it is something like leukemia? What if it is something like cancer? What if it is a serious heart condition that involves not dozens of dollars but tens if not thousands of dollars? Now they have to pay, and they have to pay dearly for something that our Nation promised them.

The amendment that I would like to offer is really not my idea. It is the brainchild of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and it is cosponsored by almost 270 Members of this body. It is cosponsored by both the chairman and the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It is cosponsored by the chairman and ranking member of the National Security Committee. It is cosponsored by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It is cosponsored by myself, and it was a part of the Blue Dog coalition budget because we think it is important that this Nation keep our promises.

When brought before the Committee on Rules with all of the things that I have just told my colleagues, the importance of keeping promises, the importance of this Congress, of any Congress ever before keeping its word to the American people, in particular keeping our word to those people who have given the most to our country, the Committee on Rules voted in a party line vote, I am sorry to say, not to bring it before this body. That is wrong and it is time we changed things.

If Members recall, 1½ years ago a group of people were swept into office with the promise that no more business as usual, no more letting parliamentary rules keeping the right thing from happening, no more losing the forest for the sake of a couple of trees. Today is an opportunity for those people to keep their word.

Today is an opportunity for the 270 people who cosponsored this bill to put their vote where they put their signature, and that is to defend the rights of our military retirees who served this country so well, who kept their part of the bargain. And all they ask in return is for our Nation to keep its word. As I said before, they are the only people in this country who were promised health care. Prior to Medicare and Medicaid coming along, they were the only people who got health care. And now is it not ironic that the people who dodged the draft, that the people who may even be here illegally get free health care? But the people who paid with 6 months at a time at sea on aircraft carriers and submarines, the people who lost limbs, the people who lost their vision, the people who were away from their families, whose families split up because they were away defending our country, they are not getting the health care they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is wrong. It needs to be defeated, and we need to give those veterans of our country, our military retirees, what they were promised.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman from Mississippi, who is my friend and the substance of whose bill I very much support, even though I am sorry to say I am not a cosponsor primarily because I wasn't aware of the substance of all the bill until yesterday, has been guided on how to go about accomplishing his mission, observing the rules and the protocols of the House. The first we have heard about this and the first I had heard about this was last night as we were in the Rules meeting.

It just so happens that through an agreement in the protocol between both parties, the minority and the majority on this, we were not able to stick to our protocols in the Committee on Rules and make him in order. However, there were other options for him to pursue without disrupting what I think is a good, open rule for us to get on with the debate with one of the major appropriations bills that has the funding for major agencies of the Federal Government and a great many people who are depending on the activities of those agencies.

It seems to me the right way to deal with that is through the established rules and protocols of the House, and we have been happy to provide that information to the gentleman from Mississippi and I hope he will follow that course and he will have my support if he does.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 10, 1996]

| Rule type | 103d Congress | | 104th Congress | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Open/Modified-Open [2] | 46 | 44 | 77 | 60 |
| Structured/Modified Closed [3] | 49 | 47 | 34 | 27 |
| Closed [4] | 9 | 9 | 17 | 13 |
| Total | 104 | 100 | 128 | 100 |

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A structured or modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 10, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Res. 38 (1/18/95) | O | H.R. 5 | Unfunded Mandate Reform | A: 350–71 (1/19/95). |
| H. Res. 44 (1/24/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 17 | Social Security | A: 255–172 (1/25/95). |
| | | H.J. Res. 1 | Balanced Budget Amdt | |
| H. Res. 51 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 101 | Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians | A: voice vote (2/1/95). |
| H. Res. 52 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 400 | Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve | A: voice vote (2/1/95). |
| H. Res. 53 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 440 | Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif | A: voice vote (2/1/95). |
| H. Res. 55 (2/1/95) | O | H.R. 2 | Line Item Veto | A: voice vote (2/2/95). |
| H. Res. 60 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 665 | Victim Restitution | A: voice vote (2/7/95). |
| H. Res. 61 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 666 | Exclusionary Rule Reform | A: voice vote (2/7/95). |
| H. Res. 63 (2/8/95) | MO | H.R. 667 | Violent Criminal Incarceration | A: voice vote (2/9/95). |
| H. Res. 69 (2/9/95) | O | H.R. 668 | Criminal Alien Deportation | A: voice vote (2/10/95). |
| H. Res. 79 (2/10/95) | MO | H.R. 728 | Law Enforcement Block Grants | A: voice vote (2/13/95). |
| H. Res. 83 (2/13/95) | MO | H.R. 7 | National Security Revitalization | PQ: 229–199; A: 227–197 (2/15/95). |
| H. Res. 88 (2/16/95) | MC | H.R. 831 | Health Insurance Deductibility | PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95). |
| H. Res. 91 (2/21/95) | O | H.R. 830 | Paperwork Reduction Act | A: voice vote (2/22/95). |
| H. Res. 92 (2/21/95) | MC | H.R. 889 | Defense Supplemental | A: 282–144 (2/22/95). |
| H. Res. 93 (2/22/95) | MO | H.R. 450 | Regulatory Transition Act | A: 252–175 (2/23/95). |
| H. Res. 96 (2/24/95) | MO | H.R. 1022 | Risk Assessment | A: 253–165 (2/27/95). |
| H. Res. 100 (2/27/95) | O | H.R. 926 | Regulatory Reform and Relief Act | A: voice vote (2/28/95). |
| H. Res. 101 (2/28/95) | MO | H.R. 925 | Private Property Protection Act | A: 271–151 (3/2/95). |
| H. Res. 103 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 1058 | Securities Litigation Reform | |
| H. Res. 104 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 988 | Attorney Accountability Act | A: voice vote (3/6/95). |
| H. Res. 105 (3/6/95) | MO | | | A: 257–155 (3/7/95). |
| H. Res. 108 (3/7/95) | Debate | H.R. 956 | Product Liability Reform | A: voice vote (3/8/95). |
| H. Res. 109 (3/8/95) | MC | | | PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95). |
| H. Res. 115 (3/14/95) | MO | H.R. 1159 | Making Emergency Supp. Approps | A: 242–190 (3/15/95). |
| H. Res. 116 (3/15/95) | MC | H.J. Res. 73 | Term Limits Const. Amdt | A: voice vote (3/28/95). |
| H. Res. 117 (3/16/95) | Debate | H.R. 4 | Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (3/21/95). |
| H. Res. 119 (3/21/95) | MC | | | A: 217–211 (3/22/95). |
| H. Res. 125 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 1271 | Family Privacy Protection Act | A: 423–1 (4/4/95). |
| H. Res. 126 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 660 | Older Persons Housing Act | A: voice vote (4/6/95). |
| H. Res. 128 (4/4/95) | MC | H.R. 1215 | Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 | A: 228–204 (4/5/95). |
| H. Res. 130 (4/5/95) | MC | H.R. 483 | Medicare Select Expansion | A: 253–172 (4/6/95). |
| H. Res. 136 (5/1/95) | O | H.R. 655 | Hydrogen Future Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (5/2/95). |
| H. Res. 139 (5/3/95) | O | H.R. 1361 | Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (5/9/95). |
| H. Res. 140 (5/9/95) | O | H.R. 961 | Clean Water Amendments | A: 414–4 (5/10/95). |
| H. Res. 144 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 535 | Fish Hatchery—Arkansas | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 145 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 584 | Fish Hatchery—Iowa | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 146 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 614 | Fish Hatchery—Minnesota | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 149 (5/16/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution FY 1996 | PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95). |
| H. Res. 155 (5/22/95) | MO | H.R. 1561 | American Overseas Interests Act | A: 233–176 (5/23/95). |
| H. Res. 164 (6/8/95) | MC | H.R. 1530 | Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996 | PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95). |
| H. Res. 167 (6/15/95) | O | H.R. 1817 | MilCon Appropriations FY 1996 | PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95). |
| H. Res. 169 (6/19/95) | MC | H.R. 1854 | Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95). |
| H. Res. 170 (6/20/95) | O | H.R. 1868 | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95). |
| H. Res. 171 (6/22/95) | O | H.R. 1905 | Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/12/95). |
| H. Res. 173 (6/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 79 | Flag Constitutional Amendment | PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95). |
| H. Res. 176 (6/28/95) | MC | H.R. 1944 | Emer. Supp. Approps | PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95). |
| H. Res. 185 (7/11/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95). |
| H. Res. 187 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2 | PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95). |
| H. Res. 188 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1976 | Agriculture Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95). |
| H. Res. 190 (7/17/95) | O | H.R. 2020 | Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95). |
| H. Res. 193 (7/19/95) | C | H.J. Res. 96 | Disapproval of MFN to China | A: voice vote (7/20/95). |
| H. Res. 194 (7/19/95) | O | H.R. 2002 | Transportation Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95). |
| H. Res. 197 (7/21/95) | O | H.R. 70 | Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil | A: voice vote (7/24/95). |
| H. Res. 198 (7/21/95) | O | H.R. 2076 | Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/25/95). |
| H. Res. 201 (7/25/95) | O | H.R. 2099 | VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996 | A: 230–189 (7/25/95). |
| H. Res. 204 (7/28/95) | MC | S. 21 | Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia | A: voice vote (8/1/95). |
| H. Res. 205 (7/28/95) | O | H.R. 2126 | Defense Approps. FY 1996 | A: 409–1 (7/31/95). |
| H. Res. 207 (8/1/95) | MC | H.R. 1555 | Communications Act of 1995 | A: 255–156 (8/2/95). |
| H. Res. 208 (8/1/95) | O | H.R. 2127 | Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996 | A: 323–104 (8/2/95). |
| H. Res. 215 (9/7/95) | O | H.R. 1594 | Economically Targeted Investments | A: voice vote (9/12/95). |
| H. Res. 216 (9/7/95) | MO | H.R. 1655 | Intelligence Authorization FY 1996 | A: voice vote (9/12/95). |
| H. Res. 218 (9/12/95) | O | H.R. 1162 | Deficit Reduction Lockbox | A: voice vote (9/13/95). |
| H. Res. 219 (9/12/95) | O | H.R. 1670 | Federal Acquisition Reform Act | A: 414–0 (9/13/95). |
| H. Res. 222 (9/18/95) | O | H.R. 1617 | CAREERS Act | A: 388–2 (9/19/95). |
| H. Res. 224 (9/19/95) | O | H.R. 2274 | Natl. Highway System | PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95). |
| H. Res. 225 (9/19/95) | MC | H.R. 927 | Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity | A: 304–118 (9/20/95). |
| H. Res. 226 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 743 | Team Act | A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95). |
| H. Res. 227 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 1170 | 3-Judge Court | A: voice vote (9/28/95). |
| H. Res. 228 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 1601 | Internatl. Space Station | A: voice vote (9/27/95). |
| H. Res. 230 (9/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 108 | Continuing Resolution FY 1996 | A: voice vote (9/28/95). |
| H. Res. 234 (9/29/95) | O | H.R. 2405 | Omnibus Science Auth | A: voice vote (10/11/95). |
| H. Res. 237 (10/17/95) | MC | H.R. 2259 | Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines | A: voice vote (10/18/95). |
| H. Res. 238 (10/18/95) | MC | H.R. 2425 | Medicare Preservation Act | PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95). |
| H. Res. 239 (10/19/95) | C | H.R. 2492 | Leg. Branch Approps | PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95). |
| H. Res. 245 (10/25/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 109 | Social Security Earnings Reform | PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95). |
| | | H.R. 2491 | Seven-Year Balanced Budget | |
| H. Res. 251 (10/31/95) | C | H.R. 1833 | Partial Birth Abortion Ban | A: 237–190 (11/1/95). |
| H. Res. 252 (10/31/95) | MO | H.R. 2546 | D.C. Approps. | A: 241–181 (11/1/95). |
| H. Res. 257 (11/7/95) | C | H.J. Res. 115 | Cont. Res. FY 1996 | A: 216–210 (11/8/95). |
| H. Res. 258 (11/8/95) | MC | H.R. 2586 | Debt Limit | A: 220–200 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 259 (11/9/95) | O | H.R. 2539 | ICC Termination Act | A: voice vote (11/14/95). |
| H. Res. 262 (11/9/95) | C | H.R. 2586 | Increase Debt Limit | A: 220–185 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 269 (11/15/95) | O | H.R. 2564 | Lobbying Reform | A: voice vote (11/16/95). |
| H. Res. 270 (11/15/95) | C | H.J. Res. 122 | Further Cont. Resolution | A: 249–176 (11/15/95). |
| H. Res. 273 (11/16/95) | MC | H.R. 2606 | Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia | A: 239–181 (11/17/95). |
| H. Res. 284 (11/29/95) | O | H.R. 1788 | Amtrak Reform | A: voice vote (11/30/95). |
| H. Res. 287 (11/30/95) | O | H.R. 1350 | Maritime Security Act | A: voice vote (12/6/95). |
| H. Res. 293 (12/7/95) | C | H.R. 2621 | Protect Federal Trust Funds | PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95). |
| H. Res. 303 (12/13/95) | O | H.R. 1745 | Utah Public Lands | PQ: 221–197 A: voice vote (5/15/96). |
| H. Res. 309 (12/18/95) | C | H. Con. Res. 122 | Budget Res. W/President | PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95). |
| H. Res. 313 (12/19/95) | O | H.R. 558 | Texas Low-Level Radioactive | A: voice vote (12/20/95). |
| H. Res. 323 (12/21/95) | C | H.R. 2677 | Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge | Tabled (2/28/96). |
| H. Res. 366 (2/27/96) | MC | H.R. 2854 | Farm Bill | PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96). |
| H. Res. 368 (2/28/96) | O | H.R. 994 | Small Business Growth | Tabled (4/17/96). |
| H. Res. 371 (3/6/96) | C | H.R. 3021 | Debt Limit Increase | A: voice vote (3/7/96). |
| H. Res. 372 (3/6/96) | MC | H.R. 3019 | Cont. Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96). |
| H. Res. 380 (3/12/96) | C | H.R. 2703 | Effective Death Penalty | A: 251–157 (3/13/96). |
| H. Res. 384 (3/14/96) | MC | H.R. 2202 | Immigration | PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/19/96). |
| H. Res. 386 (3/20/96) | C | H.J. Res. 165 | Further Cont. Approps | PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96). |
| H. Res. 388 (3/21/96) | C | H.R. 125 | Gun Crime Enforcement | A: 244–166 (3/22/96). |
| H. Res. 391 (3/27/96) | C | H.R. 3136 | Contract w/America Advancement | PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96). |
| H. Res. 392 (3/27/96) | MC | H.R. 3103 | Health Coverage Affordability | PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96). |
| H. Res. 395 (3/29/96) | MC | H.J. Res. 159 | Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt. | PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96). |
| H. Res. 396 (3/29/96) | O | H.R. 842 | Truth in Budgeting Act | A: voice vote (4/17/96). |
| H. Res. 409 (4/23/96) | O | H.R. 2715 | Paperwork Elimination Act | A: voice vote (4/24/96). |
| H. Res. 410 (4/23/96) | O | H.R. 1675 | Natl. Wildlife Refuge | A: voice vote (4/24/96). |
| H. Res. 411 (4/23/96) | C | H.J. Res. 175 | Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (4/24/96). |
| H. Res. 418 (4/30/96) | O | H.R. 2641 | U.S. Marshals Service | PQ: 219–203 A: voice vote (5/1/96). |

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 10, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Res. 419 (4/30/96) | O | H.R. 2149 | Ocean Shipping Reform | A: 422–0 (5/1/96). |
| H. Res. 421 (5/2/96) | O | H.R. 2974 | Crimes Against Children & Elderly | A: voice vote (5/7/96). |
| H. Res. 422 (5/2/96) | O | H.R. 3120 | Witness & Jury Tampering | A: voice vote (5/7/96). |
| H. Res. 426 (5/7/96) | O | H.R. 2406 | U.S. Housing Act of 1996 | PQ: 218–208 A: voice vote (5/8/96). |
| H. Res. 427 (5/7/96) | O | H.R. 3322 | Omnibus Civilian Science Auth | A: voice vote (5/9/96). |
| H. Res. 428 (5/7/96) | MC | H.R. 3286 | Adoption Promotion & Stability | A: voice vote (5/9/96). |
| H. Res. 430 (5/9/96) | S | H.R. 3230 | DoD Auth. FY 1997 | A: 235–149 (5/10/96). |
| H. Res. 435 (5/15/96) | MC | H. Con. Res. 178 | Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997 | PQ: 227–196 A: voice vote (5/16/96). |
| H. Res. 436 (5/16/96) | C | H.R. 3415 | Repeal 4.3 cent fuel tax | PQ: 221–181 A: voice vote (5/21/96). |
| H. Res. 437 (5/16/96) | MO | H.R. 3259 | Intell. Auth. FY 1997 | A: voice vote (5/21/96). |
| H. Res. 438 (5/16/96) | MC | H.R. 3144 | Defend America Act | |
| H. Res. 440 (5/21/96) | MC | H.R. 3448 | Small Bus. Job Protection | A: 219–211 (5/22/96). |
| | MC | H.R. 1227 | Employee Commuting Flexibility | |
| H. Res. 442 (5/29/96) | O | H.R. 3517 | Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997 | A: voice vote (5/30/96). |
| H. Res. 445 (5/30/96) | O | H.R. 3540 | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/5/96). |
| H. Res. 446 (6/5/96) | MC | H.R. 3562 | WI Works Waiver Approval | A: 363–59 (6/6/96). |
| H. Res. 448 (6/6/96) | MC | H.R. 2754 | Shipbuilding Trade Agreement | A: voice vote (6/12/96). |
| H. Res. 451 (6/10/96) | O | H.R. 3603 | Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/11/96). |
| H. Res. 453 (6/12/96) | O | H.R. 3610 | Defense Appropriations, FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/13/96). |
| H. Res. 455 (6/18/96) | O | H.R. 3662 | Interior Approps, FY 1997 | A: voice vote (6/19/96). |
| H. Res. 456 (6/19/96) | O | H.R. 3666 | VA/HUD Approps | A: 246–166 (6/25/96). |
| H. Res. 460 (6/25/96) | O | H.R. 3675 | Transportation Approps | A: voice vote (6/26/96). |
| H. Res. 472 (7/9/96) | MC | H.R. 3755 | Labor/HHS Approps | |
| H. Res. 473 (7/9/96) | O | H.R. 3754 | Leg. Branch Approps | A: voice vote (7/10/96). |

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; S/C-structured/closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of both the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, every hard working American family stands to benefit from the policies the Republican Congress is moving forward.

Despite the outrageous scare tactics and the ''sky is falling'' strategy of the Democrats, the future will be better for our children and our grandchildren.

We have successfully aimed to cut wasteful spending, reduce duplication, and lower taxes to get the Government out of our workers checkbooks. And with a balanced budget, lower interest rates will mean lower mortgages, lower car payments, and more affordable student loans.

We have pushed for welfare reform that rewards hard work and perseverance and returns the expectation of personal responsibility. The Democrats and President Clinton have only blown hot air at welfare reform while still pushing the same old spend-spend-spend welfare state.

Republicans have promoted workplace safety protections and pushed for better designed programs to help students go to college.

And if you really want to help working families, we'll cut their taxes and let them keep more of their hard-earned money rather than give them 90 cents an hour.

We've made solid progress to cut spending, balance the budget, and make this Government work better. This bill is an important part of the fight. So reject the deception and the distortions. Support the rule. It is a good rule. It is an open rule and support this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is about fairness, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] said earlier, and this is the only way we know to bring this matter to the floor at this time.

Military retirees and their dependents who are Medicare eligible over the age of 65 are now being forced out of the military health care system and on to Medicare. Under current law, the Department of Defense cannot be reimbursed by HCFA for treating Medicare-eligible retirees. Without Medicare reimbursement, the Retired Officers Association said these words: The DOD has no funding or financial incentive to treat military Medicare eligibles; thus, they are being shoved out of the military health care system and on to Medicare.

□ 1715

If that were not bad enough, CHAMPUS eligible beneficiaries who enroll are abruptly disenfranchised from Tricare when they become Medicare eligible.

After we looked at the Persian Gulf war 3 years ago and realized that we could have had a problem if as many people had gotten hurt as possibly could have, in treating them, we decided we ought to not persist in a drawdown of medical personnel and medical infrastructure in our active guard and reserve forces. And so at that time we passed MediGuard, allowing the Governors of the various States to select medically underserved areas in those States, and then we would use reserve and guard personnel to go and conduct what we would call, I suppose, defensive medicine, screening for high blood pressure and so forth, to keep that ready military medical infrastructure in place in case we have another situation like the Persian Gulf.

I am convinced that military medical readiness will suffer if these people are continued to be denied access to care. Our medical military system must attract, train, and retain physicians and other health care personnel if it is going to be a capable and viable national resource for our defense.

Medicare subvention provides this institutional foundation which is needed to meet any contingency operation and will ensure that our military retirees have the freedom of choice in health care that they have earned, have been promised and deserve.

Now they say, well, this is out of order because we are in an open rule on Labor-HHS. This is telling HHS in this bill that they can reimburse the Department of Defense for these people. It is the same money, the same illnesses, the same medical people, but we do not force military retirees over the age of 65 out of military hospitals. That is just plain wrong.

There is a remedy under this bill to do it. If we could defeat this rule or the previous question, then we can have our amendment, which was denied us in the Committee on Rules, brought on the floor for a vote. That is all we ask.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we come again to a time when this Congress is offering to the American public the multistrike bill and everyone is out. I would have hoped that after last year we could have come to the table of compromise on the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill, but we find that this department is underfunded some $6.15 billion below the President's request.

What strikes me the most is that we have given up on children by underfunding Head Start by $38.1 million, which serves only 740,000 out of the two million children who are currently eligible for this important and effective early childhood program.

Just a couple of weeks ago I had the opportunity to be in California discussing the crisis of juvenile crime all over the Nation, and one thing that we were assured of or convinced of, as the

RAND study has indicated, that it is the upfront cost that will allow us to invest in Americans and prevent the incarceration of citizens in their later life.

I cannot understand my Republican colleagues for striking out Head Start once more and disallowing the numbers of children that need this service to not be served. Additionally, I cannot understand if this is a Nation of working people, supporting working Americans, that we would cut the dollars that promotes workplace safety and health and also pensions security.

Just yesterday, in a very grateful manner, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to support the increase in the minimum wage. We now in the House of Representatives will be dealing with a bill that says to the American workers that they are out. We strike them out on workplace safety, we strike them out in health care and we strike them out in pension security.

We have worked over the last 2 years to ensure that our young people have an appreciation for work. The Youth Summer Jobs Program has been one that I have personally taken charge to see that we respect the fact that young people care about work. We cut it in 1995, they cut it in fiscal year 1996, but yet we were able to see that it survived. Here we go again, we are now at 442,000 youth who cannot be served because of the cuts in the Youth Summer Jobs Program. I think it is important that we recognize that America is a country of inclusiveness.

I would say that, in addition to including our youth, we should recognize those who suffer from mental illness and drug abuse. The bill provides less funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. The amount, $1.85 billion, is an aggregated cut of $33.9 million below the current funding level and is $248 million below the administration's request.

Just for a moment, one of the things I have heard often when I have spoken to my health care providers in Texas is that mental health is an important issue. I think if we defeat this rule we will be able to support youth, children, and those who suffer from mental illness and substance abuse. I ask my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition today of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. While we should be investing more in education to give our children the tools of opportunity in order to succeed, the Gingrich Congress continues its assault on education.

The central theme of the leadership revolution has been to deny working families and children in this country educational opportunities at every level of their academic development. And this bill is more of the same.

The enrollment in public schools today is rising. Tuition costs for college are going through the roof and working families are being squeezed just to make ends meet. This Congress should be doing everything in its power to expand access to a college education, to maintain support for local schools, ensure that every child who walks into a classroom is healthy, fed, and ready to learn.

This bill does the exact opposite. It slashes education. That is dumb and it is wrong. Let me cite the blows inflicted by this bill.

Our national investment in elementary and secondary education is cut by $400 million from last year's level. The bill kicks 15,000 children out of Head Start. It denies 150,000 children needed help in reading and mathematics for next year. The bill stops Federal funding of school reform. Goals 2000, which enables teachers to reform our schools, to discover innovative methods to improve the academic performance of all students, is eliminated under this bill. It slashes safe and drug-free schools, putting children in my district in New Haven, CT at risk of violence in their schools.

In higher education the bill would deny 191,000 students Pell Grants next year. The bill denies 96,000 deserving postsecondary students the opportunity to receive low-interest Perkins loans. It reduces funds to administer the direct lending program, limiting the number of loans available to students and working families for 14 colleges and universities in Connecticut.

The Gingrich revolutionaries just do not get it. We have been down this road before. The American people have spoken out loudly and clearly in opposition to an extreme Republican agenda, yet it has reared its ugly head once again in this bill. The American people understand that the only way that we move competitively into the 21st century is through an educated work force.

Educating our kids is primary to families today. Dismantling public education in this country is the wrong way to balance a budget. We should reject this all-out attack on education for middle-class Americans.

Some of my opponents say the Republicans have changed their tune from 4 months ago, found faith in America's public education. This is simply not true. I call on my colleagues to reject this extreme antieducation bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Judge PRYCE, a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida, Mr. GOSS, for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of both the rule and the Labor–HHS appropriations bill.

First, this is another open rule. With the exception of the legislative branch appropriations bill, which we considered earlier today, all of the regular spending bills that have come to the floor of the House this year have been considered under an open amendment process, and we continue that same spirit of unrestricted debate today.

Second, I'd like to commend Chairman PORTER for crafting a very responsible bill—one that keeps our commitment to preserving and protecting the health, welfare, and Social Security of the American people.

Although this year's bill freezes spending for many programs at last year's level, the bill does provide increased funding for education and Head Start, for block grants that support child care and community services, for the Violence Against Women Act, for the National Institutes of Health, and for valuable outreach and support programs like TRIO—which encourages young people in my district of Columbus, OH, to pursue a college education.

Even with the increased funding levels, Mr. Speaker, the bill is within the 602(b) allocation, and as our colleagues know, that is crucial to keeping us on the glidepath to a balanced Federal budget.

As we work to get our fiscal house in order, we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is most effective in our society. This bill achieves this important goal by emphasizing, among other things, local control, parental involvement, and basic academics.

Notwithstanding the challenge of balancing the Federal budget in 6 years, I believe H.R. 3755 makes the right kind of investment in education, job training, and health, while also shrinking the size of government and funding only those programs that have demonstrated their effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor–HHS bill is one of the largest of the 13 annual spending bills, and under this open rule, we will have the opportunity to discuss spending priorities in a fair and open manner, and I look forward to that debate. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I shall offer an amendment to the rule which will make in order the amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative TAYLOR.

The Taylor amendment seeks to allow HCFA to reimburse DOD for treatment in military medical facilities of military retirees and their dependents over the age of 65 who are Medicare eligible.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the proposed amendment to the rule at this point in the RECORD.

On page 2, line 15, of H. Res. 472, immediately after ''waived.'' insert the following:

''Notwithstanding any other provision of this rule, it shall be in order to consider an amendment to be offered by Representative Taylor of Mississippi or his designee, which

shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) or a demand for a division of the question, and shall be considered as read.''

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed the House was going to consider bills under an open process. I want to point out that 60 percent of the legislation in this session has been considered under a restrictive process.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

| Bill No. | Title | Resolution No. | Process used for floor consideration | Amendments in order |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H.R. 1* | Compliance | H. Res. 6 | Closed | None. |
| H. Res. 6 | Opening Day Rules Package | H. Res. 5 | Closed | None. |
| H.R. 5* | Unfunded Mandates | H. Res. 38 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 2* | Balanced Budget | H. Res. 44 | Restrictive | 2R; 4D. |
| H. Res. 43 | Committee Hearings Scheduling | H. Res. 43 (OJ) | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 101 | To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. | H. Res. 51 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 400 | To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve. | H. Res. 52 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 440 | To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California. | H. Res. 53 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2* | Line Item Veto | H. Res. 55 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 665* | Victim Restitution Act of 1995 | H. Res. 61 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 666* | Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995 | H. Res. 60 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 667* | Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995 | H. Res. 63 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 668* | The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act | H. Res. 69 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 728* | Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants | H. Res. 79 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 7* | National Security Revitalization Act | H. Res. 83 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 729* | Death Penalty/Habeas | N/A | Restrictive | N/A. |
| S. 2 | Senate Compliance | N/A | Closed | None. |
| H.R. 831 | To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed. | H. Res. 88 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 830* | The Paperwork Reduction Act | H. Res. 91 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 889 | Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority | H. Res. 92 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 450* | Regulatory Moratorium | H. Res. 93 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1022* | Risk Assessment | H. Res. 96 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 926* | Regulatory Flexibility | H. Res. 100 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 925* | Private Property Protection Act | H. Res. 101 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 1058* | Securities Litigation Reform Act | H. Res. 105 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 988* | The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995 | H. Res. 104 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 956* | Product Liability and Legal Reform Act | H. Res. 109 | Restrictive | 8D; 7R. |
| H.R. 1158 | Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions | H. Res. 115 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 73* | Term Limits | H. Res. 116 | Restrictive | 1D; 3R |
| H.R. 4* | Welfare Reform | H. Res. 119 | Restrictive | 5D; 26R. |
| H.R. 1271* | Family Privacy Act | H. Res. 125 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 660* | Housing for Older Persons Act | H. Res. 126 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1215* | The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 | H. Res. 129 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 483 | Medicare Select Extension | H. Res. 130 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 655 | Hydrogen Future Act | H. Res. 136 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1361 | Coast Guard Authorization | H. Res. 139 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 961 | Clean Water Act | H. Res. 140 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 535 | Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act | H. Res. 144 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 584 | Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa. | H. Res. 145 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 614 | Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility. | H. Res. 146 | Open | N/A. |
| H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution | H. Res. 149 | Restrictive | 3D; 1R. |
| H.R. 1561 | American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 | H. Res. 155 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1530 | National Defense Authorization Act; FY 1996 | H. Res. 164 | Restrictive | 36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 1817 | Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996 | H. Res. 167 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1854 | Legislative Branch Appropriations | H. Res. 169 | Restrictive | 5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 1868 | Foreign Operations Appropriations | H. Res. 170 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1905 | Energy & Water Appropriations | H. Res. 171 | Open | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 79 | Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag. | H. Res. 173 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 1944 | Recissions Bill | H. Res. 175 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1868 (2nd rule) | Foreign Operations Appropriations | H. Res. 177 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated* | Interior Appropriations | H. Res. 185 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1977 | Interior Appropriations | H. Res. 187 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1976 | Agriculture Appropriations | H. Res. 188 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1977 (3rd rule) | Interior Appropriations | H. Res. 189 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 2020 | Treasury Postal Appropriations | H. Res. 190 | Open | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 96 | Disapproving MFN for China | H. Res. 193 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 2002 | Transportation Appropriations | H. Res. 194 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 70 | Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil | H. Res. 197 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2076 | Commerce, Justice Appropriations | H. Res. 198 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2099 | VA/HUD Appropriations | H. Res. 201 | Open | N/A. |
| S. 21 | Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia | H. Res. 204 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 2126 | Defense Appropriations | H. Res. 205 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1555 | Communications Act of 1995 | H. Res. 207 | Restrictive | 2R/3D/3 Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 2127 | Labor/HHS Appropriations Act | H. Res. 208 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1594 | Economically Targeted Investments | H. Res. 215 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1655 | Intelligence Authorization | H. Res. 216 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1162 | Deficit Reduction Lock Box | H. Res. 218 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1670 | Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995 | H. Res. 219 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1617 | To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS). | H. Res. 222 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2274 | National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 | H. Res. 224 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 927 | Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995 | H. Res. 225 | Restrictive | 2R/2D. |
| H.R. 743 | The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995 | H. Res. 226 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1170 | 3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions | H. Res. 227 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1601 | International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995 | H. Res. 228 | Open | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 108 | Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 230 | Closed | |
| H.R. 2405 | Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995 | H. Res. 234 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2259 | To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments | H. Res. 237 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 2425 | Medicare Preservation Act | H. Res. 238 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 2492 | Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill | H. Res. 239 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 2491 | 7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform. | H. Res. 245 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H. Con. Res. 109 | | | | |
| H.R. 1833 | Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995 | H. Res. 251 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 2546 | D.C. Appropriations FY 1996 | H. Res. 252 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 115 | Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 257 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 2586 | Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit | H. Res. 258 | Restrictive | 5R. |
| H.R. 2539 | ICC Termination | H. Res. 259 | Open | |
| H.J. Res. 115 | Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 261 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 2586 | Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt | H. Res. 262 | Closed | N/A. |
| H. Res. 250 | House Gift Rule Reform | H. Res. 268 | Closed | 2R. |
| H.R. 2564 | Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 | H. Res. 269 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2606 | Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment | H. Res. 273 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1788 | Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995 | H. Res. 289 | Open | N/A. |

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

| Bill No. | Title | Resolution No. | Process used for floor consideration | Amendments in order |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H.R. 1350 | Maritime Security Act of 1995 | H. Res. 287 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2621 | To Protect Federal Trust Funds | H. Res. 293 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 1745 | Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995 | H. Res. 303 | Open | N/A. |
| H. Res. 304 | Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia. | N/A | Closed | 1D; 2R. |
| H. Res. 309 | Revised Budget Resolution | H. Res. 309 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 558 | Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act | H. Res. 313 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2677 | The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995. | H. Res. 323 | Closed | N/A. |
| | | PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION | | |
| H.R. 1643 | To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria. | H. Res. 334 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 134<br>H. Con. Res. 131 | Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134. | H. Res. 336 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 1358 | Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts. | H. Res. 338 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 2924 | Social Security Guarantee Act | H. Res. 355 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 2854 | The Agricultural Market Transition Program | H. Res. 366 | Restrictive | 5D; 9R; 2 Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 994 | Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995 | H. Res. 368 | Open rule; Rule tabled | N/A. |
| H.R. 3021 | To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social Security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States. | H. Res. 371 | Closed rule | N/A. |
| H.R. 3019 | A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget | H. Res. 372 | Restrictive | 2D/2R. |
| H.R. 2703 | The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996 | H. Res. 380 | Restrictive | 6D; 7R; 4 Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 2202 | The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995 | H. Res. 384 | Restrictive | 12D; 19R; 1 Bipartisan. |
| H.J. Res. 165 | Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 386 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 125 | The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996. | H. Res. 388 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 3136 | The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996 | H. Res. 391 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 3103 | The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996 | H. Res. 392 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 159 | Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment | H. Res. 395 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 842 | Truth in Budgeting Act | H. Res. 396 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2715 | Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996 | H. Res. 409 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1675 | National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995 | H. Res. 410 | Open | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 175 | Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 411 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 2641 | United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996 | H. Res. 418 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2149 | The Ocean Shipping Reform Act | H. Res. 419 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2974 | To amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims. | H. Res. 421 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3120 | To amend Title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering. | H. Res. 422 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2406 | The United States Housing Act of 1996 | H. Res. 426 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3322 | Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996 | H. Res. 427 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3286 | The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996 | H. Res. 428 | Restrictive | 1D; 1R. |
| H.R. 3230 | Defense Authorization Bill FY 1997 | H. Res. 430 | Restrictive | 41 amends; 20D; 17R; 4 bipartisan. |
| H.R. 3415 | Repeal of the 4.3-Cent Increase in Transporation Fuel Taxes | H. Res. 436 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 3259 | Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 1997 | H. Res. 437 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 3144 | The Defend America Act | H. Res. 438 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 3448/H.R. 1227 | The Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, and The Employee Commuting Flexibility Act of 1996. | H. Res. 440 | Restrictive | 2R. |
| H.R. 3517 | Military Construction Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 442 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3540 | Foreign Operations Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 445 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3562 | The Wisconsin Works Waiver Approval Act | H. Res. 446 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 2754 | Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act | H. Res. 448 | Restrictive | 1R. |
| H.R. 3603 | Agriculture Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 451 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3610 | Defense Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 453 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3662 | Interior Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 455 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3666 | VA/HUD Appropriations | H. Res. 456 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3675 | Transportation Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 460 | Open | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 182/H.Res 461 | Disapproving MFN Status for the Peoples Republic of China | H. Res. 463 | Closed | N/A. |
| H. Con. Res. 192 | Making in order a Concurrent Resolution Providing for the Adjournment of the House over the 4th of July district work period. | H. Res 465 | Closed | N/A. |
| H.R. 3755 | Labor/HHS Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 472 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 3754 | Legislative Branch Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 473 | Restrictive | 3D; 5R. |

*Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session, 60% restrictive; 40% open. All legislation 104th Congress, 56% restrictive; 44% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this body are going to have two chances to vote on Medicare subvention. Again, 270 Members, including the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is not here on the floor unfortunately, are sponsors of this measure. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]; the chairman of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE]; the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP]; and the ranking Democrats who serve on those committees are cosponsors of this measure.

□ 1730

It is the right thing. They are the only people in America who were promised health care and the only people in America who are being denied the health care they deserve.

We have a chance to fix that. Two hundred fifty-seven Members of this body, including most recently 258, because the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] has signed on, have said this is something that this Nation ought to do. It is a promise that ought to be kept.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the rule and make this in order. If it is not, then I am going to take the words of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mr. PRYCE], who is a cosponsor of this measure, to task and see if it is truly an open rule, and we will offer it as an amendment so that the Members of this body will have the chance to do the right thing for our Nation's military retirees; to prove that we are putting right over procedure and we are going to keep our promises to the military retirees of this country.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], we had one member of the Committee on Rules come in unexpectedly. I would ask if I may deviate to recognize the gentlewoman from Utah, Ms. ENID GREENE. It will be a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. GREENE].

Ms. GREENE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. It is an open rule that will provide thorough consideration of the issues by allowing amendments to be offered on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we note that for too many years Washington has spent tax dollars and created bloated bureaucracies to show that we care. Nowhere is this more apparent than when we look at what Washington has done to our education system.

Today, we have 760 federally run education programs administered by a jumble of 39 separate Federal departments, agencies, boards, and commissions at a cost of $120 billion to the American taxpayers.

But, Mr. Chairman, for all those programs and all that money, student academic performance in this country has not improved in the last 20 years. In fact, we have seen a steady decline in student performance as parents and local communities have less control over their children's educations.

SAT scores have dropped from a total average of 937 in 1972 to 902 in 1994; 66 percent of our 17-year-olds do not read at a proficient level; reading scores are down, science scores are down, and United States students score worse in math than all major countries except Spain.

Now, there is no doubt that many of these programs are well intentioned, but good intentions are not good enough when dealing with our children's education. Clearly, the Washington education bureaucracy simply has not accomplished what needs to be accomplished for our children and there may be no better example of how using spending as the chief or only measurement of creating educational excellence has failed this Nation and our children than my own State of Utah.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Utah ranks last in the 50 States in per-pupil spending in the Nation, yet it ranks second in the Nation in the number of high school graduates, first in the Nation for the number of residents who have attended college, and the scores of Utah students taking the ACT test in 1995 rose in every subject and were higher than the national ACT group in every area.

As the President said in his State of the Union Address, ''The era of big government is over,'' and it is time to empower our State and local communities to pick up where Washington needs to jump off.

Let me stress, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not gut education programs. This bill freezes spending at last year's level for the title I program for disadvantaged students as well as for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. Spending for the Head Start Program is increased by $31 million above the 1996 level, and Pell grants are increased to a maximum of $2,500, up from $2,470 just last year.

Mr. Speaker, with all the helping the Federal Government has been doing over the last 30 or 40 years, is it not time to explore other ways of giving our children the first-rate education they need and deserve?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no remaining speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all point out that already we seem to somehow get away from preciseness in the use of words. I heard ''cuts in the Head Start Program.'' There are no cuts in the Head Start Program. As the charts will show and as the debate will show as we go into the 2 hours of general debate and the individual open rule amendments, I am sure we are going to see the charts are going to be displayed that in fact there are increases in programs like Head Start; good programs that deserve increases.

We have before us a situation where we have many programs that are nice to have, that are funded by the Federal Government. And we have many programs that are, I guess we should say that we need to have, that are funded by the Federal Government for people who have true serious needs and no other place to turn.

And I think it is important to try and make the distinctions between ''nice to have,'' and ''need to have'' programs because sometimes we forget here that all of the moneys from these programs do not come from Washington, they come from us, the people, the taxpayers, from back home. And if we do a pretty good job of what we do back home and we do not have to send the money to Washington, it seems to me we are better off.

So I think when we talk about ''need to have'' programs, the taxpayers understand a little bit; and when we talk about ''nice to have'' programs, they are a little less willing to send their hard-earned dollars to Washington.

I would also point out that some of the people who are working the hardest for the ''need to have'' programs are the people who can least afford those tax dollars, and I would point out that this majority is trying to relieve them of some of their tax burdens as well.

What this boils down a little bit to is restraint. And I think that it is very important that we continue to exercise the restraint that we have started on in this Congress toward a balanced budget in the next 7 years. I am going to read just briefly from the administration's statement on this bill that they, apparently the senior advisors to the President, have threatened to veto. And I am going to take just one of the statements, this one has to do with the Department of Education and student loan programs and here is the statement I am quoting.

And it says, ''As with the fiscal year 1996 appropriation bill, the administration continues to oppose any cap on direct lending.''

Now, that is a debatable point, but it seems to me there is not much restraint if you are not going to oppose any cap on direct spending. That means the sky is the limit. How does this match up against other priorities and other needs? Those are the kinds of concerns that I am very concerned about.

I go on through the administration's statement and there are five pages of the sky-is-going-to-fall type statements in here. Then we come to some of the issues that I think Americans need to know. This is the type of thing that the administration is saying. And again, I wonder how many parents in America are going to think this is money well spent.

I am quoting from the administration's statement that is saying that ''by providing no funding for the $30 million teen pregnancy prevention initiative, the committee would stall the development of critical knowledge about how to prevent teen pregnancy.''

Now, I can tell you there is probably a bunch of teenagers running around out there that could tell me a thing or two about how to stop teen pregnancy right now. And I daresay that most of us understand how you get pregnant, whether you are a teenager or not. And I wonder whether or not the sky is really going to fall if we do not spend this $30 million that the President's administration says we have got to spend.

I think it is very important that we have good, informed people about all the consequences of their actions, whatever their actions and behaviors may be. But I think to say that we are going to lose the world with teen pregnancy because we do not spend $30 million on critical knowledge about how you get pregnant is stretching the point just a bit. And I would suggest that many American taxpayers are going to say that that is $30 million that might be well spent in other programs that will be better used to prevent teen pregnancy.

I take a look at the total difference. It is about $5.5 billion of what the President asked, which is virtually everything that was put on the plate, because the President is in the position of being the candy store proprietor in this budget process. He can come into the candy store and say, Look, help yourself we have all of these things. Somebody has to be responsible and say yes, there are all of these wonderful opportunities, but we have to pay for these things and somebody has to pay for them and that is of course the taxpayer, and besides if we consume too much candy, we will get a tummy ache or worse.

We are in a position right now of being the people who are the responsible party in the candy store and saying we have to exercise some restraint both for price and behavioral reasons about how we go about doing things, and that is what this 2 hours of general debate and these amendments are going to lead to: legitimate differences of opinion about what is nice to have and what is need to have in this area.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the proposal to defeat the rule, I think that would be a very short-sighted action at this point. We should

support the rule, and we should vote ''yes'' on the previous question for a very simple reasons. We have an appropriations bill here that has got billions and billions of dollars that are necessary for many critical programs, as we have said.

I think that the gentleman from Mississippi has made a very eloquent statement about an amendment that he feels very strongly about, and I frankly think it is a good amendment and I wish it could have been made in order, but we have rules in the House and his amendment is not germane. And we all know it.

The gentleman's amendment was voted on in the Committee on Rules and it was voted down in the Committee on Rules because it is not germane. It is legislating on an appropriations bill. We do not legislate on an appropriations bill unless we follow a protocol. The protocol is well-known. The protocol is you have to get a letter of no objection from the authorizing committees, and we have suggested that to the gentleman from Mississippi. He has a remedy to take. And I would urge him to do it because I think he has a good piece of legislation, with a significant number of cosponsors, which will do well on its own merits properly brought forward to the House vehicle. This is not the proper vehicle, and he is asking us to violate our rules and protocol if we are going to try to defeat the previous question.

So I would say we should vote ''yes'' on the previous question, and we should vote ''yes'' on the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time with in which a vote by electronic device, if ordered will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 202, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—218

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
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)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
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)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett
Dunn
Ford
Gibbons
Hayes
Lantos
Lincoln
Longley
McDade
Stark
Watt (NC)
Yates
Young (FL)

□ 1803

Messrs. OWENS, RANGEL, HILLEARY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. TATE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WATTS of Oklahoma, HERGER, SOLOMON, SMITH of Texas, RIGGS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Messrs. MCINTOSH, SMITH of New Jersey, DORNAN, SAXTON, SCARBOROUGH, MOORHEAD, and BEILENSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3755.

□ 1805

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply for the purpose of explaining to Members what the schedule will be for the remainder of this evening.

The vote that was just taken is the last recorded vote, as I understand it. We will have the 2 hours of debate on the bill according to the rule, 1 hour on each side, and we will then proceed to amendments under title I, the Department of Labor, and will complete that title this evening with votes, if any, to be rolled over to tomorrow, and we will designate title II also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for 1 hour.

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

□ 1815

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by first thanking the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations for the extremely helpful role he has played in working the bill through the subcommittee mark and the full committee. Obviously he has, I think, one of the toughest of all jobs in the House. He does it splendidly, and we are all greatly in his debt.

I also want to thank each of the members of my subcommittee who worked so hard, especially the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, for his contribution to the bill, and for all of their participation in the very difficult process that we have gone through in marking up and reporting the bill. It has not been easy for any of us.

Finally I want to thank our staff. The staff of the full Committee on Appropriations have been extremely helpful to all of us. We hope to have all of the bills, including this bill, out by the time we enter the August break. This will be an accomplishment that is a testimony to the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and to the very, very fine work on a very experienced and expert staff, and all of us thank them very much.

I also want to thank my staff, Tony McCann, the Clerk, Bob Knisely, Sue Quantius, Mike Myers, Joanne Orndorff, and Lauren James. Lauren is on detail to the committee from the Department of Education, and she has been invaluable to our subcommittee all year long.

I also want to thank Mark Mioduski and Cheryl Smith of the minority staff for their excellent cooperation and the courtesy that they have extended to each one of us.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes a recommendation of $65.7 billion for the discretionary accounts within our jurisdiction. This level is within our 602(b) allocation and is about on the same level as the level for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, the bill sets priorities. It terminates funding for 39 programs funded last year at just over $1 billion. These programs are characterized, with few exceptions, as being small, expensive to operate, and in most cases having little evidence of effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, at NIH we have taken the position that funding should be allocated according to the judgment of science as to where the best opportunities lie, and not according to the political fiat of Congress. We also have continued our effort to avoid earmarks in the bill. In NIH once again we removed all disease-specific earmarks and provided no specific AIDS earmarks. The distribution for AIDS funding as determined by NIH is at $1.498 billion across all institutes and divisions of the agency. This is a determination, again, made by science and not by politics.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here listening to the debate on the rule and listening to the people on the minority side talk about all of the terrible things that are happening to education and job training. Mr. Chairman, I want people to understand exactly what they are talking about. The subcommittee's allocation is about level with last year, and most provisions of the bill are level-funded. There are no huge cuts anywhere in education.

When the minority discusses cuts, they mean cuts from the level of funding recommended by the President in his budget. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that the President's budget was a purely political document giving huge increases, that could not be afforded, to every interest group in America. The President took no responsibility for getting our fiscal house in order. We have to take that responsibility and we take it seriously. We have carried out our responsibility in this bill.

Let me talk about what we have done on the increase side. Job Corps operations is a program aimed to help the most at-risk youth in our society. It removes them from their current environment to one where they can get real job training, a chance for a working life and career in our society. Job Corps is increased by $92 million.

The subcommittee added $54 million for the Ryan White AIDS Program. Again, the committee has attempted to protect and support programs that impact the most vulnerable of our citizens. These are important dollars to be spent for people suffering from a very, very horrible disease, and we have provided an increase for Ryan White.

Summer youth is level-funded at $625. I heard the gentlewoman from Texas saying what big cuts there were in the program. There are no cuts. It is level-funded.

An additional $8 million is provided for the Violence Against Women Act. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of this program, which provides support and protection for battered women, rape victims, and victims of other forms of violence. We have provided an increase for this series of programs.

The bill provides $900 million in new funding for the Low-Income Heating and Energy Assistance program, and with other emergency funding and funding that was available from previous appropriations, a total of $1.32 billion is available for the LIHEAP program.

NIH research is increased by 6.5 percent.

The preventive health, maternal and child health, social services, and child care block grants are all increased, consistent with the subcommittee's policy of increasing funding for programs that increase local discretion. Again, these programs cannot be seen in isolation from the individuals they serve: poor women, young children, and the most vulnerable in our society-all which have a high priority in the bill.

The community services block grant, which is an extremely flexible program that can support many social services programs, including nutrition, energy assistance, employment, and crisis services, is increased by $100 million, from approximately $390 to $490 million.

Innovative education program strategies is more than doubled, to $609 million, by terminating several categorical programs to increase funding for this broad block grant.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the premier agency in the world in the search for the causes and treatment of a broad range of diseases, is increased by $75 million, to $2.2 billion; $82 million dollars is provided for infectious disease control, $135 million is provided for breast and cervical cancer screening, and other health promotion and disease prevention programs are also increased.

Mr. Chairman, health professions training funding is increased by $34 million. Family planning is maintained at last year's level of $192 million; $802 million is provided for community and migrant health centers, and other health service programs are increased as well. Again, Mr. Chairman, these are programs that serve the poor, the disadvantaged, and the most vulnerable in our society and they are given high priority in our bill.

Head Start funding is increased to $3.6 billion. Again, this is a program aimed directly at the poorest, most vulnerable children, and while not without its faults in some of its applications, is a high priority in this bill. TRIO is increased by $37 million, an 8 percent increase. Pell grants, and I heard the gentlewoman say we were cutting Pell grants, the gentlewoman from Connecticut earlier, Pell grants maximums are again increased, this year by $30, to $2,500. Federal work-study grants are up over 10 percent, to $685 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is here that I have the greatest difficulty of understanding the criticisms of my friends across the aisle. We have increased these student financial aid programs this year, and many of them were increased or frozen last year, yet there is still the drumbeat that the majority is cutting post-secondary education. We are not. Funds for college education, post-secondary education, are increasing.

The bill also continues our efforts at reform. As I mentioned, the bill terminates 39 mostly small, ineffective programs. Goals 2000, however, is also terminated. The bill consolidates the Eisenhower Professional Development Program with the innovative State grant program that will allow the States and localities to spend Federal education funding as they see fit, to meet locally defined needs and programs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the bill continues many of the legislative provisions that were included in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations and Rescissions Act of 1996. Among those included are provisions prohibiting the issuance of regulations by the NLRB related to single-site bargaining, provisions that have been carried in the bill for several years prohibiting the use of funds for abortions—the current Hyde language—provisions that limit the use of funds for the creation of human embryos for research and the use of embryos in research.

In addition, the subcommittee included several additional legislative provisions. Language is included strengthening the current language regarding OSHA ergonomic standards. The recommended language would prohibit the development or issuance of standards or guidelines and the collection of data with respect to repetitive motion injuries. Language is also included that would raise the minimum jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. The increase would return the minimum jurisdiction to the inflation-adjusted level it originally was set at in 1950. Finally, Mr. Chairman, language is included that prohibits the use of CDC funds for the advocacy of gun control.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to hear a great deal of discussion from our friends on the other side of the aisle on their belief, and the President's, that we need to spend more money on these and other programs. In the end, however, we are going to have to be responsible. In the end, every dollar we spend above current amounts in the bill are borrowed and must be repaid by our children, who have, after all, no vote and whose futures we are mortgaging if we spend beyond our means.

This is a responsible bill, Mr. Chairman. It reflects the priorities for education and health and job training and the protection of the most vulnerable in our society, and I commend it to the Members. I believe it is a fair, responsible bill and does the job for the American people.

I would like to clarify the intent of language included in the section of House Report 104–659 relating to the buildings and facilities account within the National Institutes of Health. The report indicates that the committee expects that the detailed construction documents for the clinical center be reviewed by an outside party acceptable to both NIH and Congress. This outside party could be a single entity or a panel of experts drawn from various institutions. Such a review would take place at the design development stage of the project. The review should focus on a thorough examination of program and cost estimates, but need not involve review of detailed construction documents.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, I think, defines in a major way the differences in priorities between the two political parties in this House. For years we have had a decline in the school-age population in this country. It has been going down for a number of years. But the fact is that we are now experiencing a steady increase in school enrollment in this country, and, in fact, next year there will be more students enrolled in local school districts than at any time in the country's history.

We would simply ask the question on this side of the aisle: Why should we be cutting per pupil expenditures for those students at a time when we are experiencing an increase in student enrollment?

If we take a look at what is happening to per pupil expenditures and look at it in real dollar terms, we will see that per pupil expenditures at the Federal level are declining from $287 per student to $222 by the end of the sixth year of the Republican budget which just went through this House several months ago, and this bill is the first year's step in that budget process.

Last year the Republican majority in this House tried to cut $7 billion out of this bill. The public rebelled. After the public rebelled at those reductions last year, we were able, in conference with the Senate, to restore about 90 percent of the education cuts which had been made by House Republicans in this bill last year.

This year's bill has a more stealthy plan to make those same reductions. On the surface, it appears to be pretty much a stand-pat budget but, in reality, there is a $500 million reduction in Department of Education programs, and over the next 6 years, we would wind up with a reduction of some $35 billion below current services, and we would wind up with cuts of about $57 billion below the President's requests.

□ 1830

That is a 20 percent cut in real deliverable program levels by 2002. We simply on this side of the aisle do not think that that is in the interest of the country. We do not think that that will help the economy grow. We believe that these reductions come at the worst possible time for local schools. Schools face sharp competition for resources from State and local sources. This budget squeeze at the State and local level comes at the same time that Federal education aid dollars are declining in real terms while school enrollment, as I just indicated, is rising. That creates a double-jeopardy situation which we think is unhealthy.

This bill begins the process under which this year up to 15,000 Head Start kids will be squeezed out of the program under this bill. Over 150,000 title I children will lose title I services that help them to read and to master science and math. The President's budget would have supported nearly 450,000 additional title I students. By the end of the Republican 6-year budget plan, more than 1 million kids will not be receiving the reading and math help they need under the title I program. Under Goals 2000, which is the program that was begun under President Bush, supported by then Governor Clinton, under that Goals 2000 program which would help 8,500 local schools raise math and science standards so that kids can compete globally, that program would be terminated in this bill. That results in 2 billion fewer dollars provided for school improvement between now and 2002. Nearly 340,000 math and science teachers will lose the training that they need to upgrade their skills because the bill eliminates the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program. Over 300,000 students will lose vocational education and training opportunities in just this year alone under the bill. There will be 14,000 kids who lose bilingual education opportunities. Two hundred twenty thousands students who receive Perkins loans and grants under the State-assisted student incentive program will no longer be able to get the help they need to attend college. There are 107,000 fewer college kids who will receive Pell grant programs compared to the President's budget. Seventy-nine thousand fewer summer youth jobs will be provided under this proposal. Dislocated worker assistance will be provided to 32,000 fewer workers than last year.

This is the bill that is supposed to help children and workers get ahead in life. Yet this bill puts us on the road to a systematic disinvestment in education and puts roadblocks in the way of those workers and those children.

I would point out that there has been a lot of talk through the past years about how sound Social Security and Medicare will be in the next century. Raising the wages and the earning power of the American workforce is crucial to being able to strengthen those funds, because you need to strengthen the income people have so that they can increase their payments into those funds. This is the bill that most directly impacts our obligation to give kids from working families a

chance to make something of themselves and it is being short-sheeted in my view.

In addition to the education problem, we have added over 2 million seniors in the last 5 years to our population. Yet this bill continues the downward trend of the 1996 Appropriation Act by again cutting funds for the Administration on Aging.

For worker protection, the House bill cuts worker protection programs by 13 percent below the President's request and 9 percent below what is needed to simply maintain last year's level of operations. That means cuts in our ability to help guarantee workplace health and safety, pension protection, and immigration reform.

The bill also cuts funding for the NLRB by 15 percent below last year's level and 20 percent below the President's request. We do not think that is wise. In addition, it contains a number of riders which we do not believe make much sense.

Low Income Heating Assistance Program, a program which I started with Senator Muskie a long time ago, that Low Income Energy Assistance Program is crucial to help seniors and vulnerable individuals pay their home heating bills. I come from a part of the country where you get 40 below zero weather, and I am not talking about chill factor, I am talking about real term temperature cold. In 1996 the Low Income Heating Assistance Program was slashed by $419 million. This bill provides $100 million less than the President requested and it appropriates not one dime for fiscal 1998 for that program.

I would simply point out that from 1981 to 1994, the low-income population eligible for LIHEAP has grown by 10 million people. Yet the percentage of eligible households served by it has dropped from 36 to 21 percent and the percentage of assistance on their fuel bills which people get from the Federal Government has declined from 23 percent to 12 percent in 1994 and it will go down even more.

So for this and a variety of reasons, I would simply say that we on the minority side feel that this bill is not adequate to the challenge facing the country and I regretfully intend to vote ''no'' when the bill reaches its final passage stage.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, as a former fourth grade school teacher and the mother of two, I understand the importance of education to the health and vitality of our Nation. We who are in positions of authority have a solemn responsibility to formulate policies that will provide all children with access to quality education.

Mr. Chairman, 66 percent of 17-year-olds do not read at a proficient level, and 30 percent of all children entering college have to take remedial education classes. These sorry statistics are the unfortunate result of several factors, the most important of which is the unrestrained growth of the Federal education bureaucracy.

Only about 6 percent of all education spending in the United States comes from Federal sources, yet one study found that it accounted for over 50 percent of all the paperwork for local school districts. We need more teachers, we need better teachers in the classrooms with the students, not more bureaucrats buried under mountains of paper.

This Congress has trimmed the fat from the education budget but it has not cut vital and effective programs. Both Pell grants and the work-study program reach an all-time high under the Republican budget this year. These programs are proven successes and should be preserved.

Yet out of a Federal education monolith consisting of 760 programs and costing $120 billion a year, there is much that must be reformed. Of these programs, only 3.6 percent are science-related, only 1.8 percent are reading-related, and only 1.1 percent are math-related. Mr. Chairman, our limited Federal resources are being squandered.

Washington, DC is not the place to look for education policy. We need to look at the local school districts, the teachers, the parents, the local committees, and families that must be allowed to educate children without interference from the Federal bureaucracy.

What works for New York State may not work for the children of the central coast of California, where I come from. I say, give those who know education best the ability to make policy that works for the folks at home, for their own communities, their own children. We in Washington, DC should offer support but get out of the way. Our children deserve better.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to make an observation with respect to what is happening in the Congress and in the United States of America regarding how we spend our money and how we make decisions on spending our money.

The chart to my right shows that in 1962, 70 percent of the Federal budget was so-called discretionary spending. Discretionary spending is decisions that we make about where we want to invest our money to make our country stronger and more viable as a Nation, to make people more secure and more able to compete. That has now dropped down to less than 36 percent.

Half of that is for our national defense. I am one of those Democrats that supports the national defense, and I have done so since 1981 when I first came here. We added $12 billion to defense this year when it passed this House. Why did we do so? We did so on the premise that to freeze defense was in fact a cut. In fact, I think that rationale was correct. But I am not so sure why that rationale does not apply to the defense of this Nation as it relates to the education of our children and the security of our families.

In 1983, the Department of Education issued a report. It was a stark and compelling report, and it was entitled ''A Nation At Risk.''

What did it say? I am quoting from that report, issued under the imprimatur of Secretary Terrence Bell, who recently passed away. He was a fine Secretary of Education, a member of the Reagan Cabinet. The report said this:

> If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have dismantled essential support systems which helped make these gains possible. We have in effect been committing an act of unthinking unilateral educational disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I will oppose this bill because it sounds retreat, and America ought not to retreat. In a time when we need to have families first in our focus, at a time when we need to strengthen education and strengthen children, sounding the bugle of retreat is not a proper policy.

We will have a very substantial increase in the numbers of children going to our schools over the next 6 years. Next year, in fact, we will have more children in school than in any year in our history.

What does that mean? That means there will be a greater burden on local and State governments. As the previous speaker said, the Federal Government contributes only 6 percent of the educational resources available to our families and to educate our children. But that 6 percent is a critical part. In fact, it is the part which deals with some of the most vulnerable children in America, those who have economic, cultural, and educational deprivations in their families, and who therefore start out behind the others with whom they will go to school.

This chart shows that we are going to have 3.4 million more children entering school from 1997 to 2002. It also shows that the Republican budget's freeze at $14.4 billion for elementary and secondary education is essentially a retreat, because it will effectively be, in 2002, $12 billion in real dollars, in resources available. In an atmosphere where the need is growing, our investment is decreasing.

□ 1845

That does not make sense for our families or for our children. I said that the numbers of children were increasing, and I showed Members on the chart where the budget goes from $14.4 billion to approximately $12 billion in real terms by 2002. Now, that is when we will be experiencing an addition of 3.4 million new young people in our school system.

Those children do not disappear. Those children will not have another chance at being 3 or 4 or 5 years old. This is not something that we can catch up on tomorrow, when perhaps, as George Bush says, our wallet will match our will. I believe that we ought to have the will, and I clearly believe we have the wallet. As a matter of fact, as a Democrat for a balanced budget, I voted for the coalition budget. The coalition budget, in fact, balanced the budget, cut more spending than the Republican or the President's alternative, and provided an additional $47 billion for education. How did it do that? Because we did not pretend that we could cut taxes, balance the budget, and make sure that families were secure in the knowledge that their children would receive the kinds of education that they need.

Under the President's budget, there would have been $7.05 billion for title I. Title I is for economically deprived children who need some additional help to be competitive, so that they can join our workforce in competing with an increasingly able workforce around the world. A freeze in real terms would serve 6.8 million children in 2002. The chairman suggests a freeze in 1997 but in point of fact, that policy will result in an actual decrease to 5.8 million children who will be served in 2002. This is opposed to the President's budget, which will serve 6.8 million children. That is 1 million American children that will have no seats for title I assistance in the schools of our Nation because of this Republican budget. I believe that policy is inconsistent with our desire to compete in the global marketplace, with our desire to pledge to families that they can be secure in the knowledge that their children will have the kind of education, Head Start, and title I assistance that they need.

Now, I want to tell my friends in the House that my children have had great advantages. Their father and their mother earn substantial incomes. Their father and their mother had the advantages of higher education. But let me tell Members something that all of us, I am sure, know, and that every family in America knows: Our children will be affected by the ability to participate and contribute of every other child in their generation. Therefore, I say to my friends that this budget, which calls us to retreat, is a budget we ought to reject.

I talked about title I. Today in America, in a program that President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton supported and funded, we serve 53 percent of the children who are eligible. That means we do not serve 47 percent. I think that is a problem. I think what we ought to do is increase the percentage that we serve. Why? Because it makes us more competitive and makes us a more viable society.

But this Republican budget, as I said, sounds retreat and moves from 53 percent of children served today by title I to 42 percent of the children served in 2002. That extrapolates into those 1 million children that I told Members about. Those are real children from real families in a country that, increasingly in a global marketplace, knows that it has got to have better skills for its children.

This next chart shows in very specific terms what will happen in the cities and towns of America. Let me give some examples. In Dallas, TX, a freeze in title I as proposed by the chairman will mean 29 teachers lose their jobs and 726 students lose help next year. S. 726 students next year in Dallas, TX, as a result of this bill will not get the kind of help that they need. The Miami-Dade area will lost 40 teachers and 1,011 students next year. It will lost 255 teachers and 6,386 students over the next 5 years.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, in order to stay even, just this year, we would have to add $2.6 billion to this bill for education.

Now, recall with me my opening statement that we added $12 billion to the defense bill so that we could stay even and remain the strongest Nation on the face of the earth. My Republican colleagues pointed out that if we did not have that additional $12 billion, if we froze funding at last year's level, that we would in fact be putting at risk the Nation by underfunding our defense. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, let us not underfund the defense of America by underfunding the children, the education of America. I urge a ''no'' vote on this appropriation bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a very able member of our subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker tried to scare us about what is happening in education, and I just want to set the record straight. First of all, the Federal Government only pays 5 percent of the total amount of money in elementary and secondary education. Ninety-five percent of the money comes from State and local governments, and that is where the responsibility belongs, with the family and State and local governments.

He talks about title 1. Where are the cuts? Title I has increased 40 percent in the last 7 years, and it is flat funded for this year. There is no cut. The amount of money going for title I stays at $6.7 billion.

I rise in strong support of this bill, and I want to talk about something other than the area of education right now, and I want to talk about something that is very, very important, and that is the area of biomedical research.

Biomedical research is a fundamental priority that can dramatically improve and change the lives of individual Americans. Therefore, for the second year in a row, we have significantly increased funding at the National Institutes for Health and for the Centers for Disease Control. Another reason, by the way, I am supporting this bill very strongly is we want to eliminate wasteful and duplicative spending programs, and this bill eliminates 39 programs in addition to the 109 programs we eliminated last year. So I support this program because what it is, we set Federal priorities. We take a hard look at those functions of the Federal Government and decide what they can do and the responsibility of the Federal Government should do. We identify those crucial programs and increase the funding for those that are the most important, and we decrease funding for wasteful or nonessential bureaucracy.

The National Institutes for Health is a perfect example since it represents a true Federal responsibility. By providing over a 6-percent increase, we are continuing our commitment to ensure the health and welfare of our citizens. Under the leadership of Chairman PORTER, we have committed to building a new clinical research center, and this had broad bipartisan support.

The Human Genome Project, which is literally mapping the entire human DNA, is moving forward ahead of schedule. Funding for AIDS research is once again increased. We have seen hopeful breakthroughs at NIH for the treatment this disease, and the Republican plan continues to provide the resources needed to find a treatment and cure.

We should support the National Institutes for Health because it is truly one of the great institutions of the entire world. Dozens and dozens of Americans have been awarded the Nobel Prize with help from NIH research grants. Some of the most important medical discoveries of the 20th century have occurred at the NIH campus or through NIH grants to the Universities in this country.

America has created the finest medical research facility in the world, and this bill ensures that it will remain a true force for the improvement of our health and well-being as a society.

Another great institution is the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta. It reaches across the entire country and entire globe. This bill increases funding for several CDC prevention programs. We increase funding for breast and cervical cancer screening, chronic and environmental disease prevention, infectious disease, AIDS education and prevention, lead poisoning prevention, and the preventive health services block grant. CDC is an example of an activity the Federal Government is uniquely qualified to accomplish. We have increased funding in 1996 and again in 1997.

This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LIVINGSTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WALKER, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3396, DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–666) on the resolution (H. Res. 474) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3755 and include extraneous and tabular material and charts.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3755.

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. 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, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 43 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 39½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the Members to the charts beside me. First, a chart depicting the expenditures of the U.S. Government in 1962, Jack Kennedy's heyday, when the Federal Government in that fiscal year spent $106.8 billion with a very minor deficit. The deficit today runs around $150 billion.

It was a different day, a different era. Half of that was defense, which is depicted in the lower yellow portion of the pie, and roughly one-sixth of the budget, a little bit more than one-sixth, is the nondefense discretionary portion, which includes the programs funded in this bill.

□ 1900

The blue portion refers to the entitlements, which at that time consisted of Social Security and welfare and various other mandatory spending programs. The red is interest on the debt, which then was a ''big'' $7 billion.

Times have changed, Mr. Chairman. Today—for fiscal 1997—the chart looks entirely different. More than half is blue, the mandatory portion of the budget, which is now Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, welfare and other mandatory programs. The total amount now that we propose to spend is $1.6 trillion compared to $106 billion in fiscal 1962.

Today we spend 15 times more than we spent back in Jack Kennedy's day. As I say, half of it is for mandatory spending. We raise most of the money, and we transfer it to other people. We tax the American people and pass it on to the next guy.

The discretionary portion looks entirely different. Before, half of the whole budget was defense; now it is only one-sixth. But the other sixth, or the other half of the third, represents discretionary spending which is now about $269 billion, and a good portion of what is in this bill makes up that amount.

Actually some of what is in this bill is also funded in the blue, or the mandatory portion, but what is significant about this chart is the red. The significant of the red on this chart is the fact that it has grown disproportionate to the entire pie, which itself has grown by 15 times since 1962. The red represents the interest on the debt.

Within the next year or so the red, the interest that we pay on the debt, the borrowing of $100 billion, $200 billion, $300 billion a year over the last many years, is now rapidly approaching the same amount of money and soon will, exceed what we spend on the defense of this Nation, our first priority under the Constitution of the United States.

So I have heard various Members from the other side of the aisle troop down here and say we have to take care of the little children, the infirm, the elderly, we have to take care of the disabled and people who cannot help themselves, and my answer is if we do not get a handle on this problem, all of those people along with every one of us is in deep trouble.

The interest on the debt is the first thing the Government must pay. Otherwise we default. If we do not want to default, we have to pay the interest on the debt even before we worry about the security of our Nation and of every man woman and child in this Nation.

If we do not get that interest on the debt under control, if we do not get this borrowing in control, that tendency that has caused us to borrow up to $100, $200, to $300 billion a year, because we are spending that much more than we receive every single year with the exception of perhaps 3 years since World War II, frankly, the red color on the chart will encompass everything else, and we will not be able to afford anything else.

So I would say take care of the little children first by balancing our books. Now, the other side will say, well, we are balancing them on the backs of the children. I say that is not true. The fact is we are making significant savings. In fiscal year 1995 we saved a net of $16 billion, in fiscal year 1996 a net of an additional $20 billion. In fiscal year 1997, which we are in now, it will be another 15 to $20 billion. Minimum, a net savings to the American taxpayer of $53 billion under what was appropriated by the Democrats when they had control last in the Congress.

If we look at President Clinton's budget compared to where he would take us had he had a Democratic Congress, we are saving around $80 billion, all of that out of the discretionary spending. That savings is achieved by cutting everything fairly and equitably.

Is it out of education? No. First of all, the Federal Government only spends roughly 5 percent of the entire education budget. This is the chart showing what the United States spends on education. State and local governments spend 95 percent; the Federal Government puts up an additional 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that despite the fact that we have heard this hue and cry about cutting the people that are least able, total nondefense discretionary spending is going up. The fact is, yes, we are eliminating duplicative programs. We have cut unnecessary programs. We have already eliminated a number of programs; gone from 655 in 1995, to 515 in 1996, and to 464 in 1997, in this bill.

At the same time the savings generated by these eliminations are, in fact, going to the States in the form of block grants, block grants for States and localities to spend the money as they please. Community service block grants has gone up from $390 to $490 million. For child care and development programs, it has gone up from $935 to $950 million. For social services block grant, it has gone up from $2.4 to $2.5 billion. And for maternal and child block grants, it has gone up by $3 million from $678 to $681 million. We are spending more, not less, on block grants.

Student aid is going up. The student aid has increased. Maximum Pell

grants are going up per person, per individual recipient. The overall student aid has gone up. The TRIO Program has gone up. For the very most disadvantaged people spending has gone up. Work-study spending has gone up. So has spending for various other programs.

It has already been pointed out title I grants to the States are kept even. We have been hearing there are cuts in these programs. Head Start is staying even. We are not cutting these things. There has been a lot of rhetoric, a lot of political breast beating about how these programs are being cut. They are not being cut. They are staying even.

The point is we can go ahead and spend all the money and worry about mañana if we would like to, but the poorest of the poor will suffer the most. The people on pensions will suffer the most. The people trying to plan for their children's education by borrowing to get them in college or borrowing money to buy a house or to buy a car will pay most as long as the Government continues to borrow to make up for the deficit that it has created by spending more money than it receives year after year after year.

When are we going to bring some common sense to the system? Well, I will tell my friends, we have begun, and we are not balancing the books on the backs of the poor and the disadvantaged; we are putting this country back on an even keel in an orderly fashion. If we have our way, within 6 years we will have a balanced budget. If we do not have our way, if the other side has their way, this country is going broke.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply respond to the gentleman who just spoke by saying the following: On defense, the difference between now and Jack Kennedy's time is that when Jack Kennedy was President we were in the beginning of the Vietnam war, we had a raging hot cold war, and the Soviet Union was in its heyday. That is a little different than the situation is today.

With respect to interest on the debt, I would simply suggest that that interest on the national debt is not out of control because we are overinvesting in education. In fact, under this bill and under the Republican budget over the next 5 years, we will see a per pupil reduction in the Federal investment of almost 20 percent.

On the Pell grant front, which is the main program that helps kids go to college, in 1976 that program covered about 48 percent of the cost of going to college. Today it covers only about 20 percent of the cost. Federal support for education as a percentage of what local school districts provide has shrunk from 5.6 percent just 2 years ago when the Republicans took control of this place to about 4.7 percent under this bill. That is almost a 20-percent reduction. At the same time, the States' share of meeting the cost of public elementary and secondary education at the local level has declined from 50 to 45 percent. So we are seeing both at the State level and at the Federal level a real reduction in deliverable program levels to support education.

I would simply add one additional note. I find it quaint that when the gentleman defends this bill he says ''We are not cutting anything, we are just holding it level,'' which denies the fact that because we have inflation and we also have an increasing student population, which means, again, that in deliverable aid to each student we are having a real reduction each year.

I find it interesting that somehow this is not a cut when we are talking about education, but last month, on page 2 of the document that the gentleman's committee reported, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1997, what they pointed out is that they provided a $3.7 billion increase in raw dollars above 1996, but they described it as a $4.4 billion reduction because it did not meet the cost of inflation.

So somehow when we talk about defense, then we are supposed to take into account the ravages of inflation and add to spending; with you, when we are counting what we provide for aid to kids, we are not supposed to do the same thing. That seems to me a very quaint accounting system, especially if we are concerned about making investments in protecting the country's future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3755, the bill setting the fiscal year 1997 appropriations levels for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Service, Education, and related agencies.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and as the ranking member of the VA–HUD Subcommittee, I know first hand how difficult it is to craft a bill that truly responds to the needs of the American people. So, first, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN EDWARD PORTER, and our distinguished ranking member, Mr. DAVID OBEY, of Wisconsin, for their hard work and doing what they could to craft such a bill within the subcommittee's inadequate allocation.

While there are some things that we can be especially pleased with in this bill, there are a number of others where we should be extremely concerned. For example, we can be pleased about the fact that the bill includes an $820 million increase for furthering biomedical research and restoring the infrastructure at the National Institutes of Health; a $75 million increase to further disease prevention and health promotion activities at the Centers for Disease Control; a $37 million increase to expand higher education opportunities for disadvantaged students under the Trio programs; a $45 million increase for Job Corps; and a $33 million increase in health professions training to ensure a cadre of health care providers to meet the Nation's health care needs especially in urban and rural underserved areas.

While we can be pleased with these investments, we must be equally disturbed by the major shortfalls in H.R. 3755 which threaten the quality of life for the most vulnerable among us. For example, the bill eliminates funding for the Healthy Start Program. This is a program which is designed to improve the Nation's infant mortality rate. It is appalling that the United States, ranking 22d, in fact has the worse infant mortality rate among industrialized countries. The Healthy Start demonstration projects have proven their effectiveness in reducing infant mortality.

As such, I cannot understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can label themselves as ''pro-lifers'' and then zero out funding for this highly successful pro-life program—which is designed to save the lives of babies. Now is the time to provide the resources needed to begin to implement and to apply the Healthy Start Program's lessons learned to other communities that have a dramatically high rate of infant mortality. For the sake of families across this country—we now know what works—let's use it.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3755 falls seriously short on addressing the needs of our Nation's youth. Funding for the Summer Jobs Program is $171 million short of the amount needed to just support the same number of summer jobs as in fiscal year 1996. As a result, nearly 80,000 kids who need and want to work would be denied that critical opportunity.

Out-of-school youth are hit even harder, as the bill virtually ignores their employment training needs at a time when we know that education and skills matter most in today's job market. The Youth Employment Training Program was gutted in the past rescission and appropriations cycle, and is now flat funded at $127 million.

Substance abuse treatment is cut by over $38 million. With respect to at-risk youth alone, 5 million individuals will be denied the substance abuse prevention services they desperately need.

The dramatically high rate of unemployment among out-of-school youth and the high rate of teen pregnancy are two of the most significant problems confronting this country, consuming scarce resources, and compromising our youth's future. We can and must do something to effectively address each of these ongoing problems. They are too costly in terms of human capital and monetary expenses to ignore.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3755 also fails our Nation's school children, jeopardizing their academic future. At a time when school enrollments are on the rise, and are in fact the highest in history, the bill freezes funding for teaching assistance in basic reading and math under the title I Grants to Local Education Agencies Program. Funding for Safe and Drug Free Schools is cut $25 million below the current funding level despite the increase of crime and violence in our Nation's schools. Funding for training and advisory services associated with carrying out title IV of the Civil Rights Act is not only frozen, but is also 48 percent below the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request. In addition, no funding is provided for the Women's Educational Equity Program. These two programs are critical to ensuring educational equity for minorities and women.

The bill also eliminates funding for Goals 2000, which is designed to assist and provide communities critical resources needed to raise education standards and children's academic achievement. Funding for these five programs alone falls nearly a billion dollars below the President's fiscal year 1997 funding request level, and $375 million below the current funding level.

The bill also threaten's seniors' quality of life by short funding low-income home energy assistance, the Administration on Aging, and the National Senior Volunteer Corps. Funding provided for these three programs alone falls over a billion dollars short of the administration's request.

At a time when we speak of the critical need to insure personal responsibility, H.R. 3755 is weak on addressing the needs of families. Funding for the mandatory Social Services Block Grant Program and the child care development block grant are $320 million and $98 million respectively short of the administration's request. These resources are desperately needed by working poor families who not only need to work but equally important want to continue working. In addition, funding for the Centers for Disease Control's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control Program is cut $2.6 million. These funds are critical to further research on the prevention and control of fires, poisonings, and violence including homicide, suicide, and domestic violence. Programs under the auspices of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration are also especially hard hit by H.R. 3755. The over $38 million cut in substance abuse treatment is compounded by the fact that funding for treatment was gutted 60 percent in fiscal year 1996, and that for treatment demonstrations was cut 57 percent. As a result of the dire funding situation, with respect to at-risk youth alone, 5 million individuals will be denied the substance abuse prevention services they desperately need. In total, funding for these four programs alone is $670 million below the administration's request, and over $70 million below the current funding level.

Mr. Chairman, each and every day, parents across this country continue to raise their children telling them to get a good education, work hard, and play by the rules, and you will succeed. H.R. 3755 denies these kids access to many of the most critical tools they need to succeed. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 3755 in its current form.

□ 1915

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important debate. This bill is a very important part of our effort to balance the budget for this Nation. If the President of the United States had his way with this appropriation, we would spend an extra 12 percent on this bill. We would spend an extra $7.8 billion in 1 year alone if the President had his way on this bill.

On the other hand, the bill that we have before us is level-funded from last year's appropriation. So the first question we have to ask ourselves is: Do we level-fund for the next fiscal year in the context of a balanced budget, or do we spend an extra $7.8 billion? I come down on the side of balancing the budget.

The second question we ask ourselves tonight is: Are we making an adequate investment in these very important programs, and in particular I would ask, are we making an adequate investment in education? I would submit to my colleagues that under this bill we are making substantial additional expenditures in education.

Mr. Chairman, this first chart I have gives a history of Head Start funding. It shows that under this appropriation bill we will appropriate an additional $31 million for Head Start in fiscal year 1997. It also shows that in the last 7 years alone Head Start expenditures have increased by 132 percent. This is at a time when enrollment in this program has not increased by nearly that percent.

Now, the second chart I have is simply an account of Pell grant maximum awards, and my colleagues can see that the maximum award for 1996 is $2,470. Under this bill it will go up to $2,500.

Other increases in this bill are the Job Corps program, a $45 million increase; the work-study program, an increase of $68 million; impact aid, an increase of $68 million. We have also level-funded important programs such as job training, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools State grants, and Title I funding for the disadvantaged.

It is very, very easy to be for a balanced budget back in our districts in an election year, but it is hard work to actually get to a balanced budget. It is hard to actually plug in those numbers that will reduce the deficit, when we consider them item by item by item.

I would respond briefly to the comments of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], my dear friend. His quarrel is with the overall budget plan which includes tax relief. There are many colleagues on the other side of the aisle who object to the budget allocation. They said, ''We did not vote for these tax cuts and we should not be bound by the budget plan.''

Mr. Chairman, we have to make judgment calls, and if I have to make a judgment call on the side of the hard working taxpayer, I will do that. If I can put another $1,000 in the take-home pay of a young family making $25,000 or $30,000 and still level-fund these very important programs, I will do that.

This is a choice of another $7.8 billion in spending or a balanced budget. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to choose a balanced budget and vote for the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mr. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his leadership for funding for the National Institutes of Health. This bill provides for a 6 percent increase which I wholeheartedly support. This increase will enable important research to continue in the area of breast cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, AIDS and many others.

The bill also increases funds to train child welfare workers to better care for abused and neglected youngsters. In addition, I thank the chairman for working with me to prevent cuts in public television funding, and I also thank him for continuing to work with me to fully fund domestic violence programs.

However, Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my deep concern with this bill. This bill has always been called the people's bill. But again, for the second year in a row, this bill falls short of meeting the needs of the people of this Nation: our schoolchildren, college students, elderly, and hard-working men and women across the country.

Unfortunately, this bill represents a serious reduction in our Nation's investment in education. While the draconian cuts above $4 billion proposed by the majority party of last year have not been repeated, the bill still fails to make the necessary investment in our Nation's schools.

It was the proposed $4 billion in education cuts, coupled with steep reductions in job training and worker protection, which led to two government shutdowns and an 18-month stalemate over the budget. Finally, the majority retreated from their extreme position and 90 percent of the cuts in education, 60 percent of the cuts in job training,

and 75 percent of the cuts in worker protection programs were restored.

But the bill before us today takes us down the same path as last year. Under this bill, the Federal Government is further shirking its responsibilities to our local schools. In the 1994–95 school year, when Democrats were still in control of the Congress, the Federal Government contributed 5.6 percent of State and local expenditures for education. Under the bill before us today, the Federal contribution to local schools is down to only 4.7 percent.

This bill also shortchanges students in colleges, universities, community colleges and training programs across our Nation.

By the year 2002, an additional 1.5 million students will be enrolled in college. This is an increase of almost 10 percent in student enrollment. The cost of a college education is increasing faster than the rate of inflation. Unfortunately, this bill does not take into account increased college enrollment or increased college tuition.

The Pell Program is the cornerstone of Federal college assistance, providing aid to 4 million needy students. Pell recipients are not well-off, and more than 90 percent of the aid goes to students from families and incomes below $30,000. The Pell Program is one of the few sources of grant aid still available. Pell helps to cut down on the crushing college debt burden assumed by so many students and their families today.

But in the bill before us today, the maximum Pell grant is $2,500, only $30 above last year. This $30 increase in the Pell grant would buy a single college textbook. The Pell funding in this bill is simply inadequate to meet the costs of higher education today.

The bill is also inadequate when it comes to the Perkins Program. The bill provides no capital contributions to the Perkins Program. Three-quarters of a million low income students depend on the Perkins Program. In my state of New York, Perkins provided low-interest loans to nearly 60,000 deserving students.

In addition, the bill before us today completely eliminates the SSIG Program. In fiscal year 1995, SSIG was funded at over $60 million. Last year we funded SSIG at $31.3 million, but only after a long and protracted fight over funding priorities. If we added a modest $31.3 million to the SSIG Program, we could provide aid to 105,000 students and generate over $100 million in State students aid funds.

The bill also fails to fund the President's important teen pregnancy initiative, provides no funding for school infrastructure, and eliminates the Women's Educational Equity Act.

The bill was flawed from the start because it was a direct outgrowth of mixed-up Republican priorities. Like last year, the House gave the Pentagon billions more than Pentagon requested. This year the House voted to give the Pentagon $11 billion more than it requested. This is wrong, Mr. Chairman. It is shortsighted. We cannot afford to keep shortchanging the important priorities of this Nation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that under Republicans in the last 2 years we have raised maximum Pell grants by $160, and under the last 4 years of Democratic administrations, the gentlewoman from New York might realize that they cut maximum Pell grants by $60.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the full committee.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education, for the very hard work he has done, he and his staff, on this bill, putting together a very tough bill under very tough circumstances. Mr. Chairman, I think they put together a very workable appropriation for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, ensuring that the medical needs and the education needs of the young and the old are met, and that we feed not only the body but the mind and the soul.

But I stand here today mostly not in my capacity as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but as a member of the Committee on the Budget where some of these overall priorities are being established, because this bill that we are looking at today incorporates the goals and the promises that the Republican Congress made to provide our children with a better future.

Mr. Chairman, simply stated, the best thing we can do for our children is to balance the budget. If we do not get runaway Federal spending under control, we are not going to have any money for college loans in the future; we will not have money for Head Start; we are not going to have any money for children's health programs.

Through all of our history, each succeeding generation has always enjoyed the promise of having a better life and standard of living for themselves than the previous generation, but compare what Government spending has been between 1962 and 1997.

This chart here shows the amount of money that was spent on discretionary nondefense spending in 1962 was enormous, more than half of the total Federal budget, and when we add the other part of the yellow in there, almost all of the budget was in discretionary spending. Look at how that has dropped by the year 1997, so discretionary nondefense spending is down here to a much smaller part of the pie. Whereas it was once 50 percent, today it is less than 20 percent on those same kinds of programs.

The kinds of programs that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and his subcommittee have to deal with are being squeezed down by the entitlement programs, Medicare, Medicaid, Welfare, and Social Security. They are consuming an ever larger portion of the total Federal expenditure. When in 1962 they consumed 25 percent of Federal expenditures, today by comparison they consume 50 percent of those expenditures.

We made, in the Committee on the Budget, a promise to cut Federal spending, to decrease taxes, to balance the budget. With a balanced budget we are going to give families lower car payments. We are going to give them lower student loans and lower house payments for their mortgages, and therefore they will have more money in their pocket.

Once again, if we do not balance the budget, the people we are hurting are our children and our grandchildren.

The President and some of those on the other side of the aisle would have us believe that the budget resolution in this appropriation bill is going to strip away valuable services, including education and health care for the elderly, women and children. This is simply not true. Under the budget conference agreement, and this bill fulfills that agreement, spending for education and job training increases from $47.8 billion in 1996 to $50.4 billion in 2002.

□ 1930

That is a $3 billion increase. Anybody outside Washington, Mr. Chairman, understands that that kind of spending, a $3 billion increase, is just that, it is an increase. So we are not talking about cuts. We are talking about increases. It is the other side that wants to talk about cuts.

We know that money does not necessarily mean better education. We have a lot more bureaucracy in Washington with the Department of Education, when we do not have better education, not necessarily. So we need to be sure that we target the money that we do have available to those things that are absolutely vital and absolutely critical. This bill does that in health and human services, in education. I strongly urge that we support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a member of the subcommittee.

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

I am going to lay a guilt trip on some of my colleagues who are considering at this time voting against this bill, because if they are for children and if they are for education and if they are for an improved health care system, they want to vote for this bill. Otherwise, frankly, I do not know how my colleagues who are considering voting against this bill can sleep at night.

Examples: We are increasing Job Corps funding in this country that

would allow nine new Job Corps centers to be built by June of 1998, $45 million more for Job Corps this bill contains that we had in the last bill. So if Members want to support young people who are trying to get a second chance in communities across this country, they are going to vote for the bill. Otherwise, I do not know how they can live with their guilt of abandoning these young people who desperately need this money.

The same could be said for the Centers for Disease Control. We are increasing funding for them $75 million over fiscal year 1996. How can my colleagues live with themselves if they consider voting against this bill and abandoning the good work that is done at the Centers for Disease Control.

Breast cancer screening increased by 8 percent. How could we live with ourselves if we vote against this bill when it provides increased funding for this most important cause? Community and migrant health care centers, again very necessary in many of our rural and poor areas of this country. How can Members vote against this bill and abandon the people who need this service so desperately in our communities?

Pell grants. We have been talking about that for awhile now. We are increasing funding for Pell grants, when under previous leadership of the other party, Pell grants were actually cut. How can my colleagues live with themselves if they consider voting no on this bill that provides more money for Pell grants?

The TRIO Program, that is an extremely important program for this country. We are providing $37 million more money for TRIO programs in this country. Think about the young people that come from families that have never had an opportunity before to go to college, families around this country that have been struggling, they are finally getting an opportunity to send someone to college in their family, and TRIO is going to give them an opportunity. How can we live with ourselves if we vote against this bill that provides more money for TRIO?

The bill also contains additional money for health care professions, young people from disadvantaged areas in this country who are wanting to study to become nurses and dental hygienists in low-income areas, that provide health care in low-income areas, rural areas that oftentimes do not have health care that is necessary in their areas, this is going to provide $31 million more in funding for health care professions.

I ask my colleagues, how can they live with themselves if they consider voting no on this bill?

Please consider voting yes on this bill. We are all in this together. We want to help children, education and health care in this country. I ask Members to support us in passage of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member, for yielding me this time and commend him for his leadership, especially now, in defining the problems in this bill.

I also commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for his efforts to do the best he could with inadequate resources.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill as reported for many reasons. The bill is simply underfunded by 7.8 billion, or 11 percent, below the President's request. President Clinton demonstrated that there are ways to balance the Federal budget while at the same time investing in health and education of our people, especially our children. Indeed we will never balance the budget unless we make these investments in our children.

This bill falls short because it follows the flawed budget blueprint adopted by the Republican majority. There are three reasons, there are many reasons, but I put forth three reasons to vote against this bill: cuts in education, cuts in education, cuts in education.

Our colleagues on the Republican side get up and say that the Federal role in educating our children is only 5 percent. Indeed, under this bill we would not even be able to live up to that 5 percent. My democratic colleagues have addressed the education cuts over and over again in this debate, so I will turn to some of the cuts that affect American workers.

Mr. Chairman, during the committee's deliberations, I presented an amendment addressing a number of the concerns about protecting American workers. Under the rule I was not able to offer that amendment as presented. I would like, however, to outline my concerns with the bill with regard to vital worker protection programs.

In this bill, the Republican majority has declared war on the American worker. As the national debate continues over our commitment to American children, their education, their health and well-being, we must also address the economic well-being of their families. Over the last 2 years, primarily through the appropriations process, the 104th Republican controlled Congress has reversed decades of progress on job training, education, pensions and worker protections. This is particularly alarming when American workers and their families are menaced by trade, downsizing, technological downsizing, and other layoffs.

This year the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill makes further cuts to important initiatives for America's 923 million working men and women in 6,000,000 workplaces across the country. These initiatives promote workplace health and safety, ensure pension security, and ensure that employees have fair wages and working conditions, and indeed even limits their ability to begin to bargain collectively. Indeed they even prohibit voluntarily guidelines for ergonomics, that is, repetitive motion injuries, which are the fastest growing health problem in our workplace.

I want to refer my colleagues to this chart on the war on American workers. Safety and health enforcement in this bill is cut by 13 percent below the President's request, 9 percent below last year what is required to maintain last year's levels.

It even prohibits the new OSHA initiative and assistance to small businesses enabling them to reduce workplace accidents and fatalities.

Mine safety: The cut of 6 percent below the President's request for mine safety will mean no funds to acquire new mine safety equipment and a reduction of mine safety inspection.

Pensions: On pension protection, a cut of 22 percent below the President's request, 6 percent below current services. No funds are provided for three of the administration's pension priority protection initiatives, pension education and participants assistance, the electronic filing initiative, and the 401(k) enforcement initiative.

This is in addition to last year's Budget Reconciliation Act, which turned back the clock on protection of pension plans. Fortunately, the bill was vetoed by the President, but it would have threatened the security of pensions in 6000 pension plans.

Employment standards, the Employment Standards Administration, ESA, makes sure that ordinary Americans get a fair shake at the workplace. The enforcement of child labor laws, sweatshops, fair wage laws and fair hour laws are critical to American workers.

Funding for ESA is cut by 6 percent and is 15 percent below the President's request. As a result, reductions will have to be made in efforts to eradicate garment sweatshops and protect workers' newly won family and medical leave.

Collective bargaining, the National Labor Relations Board investigates and prosecutes unfair labor practices. It is being cut substantially, minus 20 percent, $36 million in this bill. Dislocated workers cut by 15 percent. Over 2½ million American workers lose their jobs each year due to global competition, et cetera, and will not receive assistance.

There are 81,000 fewer laid-off workers being served.

American workers are the engine of our economy. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. They also deserve a safe workplace. Despite our budget challenges, we should not retreat on worker protection. This is the wrong place and the wrong time to cut back. American workers and their families deserve better.

With that, I commend the chairman for doing the best he could with what little he had. I hope that in this battle of priorities, our national value system will say we need more for children, more for American workers, more investment in the future of our country.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his outstanding leadership on this very important piece of legislation. Just so this does not turn into too much of a he-said, she-said type of debate on this floor this evening, I would like to point out to my colleague, the gentlewoman from San Francisco, that we were able to team up in this legislation to address a very high priority for us, for our districts, and our constituents; that is to say, funding for AIDS research, prevention and treatment programs.

I wish that we could at least have the intellectual honesty to come down to the floor and acknowledge what we would like about the legislation before engaging in the partisan bashing of what we do not like about the legislation. That would be for me a very refreshing approach, I think to discussing and debating legislative issues on the House floor.

Second, I also want to point out that the bill funds the Ryan White Care Act at the House and Senate approved funding levels. So I thank both of those items are very welcome news to northern California and to those other parts of the country which have been experiencing and attempting to cope with the AIDS epidemic.

I also want to commend the subcommittee chairman for increasing funding for Head Start. I recognize that there are problems with this program regarding the lack of accountability and the lack of demonstrated results on a long-term or longitudinal basis which I hope we can address again through a serious and honest bipartisan debate. But I think it is important, since I happen to be an advocate of universal early childhood education, to continue our funding support of Head Start.

With that, I also want to point out, as previous speakers before me have on this floor, that this bill, the 1997 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education increases—I did not say decrease or cut—increases by 2.4 billion, to a total of 40.7 billion, Federal taxpayer assistance for higher education in this country. So another way of putting that is, we continue to make student aid a top priority of this Congress. And we increase funding for all of the major student aid programs as the chairman and other Members have pointed out.

Let me use this chart very quickly to make my point. We increase funding for Pell grants by $5.3 billion, we increase it to a $5.3 billion level. As the previous speakers have pointed out, the maximum Pell grant is raised to $2500 from $2470 last year. This will be the highest maximum ever provided in this country. That does not sound to me like a Republican majority, a Republican controlled Congress drastically cutting education funding.

Work study, the second most important Federal higher education program, is also increased by $68 million, and that is higher than the President's request. So come down to the floor and talk about the draconian and drastic and dire proposed cuts in the President's budget if you want to use this same rhetoric.

Lastly, the TRIO Program is increased to $500 million. This is a very important program for outreach to minority Americans. So please, do not come down here and contend that we are cutting student financial aid. This is a good spending bill. It is good policy and it increases aid for students.

□ 1945

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BLUMENAUER].

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate here this evening and have been troubled by the perverse logic that this small, but important, 5 percent of the Nation's educational expenditure is dismissed. It is dismissed by people who obviously have not been talking to the struggling school boards, teachers and principals who are tying to make do, particularly in areas like this bill that would provide less per pupil at a time when many communities are struggling with growth, as has been documented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

But most of my concern, I guess, is focused on the dismissal of the critical partnerships with State and local government. Every Member of this Chamber has benefited in the Nation's prosperity in the 25 years after World War II due in no small measure to Federal educational investment and unprecedented partnerships with local schools. Everyone benefited from that. This bill would turn its back, and I use just one example:

The bipartisan effort, the Goals 2000 to promote educational reform that has made a great deal of difference in my State increasing academic standards for students, bringing technology into classrooms, fostering an increased relationship between schools and higher education, and developing those public private partnerships between schools and employers that people talk so much about; this has been done in my State using this. And somehow we could not find less than 1 quarter of 1 percent in this bill to fund Education 2000. It is a tragic mistake. It is shortsighted and counterproductive.

Yes, it is difficult to balance the budget, but the issue is one of priority.

I just want to say that turning our back on the Federal partnership and investment, ignoring our past successes, our current obligations and our children's future is no way to achieve that goal of a balanced budget.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], an able and valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, during the War of 1812 this building was surrounded by the British. In fact, the British came in and tried to burn it. There is evidence of that as we go about this wonderful structure. What we have now, though, is an enemy, not something that is tangible, but something that we are faced with and we might get into, and that is indulgent spending.

Our Nation is spending money, this Congress is spending money, that we do not have. We are spending money of our children and our grandchildren, and what is immoral about that is it is without their permission, and this is why this bill that we have here today is so important, that we are trying to balance the budget for the sake of our Nation and, particularly, our children and our grandchildren.

On this Committee on Appropriations, this is my first term, and I was told that it was a very prestigious committee and it is one that one can go on and gain a lot of friends. But there are not a whole lot of constituents that come in and say, please, cut my program. And so we have had the job of looking at the responsibility that we have, the moral responsibility that we have, of cutting the budget and saving this country from the enemy that is from within, and we have had to say ''no.'' We have had to say ''no'' to program after program after program, and it has been tough, but we have wanted to cut spending first.

The sad thing is that we have not been able to do it with the very people who could help us the most. The architects and the caretakers of all of these spending programs that started roughly in 1964 are here today, and they could point out the waste, fraud and abuse that we have and help us, in a patriotic fashion, work together to try to balance the budget.

No. What they are doing is taking cheap shots, throwing hand grenades and trying just to get by this 1996 election. Where they could be helping us, where they could be taking some responsibility for what has happened, they are not doing it. They are saying this is cruel, this is wrong; they are bringing emotional arguments to bear so we will back down off our promise to the American people. But in 1994 we said, no, we wanted to balance the budget, and we were going to take the tough cuts.

Let me give my colleagues an example of one instance, just one agency, and that is the NLRB, the National Labor Relations Board. This board administers a program that has 1,934 employees, 500 in Washington, and the balance in field offices. It has 792 lawyers. It has 52 field offices, three in Los

Angeles alone. It has an annual rent of $8 million. We have been through the second year now of trying to ask them to help us and come on our side and bring us some semblance of reasonableness to this budget.

We have cut this budget by 15 percent not because we know how to do it, not because they have helped us do it, but they have stonewalled and said, no, we want an 8.3 percent increase, we do not want to participate to help our children and our grandchildren, and this is what we are trying to do, and that is the reason why I am supporting this bill and going to vote for it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to oppose this bill. Education is the key to the American dream and the key to global competitiveness for jobs, and this bill is inadequate, woefully inadequate to meet our young people's educational needs. Overall in this budget education is cut 7 percent below 1995 levels, 7 percent below 1995 levels, while enrollment is projected to increase by 7 percent over the next 6 years. In my State of Maryland alone enrollment has increased 12 percent between 1990 and 1995.

This bill in inadequate. It provides $7.8 billion less than the President requested.

Now, I have to tell my colleagues I am amazed when I hear Republicans puff out their chest and say, well, we only pay 5 percent of the cost of education anyway coming from the Federal Treasury. That is not something to be proud of. I dare say most taxpayers would like to see more Federal aid for education.

Now, do not be fooled. Less Federal aid means only one thing: Higher State and local taxes, higher property taxes at the local level. Less Federal aid means larger classes, less equipment and materials, and poorer classes. And I assure my colleagues that the taxpayers in poorer States and counties would like to see more Federal aid for education.

Now my colleagues have heard several of our colleagues stand up here piously and say, but we have to balance the budget. Let me give my colleagues the truth about this. They are providing $7.8 billion less than the President asked for for education, but they are providing $11 billion more than the Defense Department asked for for defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would just add that they have cut the Goals 2000 Program, which provides local assistance. They have cut safe and drug-free schools, but they say they want to fight drugs. They cut $25 million out of safe and drug-free schools, and they cut Healthy Start, which is designed to save kids. In Baltimore and my State, infant mortality under Healthy Start was reduced by 31 percent. This is an important program.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a bad bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the full committee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, many years ago a song stated that ''Diamonds are a girl's best friend''. Today, women are seekng more from life—they are looking for good health, safe communities and a future for their children. I can tell my colleagues in this regard, H.R. 3755 is truly a precious gem.

In this bill this Congress has not only talked about helping American women and their families, but it has really done it. More money has been put into the National Institutes of Health for research of heart disease, diabetes, AIDS, and cancer.

Of particular significance to me as a breast cancer survivor, and to the thousands of women who have been diagnosed with this disease, is funding under the National Cancer Institute. An increase of $6 million is provided, bringing funding level totals to $409 million to be used for breast cancer research next year. I want to personally thank my colleagues for their support of this research, and especially thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the staff. More than 46,000 American women will die from this devastating disease this year. Let me repeat—46,000 women. We are coming close to understanding this disease so that a cure may be found, and this money is sorely needed.

This Congress knows that in order to treat breast cancer and cervical cancer, women must first detect the cancer. That is why an additional $10 million has been provided for the breast and cervical cancer screening program. This program helps ensure that low-income women get the information and assistance they need to maintain good health—so that they may spend a life together with their families.

My friends, every day on the news we hear about the crimes in our streets—but what about the crimes in our homes? Every day thousands of women must face horror right in their own homes, with no one to protect them. While Congress cannot eliminate domestic violence, it can provide women with the means to get help. We in this Republican Congress have made a commitment to helping these unfortunate women. H.R. 3755 contains $25 million for battered women's shelters; $2 million for runaway youth prevention; $400,000 to operate the domestic violence hotline; and $5 million for domestic violence community demonstrations. And since violent crimes happen outside the home, as well as inside, this Congress has included $28.6 million for rape services and prevention block grants to the States, which can better serve these women.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress is compassionate and this Congress is listening. More than that, this Congress is doing something. We do not take our women for granted, we do something for them. Mr. Chairman, diamonds are no longer a girl's best friend, the 104th Congress is. I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and his staff for putting together a good bill. I urge all of my colleagues to show their friendship toward women by voting for this important bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to stand in opposition to this bill because of the elimination of the Goals 2000 Program.

I applaud Mr. PORTER for his efforts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3755 for several reasons: Freezing summer youth jobs programs, eliminating healthy start, and abortion family limits.

Perhaps the most pressing reason, however, is the elimination of funding for the Goals 2000 Program.

As a former teacher and a person who still cares passionately about the education of our youth, I am appalled by this political attack on the future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is currently ranked third in the world in terms of the reading skills of our youth.

While this may be admirable to some, I would in fact argue that we need to do better.

Given the global economy into which our children will soon be entering, and the need for the United States to remain competitive in this new international arena, it is imperative that we offer them the best education possible.

In order to help prepare our children for the future, the Congress passed, in 1993, the Goals 2000 legislation.

Unfortunately, since that time, the purposes behind Goals 2000, and the methodology involved in its implementation, have been grossly distorted.

To set the record straight, Goals 2000 is a framework to help States develop a curriculum for their public school students to help them gain the knowledge and learn the skills that will be necessary for us as a nation to remain competitive.

Goals 2000 was developed to enable us to deal with the almost 15,000 public school districts in our Nation which are charged with educating and preparing the 50+ million public school children who will be looking for help and guidance as they face the future.

It may interest my colleagues to know that approximately 5.2 million of these over 50+ million public school students reside in my home State of California.

It is in my home State in fact that our Governor, who by the way is a member of the other party, has included in his latest budget a request for funding to increase the quality of public education and decrease the class size of public school.

While I do not agree with our Governor on everything, I do agree that we need to put public education at the top of our priority list.

We need to stay competitive, and we need to educate our children. If we are sincere

about changing behavior in our urban children, if we are sincere about giving them a fighting chance to move from the bowels of despair Goals 2000 is one of the many tools which we can and should use in their fight for the future.

I therefore object strongly to this bill, and I hope that the other body shows more foresight when they consider this legislation.

I thank the gentleman again for this time and I urge my colleagues, in the strongest terms possible, to oppose this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this appropriations bill and what it does to education. I supported the coalition budget which would have balanced our budget in 2002, and provided more—not less—money for education.

It is our duty to ensure that every American child has access to education and training needed to be productive citizens. This freezing of education funds and particularly the defunding of Goals 2000 undermines our ability to honor this commitment.

Goals 2000 was created in my district in Charlottesville, VA in 1992 when President Bush and our Nation's governors conducted an education summit to determine what we could do as a nation to be more competitive in a global economy.

Goals 2000 is an effective investment in our children's future. It is fiscally responsible. Perhaps most importantly, Goals 2000 is needed by our Nation's schools.

Goals 2000 provides money for computers, microscopes, and library books. As honorary chairman of Pittsylvania County Goals 2000, I know first hand the vital aid it gives to schools—particularly in rural areas, such as my own.

We owe it to our children, ourselves, and future generations to provide adequate funding for education and to restore funding for Goals 2000.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a valued Member of our full committee.

(Mr. BUNN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2000

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, let me start my remarks by saying that I appreciate all the hard work the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has put into this package. Funding for crucial health care programs was increased over last year and I fully support those efforts. However, I think we could have done more for higher education.

We can all argue the merits of Federal education funding versus State education funding, but maintaining access to higher education is a crucial role of the Federal Government. We need to ensure that our students who have the ability can continue to attend the best higher education facilities in the world. If we continue to decrease our commitment to higher education students, our schools will decline and our colleges and universities will be for the rich, not the best and brightest.

This bill eliminates the State student incentive program. This bill eliminates capital contributions to the Perkins loan program. This bill increases the maximum Pell grant by a little over 1 percent, not even keeping up with inflation. We need to do better, and I think we can.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me, and I want to commend all of those involved in this important issue of providing education and other resources for our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, although there are many features of this bill that are better than last year, there are far many more features of this bill that we find unacceptable. I only want to use my time to highlight two of those, and perhaps not emphasize as much as my other colleagues have about education, but education indeed is important, and we have not invested enough in education.

Also, the other issue that we have not invested anything whatsoever in is teenage pregnancy. Teenage pregnancy is a hot subject now; we talk about that, but we have the dubious distinction of leading the world in this area. No other industrialized nation with a standard of living comparable to the United States has a problem of this dimension.

Eash year approximately 1 million teenagers become pregnant. Teenage pregnancy significantly affects the health of teenagers, as well as their economic and educational future. Once a teenager becomes pregnant there is no good solution. The best solution indeed is to prevent the pregnancy in the first place.

Teenagers having kids, we talk about that. In fact, many of our Members here on the floor say we can no longer afford that. Demagoguery is very easy. Meaningful action means deeds are difficult. We have provided no funding whatsoever. The President asked for $30 million for the teenage pregnancy prevention initiative, and not one cent was provided, when we know it costs this Nation about $6.9 billion in the costs of providing for teenage pregnancy and their children. This would have been less than one-half of 1 percent. Again, voting for teenage pregnancy would indeed have enabled our young people to improve their health and education and economic opportunity for our Nation's youth.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our investment in education is indeed our investment in our future. Many organizations, our colleagues, and millions of citizens say we should invest more in education, not less.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman who just spoke: Education is the future of this country. I do not think there is demagoguery. I think there is an honest debate here on policy, whether we want the Federal Government to be able to have the control to spend the dollars in education, or we want people in States to control that. I think that is a legitimate debate. That is what is before us today. I do not think there is demagoguery. I think people truly believe. I believe that those that believe that a socialistic model for the poor is better are wrong. That is what I would like to speak about tonight.

Mr. Chairman, my friend who spoke in the well a minute ago said he wishes there were more dollars in the Federal education system than just 5 percent. I believe that is not demagoguery, I believe he believes that. We, however, believe that people can control their dollars more and spend it on their children than the Federal Government can. They can get a bigger bang for the dollar than the Federal Government can with its big bureaucracy.

Yes, only 5 percent of education funding comes from the Federal Government. In some cases, as little as 23 cents on a dollar, 23 cents on a dollar, gets back into the classroom in many areas. That is wrong, Mr. Chairman. That is a waste. That is cutting education. And I propose that the liberal Democrats that are trying to save education have done it a great harm and have actually cut education. When we only get 23 cents on the dollar back into the classroom, that is cutting education. We are proposing to turn that around.

How? First of all, that 5 percent of education funding, we have found there are 760 education programs. Think about the bureaucracies, think about the overhead that takes. We eliminated over 187 programs. We believe, yes, that medical research, the Government has a direct function in. Those savings ought to go to that. We believe that Pell grants for the poor are important and a priority. We took the savings from that and put it into the Pell grants. We increased student loans by $3 billion.

Yes, even though the dollars come to the Federal Government and are returned at a low rate, those are priorities, and I think most taxpayers do not discern those dollars because they go to help the poor and the children. But we do believe that the Federal waste in the programs is not the way to go.

Let me give an example. Some of my colleagues truly believe, they are not demagoging, they believe in Goals 2000. But as the chairman of the committee, let me tell the Members about Goals 2000. There are 45 instances in Goals

2000 that says States that mandate, it says States will. They say it is only voluntary. It is only voluntary if you do not want the money.

Let us take one of those 45 instances. My wife is a principal. You have to take all of the requirements from Goals 2000, internalize it, have a board that literally looks and sees how to run Goals 2000. They report to the principal. The principal reports to the superintendent. Then all of that paperwork goes to Sacramento, to our State Department of Education. Think of the bureaucracy in the State that has to take the flow of all the schools in the State of California. Think of that paperwork flow and all that wasted energy. Then guess what they do? They have to send it back here to River City, in Washington, DC, to another big bureaucracy.

That is wasteful, Mr. Chairman. In many cases they have to hire grant writers to apply for Goals 2000 money. The small schools in many cases never get a dime, and some that do, the cost of the grant writer, either in the little funding they get or the cost to exercise Goals 2000, is more than the grant that they get. That is cutting education, Mr. Chairman.

What we do is give the money to the State and say, listen, if you want to do a George Bush Goals 2000, let the State do it. We think Goals 2000, by setting local standards, local goals with teachers and parents and children and administrators is good. But what the real policy fight is about is if the Federal Government can manage all of that, if the Federal Government can control the dollars.

Where do they get those dollars? They keep saying the President's request. Does he get that money from God? No. He gets it from the same working families that he returns it to, at 23 cents on a dollar. Yet he wants more money to spend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS].

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me time to rise in opposition to this year's spending bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

This measure provides inadequate funding for many of our vital programs that have proven to be beneficial to individual families, our communities and our nation as a whole.

I am deeply dismayed that this measure has taken a ''meatax'' to the Healthy Start Program. H.R. 3755 radically eliminates all funding for this program that is saving lives across the country.

Historically, my congressional district of Baltimore has experienced an exceedingly high rate of infant mortality. Many high risk areas in the city had twice the national average of infant deaths.

However with the implementation of the Healthy Start Program in 1993, Baltimore has severely reduced the number of babies born with low birth weights, and dramatically reduced the number of infant mortalities. Ours, is truly a success story.

The Baltimore Healthy Start Program is one of the most successful programs in the entire country. We have targeted the program's services to the poorest areas of the city which are at the highest risk. Baltimore's neighborhood Healthy Start program has currently serviced about 2,000 women.

The staff is mostly comprised of community residents who have been hired and trained through the program—thereby providing important employment opportunities to the community.

The staff in conjunction with the mayor's office, and the surrounding community are committed to ensuring that all babies have a strong and healthy beginning by providing important prenatal care to high risk mothers who need it most.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly shocked that this body would attempt to pass a measure that eliminates this vital program which has proven and tangible results.

I am shocked that this body would take away the one opportunity to give our poorest and most vulnerable citizens the gift of life.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking and congratulating the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for what has been a remarkable job, given the conflicting desires that exist in trying to manage a bill as large as this Labor-HHS appropriations bill. He has done, as I say, a magnificent job. He has one of the toughest jobs on Capital Hill.

I want to talk to Members a bit about one program, one very important program that is in this bill that has received an historic increase, the Community Service Block Grant Program. This is a program that the President recommended no increase in. It is a program that receives in this bill a 27-percent or $100 million increase. We have never in the history of funding the community service block grants ever received an increase as large as this. It is deserved, because it encapsulates everything we are trying to do in terms of an important antipoverty program. It is one of the premier antipoverty programs within the Federal arsenal.

It is important and significant and worthy of additional funding because it does all the things we say we want to do. It leverages public dollars. Over $1 billion in non-Federal spending will exist because of the spending in the community service block grants. It ensures that there is volunteer activity. There is almost 20 million hours of volunteer activity as a result of the community service block grant programs and the community action programs that are part of the network through the community service block grants. It is a program that targets the neediest, the low-income, the people who are struggling. It facilitates nutrition programs. It helps seniors. It deals with the retired programs. It ensures that there are training programs that go forward.

Part of the money is used to ensure that there is comprehensive collaboration so money is not wasted in duplicative efforts. Only 5 percent of the money can be spent by the States. The rest of it goes down and gets to the intended targets. Get down there it does. It is a program with proven results.

This does not create bureaucracies, it empowers people. Let us save people first, and if we do it right, we will save money in the same process. In 1981, Mr. Chairman, there were over 1,000 Federal employees that helped administer this program. Do Members know how many exist right now to administer this program? Five hundred, 400, 300, 100, 50, 25? Forty-five Federal employees now administer a program that was once run by over 1,000 Federal employees. That means more money gets to the grass roots. It means more money is being used to help people at the bottom rung of the economic ladder.

It is a program that has gotten the attention of people who are deeply concerned in poverty programs and not interested in building more bureaucracies. It has gotten the attention of people who are interested in measuring results, not inputs. It has gotten the attention and support of people who are not interested in creating more patronage, but people who are interested in creating more empowerment and more opportunities for the lowest income people, lowest income Americans among us. There were over 1,000 community action agencies throughout our Nation. Over 98 percent of the counties throughout our Nation receive some form of this block grant. It goes primarily to not-for-profits, people who have dedicated their lives to ensure that they help the neediest among us.

This is a vision that we have of antipoverty programs, not to throw more spending. Again I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for funding a very important anti-poverty program in the most significant and historic way.

□ 2015

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, almost all of the money in this bill that is being expended is for good purposes.

The problem is not with what is in the bill, it is what is not in the bill, what is out of it. I am glad we are able to do something on community service, put $100 million in, but we take $1 billion out of LIHEAP. I am glad we are able to provide some money for education, but when someone says the Federal Government is the program, is the sum and total program for higher education, that is it. The nonprofits and others are running out.

But the real problem is that beneath the veneer of fighting for fiscal discipline and budget balance, the policy path evoked by this measure will build upon the distorted priorities of the 1996 Republican appropriation effort, in sum, adding to the human deficit in this Nation, a human deficit which is borne by those with less power, the children, the working poor, the students, and those who struggle to achieve the promise of America. The opportunity to get ahead.

Investment in people is our best American investment. It pays the greatest dividends. Yet this measure in the Republican-led House has repeatedly broken faith with our children, our workers, and, in reality, our American future. I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure for that reason.

As a teacher, as a science educator, I understand. In my district, 25 percent of the kids are Southeast Asians. They need the bilingual education. They need the help so that they can achieve the type of success and the American dream that has been the promise, the renewed promise, of this Nation. But we cannot do it because we have put 7, 8, 9, $10 billion more into Pentagon spending, because we need to have tax breaks.

What is wrong with this measure is that the money is going in other directions where it is not needed. I think it is more justified here. And if it is efficiencies and new definitions and all the other rhetoric that is going on here today in terms of what we are going to do, the fact is, the bottom line is the States are not capable of the miracle of loaves and fishes. So if we do not give them the dollars, we are going to hurt the people that we purport to be helping in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 1997 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill being considered today.

Investments in education, whether in our children or workers, determine a nation's standard of living and a country's ability to be competitive in the global marketplace. This legislation, like last year's spending bill, targets labor, education and job training programs for the most severe funding cuts. These types of programs, which invest in America's working families and children should not and must not be undermined.

This legislation reduces funding for elementary and secondary education programs such as Title I, Safe and Drug Free Schools and bilingual education. The cut in title I funding is in addition to the funding freeze the program endured last year, which translated into a real cut for growing school districts. Title I provides students who are falling behind their classmates additional academic help. In my district in St. Paul, MN, the title I program cannot currently reach every student who needs such assistance. Reducing funding for this program would cause even more students to fall behind in their studies, and this type of policy has consequences that reach far beyond these students' school years into their post-academic lives. We cannot ignore some students, inhibiting their success, simply because they have difficulty learning.

In the same regard, we also cannot ignore that today's school environment is becoming more violent and dangerous in many, especially but not solely urban, areas. The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program is one initiative, run in virtually every school district in the nation, working to fight that trend. However, the program after protracted debate over a 57 percent cut was finally level funded in last year's Republican budget, and the bill we are debating today proposes to reduce funding for this program by again $25 million in fiscal year 1997. This means that in fiscal year 1997, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program will be funded at a level below its allocation in fiscal year 1995, at a time when the need for such drug, alcohol and violence preventative programs are dramatically increasing!

One other population of students who will be hurt by this legislation is immigrant children. Funding for bilingual and immigrant education programs is set to be reduced by 11 percent in this spending bill. Multiethnic communities and schools will be hit especially hard since these schools must continue providing such services with less Federal help. Investing in the education of these children is important. These children should not be left out in the cold regarding educational opportunity, unable to improve their lives and become productive members of our society.

The bill also takes aim at higher education, increasing funding for some student aid programs while eliminating or sparsely funding others. The measure modestly increases the maximum Pell grant award by $30; not enough for a book much less inflation but this bill does increase funding for the Work-Study Program. However, at the same time, the bill reduces Perkins Loan funding by 82 percent and eliminates the State Student Incentive Grant Program altogether. In a time when the cost of a higher education is skyrocketing, the need for such a degree is growing, and parents are less able to help with such expenses, we cannot afford to pull the financial rug out from under our Nation's students.

The Federal Government is the lifeline of higher education funding, States and nonprofits are stretched to the limit, yet this Congress proposes to do less compounding and cutting off opportunity for 100,000 students.

Today's workers could also lose the ability to acquire additional education and job training under this bill due to the lack of sufficient funding for such programs and services. This measure freezes spending on such programs at the fiscal year 1996 level. Our Nation benefits greatly from developing the skills and abilities of future generations of workers and allowing those workers to update that knowledge and skill. No amount of infrastructure, technology, or opportunity will help our Nation's workers and future workers if they are unable to meet the challenges of the world of work.

Another drastic provision in this measure is the reduction in funding for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] by $6 million from the fiscal year 1996 level in this Republican spending bill. This funding is vital to workers, whose lives, health and safety are literally at risk on the job. Each year, thousands of workers are killed on the job and millions suffer disability related injuries. The National Safety Council estimates that work-related accidents and deaths cost the Nation over $100 billion every year. Cutting the budget of the principal public entity OSHA, that attempts to reduce that figure and increase workplace safety not only is a slap in the face to every American worker who puts their health and safety on the line, but also does not make fiscal sense. Furthermore, the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB] is targeted for a 15 percent cut when combined with funding cuts from last year. This proposed reduction would cripple the NLRB's ability to adjudicate labor disputes and appears to be yet another slap at working people who seek equitable wages and work conditions based upon worker rights promised in Federal law.

I agree that we should work toward a balanced Federal budget, but there are many ways to achieve such a balance than abandoning the investments that America has long made in its working families. Not all of the cuts need to be made from people programs and surely the ideological mindset that guides these cuts cannot be glossed over by the rhetoric of budget balancing. The Pentagon, space programs, corporate welfare and natural resource giveaway are just some of the many Federal programs that should also be subject to fiscal discipline and tough choices. The price for reducing investments in America's people should not be new tax breaks for corporations and investors or increasing the defense budget to a greater level than that Department even requested. But this 104th Congress has acted repeatedly to insulate from shared sacrifice this laundry list of special interests and placed foremost for cuts the vital programs that affect health, education, job training, and the environment.

This Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations measure for fiscal year 1997 continues the assault on working Americans and families that was so vigorously waged last year. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this measure and return our Nation to one that values all of its people.

Beneath the veneer of fighting for fiscal discipline and budget balance, the policy path evoked by this measure would build upon the distorted priorities of the 1996 Republican appropriation effort, in sum, adding to the human deficit in this Nation.

A human deficit which is borne by those with less power, the children, the working poor, the students and those who struggle to achieve the promise of America; the opportunity to get ahead. Investment in people is our best American investment; it pays the greatest dividends yet this measure and the Republican-led House has repeatedly broke faith with our children, our workers, in reality our American future.

I oppose and urge Members to oppose this appropriation measure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

As ranking member OBEY said, ''This bill puts forth systematic disinvestment in education, health, seniors, children, women, and the list goes on.

Specifically, I would like to talk about the disastrous effects of zero funding the Healthy Start Infant Mortality Prevention Program.

By eliminating funding for Healthy Start, this bill abandons America's children.

In New York City, Healthy Start has saved lives.

From 1990 to 1994, over 70,000 women and infants have benefited from this program; the infant mortality rate dropped by 38 percent; the rate of late or no prenatal care fell 32 percent; and the number of low birth-weight babies went down.

We also know that Healthy Start is responsible for saving precious Medicaid dollars by producing healthier babies.

Mr. Chairman, if we refuse basic health care to our newborns, what kind of priorities have we set?

If we turn our backs on young mothers-to-be what kind of example have we set?

If we don't prove that we care about giving every newborn baby the opportunity to have a Healthy Start, what kind of nation are we?

Mr. Chairman, totally defunding Healthy Start is a sad example of a tragic reversal of priorities.

No one should support this bill.

The Labor/HHS bill cuts any specified funding for the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, which funds each State office that trains volunteers who serve as watchdogs over nursing home abuses and serve as advocates for nursing home patients.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stand up for the rights of seniors who live in America's nursing homes.

Today, the war on America's seniors continues as the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program faces elimination by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, New York State's network of 51 countywide ombudsman offices have a trained team of over 500 volunteers who protect seniors who are being abused, neglected, and mistreated in nursing homes in this State alone.

Long before this program was created in 1987, we saw rampant abuses in nursing homes—including patients being tied to their beds, drugged, and worse.

By creating the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, many of these problems were corrected, but we still have more work to do.

In total last year, New York's team of nursing home watchdogs handled over 10,000 complaints from nursing home residents and their advocates—at least 2,000 of them in New York City.

For those residents of long-term care facilities who have no one to protect them from mistreatment, the Long-Term Care Ombudsman is their only hope.

To eliminate funding for this important program in gross negligence on the part of this Congress.

As responsible legislators, we must provide a voice to those who are silenced by abusive conditions in our States' nursing homes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from Maryland before her both have mentioned the Healthy Start program, and I want to respond to that, because they are correct, it has shown itself through demonstration to be a very good program.

The difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that this was a program proposed by and started by the Bush administration in fiscal year 1991, funded by Congress with the clear understanding that it would be a 5-year demonstration, including evaluation, with the last year of funding to be fiscal year 1996.

We believe that the program has proved itself very adequately. The difficulty is that it should not continue as a demonstration program where it is not made available generally. Under the original conception of the program, it was to be a 5-year demonstration. That period has expired. It is time that we either fund this as a general program available broadly across the country or not fund it at all.

I think that the points made about the program are very good ones. What we have to do is come to grips with which way we are going to go on that. We cannot do this in the appropriations process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I would just ask rhetorically to the chairman of the subcommittee from Illinois, under those circumstances, why did they not make it a general program and put money in for making it a general program? I will yield time for that answer if there is any left when I get finished.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. I could find compelling reason to oppose many features of the bill but I want to confine my comments to the field of education.

Mr. Chairman, once again this body is jeopardizing our children's future. So far the 104th Congress has cut $1.1 billion from education. This proposal cuts $400 million more. When do we say enough is enough?

Eliminating the Goals 2000 education reform, which this bill does, when academically our students lag behind virtually all our industrialized competitors, is foolish. Cutting $25 million from safe and drug free schools, which this bill does, is bad judgment. And cutting funds for reading and math assistance for students who just happen to live in desperately poor school districts, which this bill does, is without compassion as well as violates our national security.

Balancing the budget is everybody's goal but slashing education is, in my view, simply wrong. I urge my colleagues to reassess our priorities and put education first, ahead of tax cuts for the already well-off, ahead of unrequested defense spending, ahead of corporate welfare. Thereby, I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 5 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to close.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank ranking member OBEY for this opportunity to really offer an apology to the American people. I was hoping that as we looked at a bill that had the opportunity to really change the direction of this country, to focus on the front end and not the back end, if you will, this bill has missed its opportunity and I rose to the floor to say this is not the ''3 strikes bill and you're out,'' it is the ''multistrike bill and we're all out,'' primarily because you do not know where to start in the cuts that have come about that would help people to rise out of their condition and become independent.

We have heard so much about welfare reform and the dominance of this country in having people extend their hand to get a handout. This labor-HHS bill could have given people an opportunity never to look back and to become independent, particularly when we look at the President's youth employment training program. When we go throughout this Nation, aside from those who are attempting to get a higher education, there are those youth who have been lost between the cracks of either not finishing high school or finishing high school and being undertrained for jobs in this community. This program would have allowed us to train youth to become available and well trained for the jobs that America has to offer. This money now has been gutted. And so we are not investing in the front end, we are looking to the back end when ultimately maybe these youth will wind up being incarcerated.

The youth summer jobs program has no growth in it, although I am gratified we have saved it, this program that helps to employ some 4,000 youth in the city of Houston had to be cut. Many parents came to me and said, ''What are we going to do in training our youngsters to know what work is all about?'' And then unfortunately with a Nation that has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the western world, we cut the Healthy Start Program. There we go again with no investment in the front end, waiting on the back end results of low birth weight opportunities.

I would simply ask my colleagues to review this legislation and this appropriation bill, go to the front end and invest and not wait for the back end. Defeat this legislation so that we can treat Americans right.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this legislation. I am afraid that, in its current form, this bill does not do enough to protect the quality of life for our most vulnerable citizens. This bill funds a great number of the programs and services that are relied upon by our Nation's families—our children, women, and senior citizens. I do not believe that these are the programs that we should be drastically cutting in our efforts to balance the budget. We must maintain our commitment to protect children and families, to support education and training, and to continue programs such as head start, healthy start, substance abuse prevention and treatment, and summer jobs.

LABOR PROGRAMS

This bill seriously jeopardizes worker protection by dramatically cutting programs that promote workplace safety and health, and pension security. Funding is cut by $129 million below the President's request and $83 million below the amount needed to maintain last year's operating level. The Pension and Welfare Benefit Administration is provided with only $65.8 million, which is a $1.3 million cut from the current funding level and $19.7 million below the President's request.

One of the best known worker protection agencies is the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA], is cut by over $6 million. This bill would specifically reduce Federal enforcement of workplace safety by $4,765,000. OSHA enforces this Nation's labor protection laws and as a law enforcement authority it may not be popular with the law breakers, but for those they serve and protect everyday do not want this Congress under valuing their life or health.

When my colleagues speak so passionately about the American taxpayer, there are speaking about people that the Department of Labor should be in the business of protecting and whose pension plans should be assured of solvency when they are needed. That is the least the working American taxpayer should expect from the 104th Congress.

This bill would also zero out funding for the President's new youth employment training program, the Opportunity Areas for Out-of-School Youth. The President only requested $250 million to help address the special employment training problems faced by many of our Nation's youth.

This legislation will once again shortchange our youth through the underfunding of the Youth Summer Jobs Program for fiscal year 1997. The $625 million appropriated is the same level funded for this fiscal year. At this level of funding only 442,000 youth can be served while those in need number over 600,000.

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

This bill would eliminate funding for the healthy start program, which is designed to reduce the Nation's high infant mortality rate. Now is not the time to dismantle this critical life saving program. The United States has the highest infant mortality rate of 22 industrialized nations. Furthermore, while low birthweight babies represent 7 percent of all births, they account for 57 percent of the cost of care for all newborns. Long term health care costs for a low birth weight baby can reach $500 thousand, while prenatal care to prevent low birth weight costs as little as $750.00. Clearly, we must continue this important program.

I am concerned that this bill includes less funding for the Centers for Disease Control's National Center of Injury Prevention and Control. This important program focuses on motor vehicle accidents, falls, fires, poisoning, drowning and violence including homicide, suicide and domestic violence.

Similarly, the bill provides less funding for the Substance Abuse an Mental Health Services Administration. The amount ($1.85 billion) is an aggregated cut of $33.9 million below the current funding level and is $248 million below the administration's request. The $38.4 million fiscal year 1997 funding cut for substance abuse treatment is compounded by the fact that funding for treatment was gutted 60 percent, or $148 million in fiscal year 1996. As a result of this decrease in funding, 5 million at-risk youth will be denied the substance abuse prevention services they need.

The $3.6 billion provided for the Head Start Program is $381 million less than the administration's request. This program currently serves less than half of the estimated 2 million children eligible for head start services. At the level provided in this bill up to 15 thousand head start slots would be eliminated next year.

This bill provides only $900 million for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which provides assistance to low-income households in meeting the costs of home energy. This is $100 million less than the administration's request. Furthermore, the bill does not appropriate any of the $1 billion requested for fiscal year 1998. The advance appropriation is critical to States' budgeting and planning and allows them the time necessary to determine the program eligibility rules.

This bill includes a large cut in funding for the Administration on Aging, including the elimination of all funds for aging research, training and special projects which will hamper local communities' ability to improve, develop and test innovative solutions. Similarly, the amount of funding provided for the Social Services Block Grant is still $320 million below the entitlement level of $2.8 billion required by current law, and requested by the administration. For States that do not provide additional funding for social services, the impact will be especially severe as this program, includes support for protective services for children and adults, home-based care, and child care.

This bill does not include the $30 million the administration requested for a concentrated teen pregnancy initiative, which would have been invested in comprehensive interventions to provide opportunities for young people to take responsibility, increase their life skills and to become contributing members of society. The U.S. has the highest rate of teen pregnancy of any industrialized country. Addressing this problem is key to reforming the Nation's welfare system.

I am pleased that this bill increases funding for the National Institutes of Health, however the $1.4 billion provided for AIDS is provided at the institute level rather than in a single appropriation to the Office of AIDS Research as requested by the administration and as consistent with the NIH Revitalization Act.

EDUCATION

The bill does nothing to address what nearly everyone agrees is our most important task—educating our children. Funding for Goals 2000 is eliminated. The program is currently $350 million and the President requested $491 million for Goals 2000 in fiscal year 1997. This program strives to raise academic standards and encourage students to work hard to meet them. Now it not the time to scale back on improving education standards for children across the Nation.

This bill freezes Title 1 grants to local education agencies at $6.73 billion. This means that given inflation and increased operating costs, fewer funds will be available to provide students the assistance they need in basic reading and math skills. Title 1 currently provides supplemental funding to 50 thousand schools serving nearly 7 million disadvantaged students nationwide. Under Title 1, disadvantaged students are provided the assistance they need to achieve the same high standards as other children.

This bill cuts the Safe and Drug Free School Program by $25 million compared with fiscal year 1996 and $99 million less than requested by President Clinton. In this time of increased crime, violence, and drug abuse, we must help our schools become safe havens where children can learn and study free from the dangers of these afflictions.

For college students, the bill eliminates aid for the Federal Perkins Loan capital contribution account. In fiscal year 1996, $93.3 million was provided for this program. In almost every other educational program—Adult and Vocational education, Special Education Grants for Children with Disabilities, Bilingual and Immigrant education, Pell Grants, Charter Schools and many others—the funding levels in this bill are far below the level requested by President Clinton.

The priorities of this bill are out of line with common sense. All participants agree that balancing the budget is a goal that we all share. However, we must also invest in our children and their future. There is no use in passing on a balanced budget to our children if we deprive them of the education that is necessary in order for them to take the mantel of leadership.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman PORTER for the outstanding job he did with this piece of legislation. Make no mistake about it, people on both sides of the aisle here have the same ultimate purpose. We want to help kids. We want to make sure kids have a chance to go to college. We want to help protect our workers. We want to make sure that education is a key priority. We agree on that. My personal experience as someone who went to school on a student loan and could not have gone otherwise, as someone who taught in a public school for 7 years and in an urban depressed school district and as someone who ran a Federal title I program for 3 years, I think I know something about some of the programs we are talking about.

There is a key difference, Mr. Chairman, between what the administration wants and what this Congress wants. The difference is that the administration wants to empower the bureaucracy and we want to empower people. It is very simple and very fundamental. We heard in the debate on the other side from our more liberal friends that there is no help for job training, for housing assistance, for energy assistance, for child care, for homeless shelters, for health care for the poor and for housing rehab, to name a few. What they did not say, Mr. Chairman, is that this bill increases the community service block grant by the single largest amount in the program's history since 1981, $100 million, Mr. Chairman. Where is the rhetoric coming from the other side in the largest single increase in this program's history? And where is the acknowledgment, Mr. Chairman, on the other side that this will allow us to assist 2.1 million more people than we assisted last year to a total of 10.3 million? And where is the information from the other side about the leveraging of another $267 million of private sector investment which is what all 1,200 community action agencies across the country do in every one of our Members' districts.

This is a good bill. It is a key difference between what the liberals want and what we want. We want to empower people. We want to empower grassroots decisionmakers. We want to empower those people who are involved in community action agencies like the one I started in my county back in 1979 which has grown to a $14 million a year agency providing all of these services.

I say vote ''yes'' for this bill and I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], a member of the full committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, as I went back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and looked at what the Democrats had to say about this bill last year, it was just absolutely ridiculous, offbase political rhetoric, just like we are hearing this year: war on children, mindless, mean-spirited package. It is the same old thing. The Democrats want to smoke but they do not want to inhale. They want to cut the budget but not here, not this bill, not now, not this group.

The fact is, my Democrat friends, that money is not always the solution. Just one particular case, one small example: Since 1970 per-student spending in America has increased from $4,000 to $7,000 per student. Yet during that same period of time SAT scores have fallen from 937 points in 1972 to 902 points in 1994.

Money, money, money is not always the answer. So let us try to put our investments in programs that work, cut out the Washington bureaucracy, empower the people back home, and pass this bill.

□ 2030

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear we have absolutely no quarrel with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. He has done a fine job under the circumstances, and I honestly believe his heart is in the right place. The problem, frankly, as we see it, is simply that the budget priorities of Speaker GINGRICH and the majority party in this House are simply wrong. They say, oh, it is okay to give $11 billion more than the President or the Pentagon is asking for the Pentagon; but, oh, by the way, we have got to balance the budget.

So what did they do? They put us on a 6-year track that will knock one million kids off the most important program supported by the Federal Government to teach kids to read and to help them to master science and mathematics. They cut the Eisenhower teacher training program, an immensely popular program with any teacher in any district who is interested in improving his or her ability to convey information to children.

They zero out Perkins loans. They, in fact, in the education area provide over the next 6 years—and this is the first step in that process—they provide 20 percent less in real deliverable program support for education over that time period at the very time when student populations are rising after a long time when those student populations were declining. They say, oh, we must make up for inflation when we appropriate funds to the Pentagon; but, oh, no, there is no need to make up for the cost of inflation when we are dealing with education. I find that separation and logic to be an extremely interesting revelation in terms of the respective priorities of the parties.

The majority party says we should honor work. I agree with that. I worked hard all my life. So did my kids. So did most other people in this Chamber. But after they say we should honor work, what do they do? They cut the National Labor Relations Board by 15 percent so they limit the ability of that agency in a severe way to protect worker health, to protect worker safety, to protect the integrity of worker pension plans, and to enforce the law that guarantees that workers will be treated fairly and squarely on wages and hours.

They drive a billion-dollar hole through a crucial program that provides assistance to low-income elderly and low-income individuals under the low-income heating assistance program. Then they brag about putting 10 percent of that money back by way of community service block grants.

I take a back seat to no one in my support for community service block grants. For year after year after year on that subcommittee, it was DAVE OBEY who pushed that program against many times almost unanimous opposition on the Republican side of the aisle and some opposition on my own side of the aisle. So I take a back seat to no one in my pleasure that that program is finally getting a justifiable increase. But do not pretend that that tiny increase for that program makes up for the deep-sixing that my colleagues are doing on so many other initiatives to help the very same people that that program is aimed at.

I thank God for small favors, and I thank the subcommittee chairman, but I do not get overly excited about it. I would simply say that this bill, more than any other, as Bill Natcher used to say, this bill more than any other is meant to help meet the needs of workers and people. We should not be squeezing it, as this proposal does.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I really want to acknowledge Chairman PORTER and the members of the subcommittee for their efforts on a very difficult bill. While I have some concerns with some of the programs in terms of the education area, I do appreciate the chairman's work to develop a fair bill that funds so many critical programs. I am strongly supportive of the 6.5 percent increase in overall funding for research at the National Institutes of Health. I know of no Member of Congress with a greater commitment to biomedical research than Chairman PORTER. And as the representative in Congress for the NIH, I greatly appreciate his strong support in protecting the integrity of the NIH professional judgment budget.

I also commend him for his efforts to ensure that Congress does not interfere with funding priorities established by the scientific community. In that regard, the Office of AIDS Research at NIH continues to plan for AIDS research, which is conducted among the

24 institutes, also centers and divisions at NIH. The committee has provided report language that clearly recognizes the integral role which the NIH Office of AIDS Research plays in coordinating AIDS research. I believe there is a critical need for the OAR to have sufficient budgetary authority to effectively manage AIDS research dollars, and I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman PORTER and the committee to see that OAR be granted the budgetary authority it needs to manage the AIDS programs across the NIH. Such authority, which has been strongly endorsed in an external evaluation of the NIH's AIDS program by our Nation's leading scientists, will ensure accountability in spending AIDS research dollars.

I commend the chairman of the committee for including funding increases for AIDS research and prevention and the Ryan White Care Act. I also appreciate the inclusion of report language that I submitted again this year expressing the importance of continued funding for research on microbicides.

Mr. Chairman, I guess there is no more time left, but I want to comment on continued support for the violence against women program and the increased funding for breast and cervical cancer research.

Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge Chairman PORTER and the members of the subcommittee for their efforts on a very difficult bill. While I have concerns with the funding levels for education, I do appreciate the chairman's work to develop a fair bill that funds so many critical programs.

I am strongly supportive of the 6.5 percent increase in overall funding for research at the National Institutes of Health. I know of no Member of Congress with a greater commitment to biomedical research than Chairman PORTER, and, as the Representative in Congress for the NIH, I greatly appreciate his strong support in protecting the integrity of the NIH professional judgment budget. I also commend him for his efforts to ensure that Congress does not interfere with funding priorities established by the scientific community.

In that regard, the Office of AIDS Research [OAR] at NIH continues to plan for AIDS research, which is conducted among the 24 institutes, centers, and divisions at NIH. The committee has provided report language, similar to the report language provided in fiscal year 1996, defining the authority of the OAR. While I am pleased that the committee has continued to provide limited transfer authority to the OAR, I remain convinced that AIDS research funding at NIH can best be managed through providing maximum budgetary authority, in the form of a consolidated appropriation, to the OAR.

During the past year, a group of highly respected leaders in the biomedical research community conducted a thorough evaluation of AIDS research funding at NIH. This group, which was chaired by Dr. Arnold Levine of Princeton University, released a report in March 1996, which included recommendations to strengthen the management, oversight, and accountability of AIDS research funding among the 24 institutes, centers, and divisions, involved in AIDS research at NIH.

Dr. Levine's working group has provided specific recommendations regarding scientific priorities and improved coordination of AIDS research activities, and has recommended that Congress provide the OAR with maximum budgetary and management authority.

I believe strongly that Congress has a responsibility to ensure that our biomedical research dollars are being spent in a well-managed, coordinated fashion. Decisions relating to the provision of budget authority to the OAR should be made in the interests of the best possible management of scientific resources. As the committee works to reconcile differences with the other body later this fall, I urge the committee to re-think their position on the level of budgetary and management authority provided to the OAR, and to use the Levine Report, with an eye toward achieving the most effective possible management of AIDS research funding.

I commend the chairman and committee for including funding increases for AIDS research, prevention, and the Ryan White CARE Act. I also appreciate the inclusion of report language I submitted again this year expressing the importance of continued funding for research on microbicides for STD/HIV prevention and the Women's Interagency HIV Study, two research priorities for women in the HIV epidemic.

I am also pleased with the continued support for the Violence Against Women Act programs, and the increased funding for women's health research and services.

As a former teacher, I believe that education must be one of our top priorities. I am concerned that this bill cuts another $400 million from public education programs.

Violence in our Nation's schools and student drug use are among the top concerns of most Americans. Yet, this legislation cuts $25 million from the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. The number of students served by the Individuals With Disabilities Act [IDEA] is increasing. Yet, this bill freezes, at last year's level, funding for special education grants to the States. That means that States will get even less Federal assistance with the burgeoning costs of educating children with disabilities.

I also oppose the portion of the bill that prohibits funds from being used to benefit persons not lawfully within the United States. School officials throughout the U.S. would then be required to determine the citizenship status of every student and their parents. This would create a paper nightmare, and would turn local school districts into mini-immigration services.

Most immigrants, documented or not, most likely will remain in the United States. If we do not educate these individuals, they will end up on the streets. Instead of contributing to the tax base of our society, these children would only add to the long-term problems of homelessness and crime.

The future of our country is linked to the quality of education that we afford our children. It is in the national interest to assist States and local governments to provide the best possible education for our Nation's students.

I look forward to working with the chairman to increase funding for these programs in conference, and I appreciate his skill and sensitivity toward meeting the tremendous needs addressed in this critical bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Chairman, of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3744

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, 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, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act; the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act; the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; $4,171,482,000 plus reimbursements, of which $3,297,011,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998; of which $73,861,000 is available for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 2000 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers; and of which $175,000,000 shall be available from July 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998, for carrying out activities of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act: *Provided,* That 450,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, $65,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 402 of such Act, $7,300,000 shall be for carrying out section 441 of such Act, $2,530,000 shall be for all activities conducted by and through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee under such Act, $850,000,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, and $126,672,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part C of such Act: *Provided further,* That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided further,* That funds provided to carry out title III of the Job Training Partnership Act shall not be subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) of section 315 of such Act; that the waiver allowing a reduction in the cost limitation relating to retraining services described in subsection (a)(2) of such section 315 may be granted with respect to funds from this Act if a substate grantee demonstrates to the Governor that such waiver is appropriate due to the availability of low-cost retraining services, is necessary to facilitate the provision of

needs-related payments to accompany long-term training, or is necessary to facilitate the provision of appropriate basic readjustment services; and that funds provided to carry out the Secretary's discretionary grants under part B of such title III may be used to provide needs-related payments to participants who, in lieu of meeting the requirements relating to enrollment in training under section 314(e) of such Act, are enrolled in training by the end of the sixth week after grant funds have been awarded: *Provided further,* That service delivery areas may transfer funding provided herein under authority of titles II–B and II–C of the Job Training Partnership Act between the programs authorized by those titles of that Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further,* That service delivery areas and substate areas may transfer funding provided herein under authority of title II–A and title III of the Job Training Partnership Act between the programs authorized by those titles of that Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any proceeds from the sale of Job Corps center facilities shall be retained by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the Job Corps program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

On page 2, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

On page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

On page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000 for sweatshop enforcement in the garment industry)''.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take my name off the amendment and replace it with the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will have to withdraw the amendment and have the gentlewoman offer the amendment on her own.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a timing problem here.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment so it might be reoffered by the original author, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

On page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

On page 2, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

On page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

On page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000 for sweatshop enforcement in the garment industry)''.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, we cannot pick up a newspaper, turn on the radio or television without seeing the names and faces of celebrities caught using sweatshop labor to produce their signature line of goods. Last month it was Kathie Lee Gifford; then it was Michael Jordan; and next week, it will be someone else. The fact of the matter is, sweatshops are a very serious problem throughout the United States.

As sweatshops have spread like wildfire, Congress has turned a blind eye and ignored this problem. This has caused millions of workers and American businesses to suffer.

My amendment takes the first step to rectify this national disgrace, by restoring funds to the Department of Labor to fight sweatshops, across this country. It provides $5 million to the Wage and Hour Division, to specifically fight sweatshop violations in the garment industry. To pay for this, we would transfer $5 million from the Jobs Training Partnership Act, that was funded at $25 million over its fiscal year 1996 level. Both of these efforts serve to help disadvantaged workers. We must provide these professionals, who are on the front lines of this battle, a fighting chance. In recent years, the Wage and Hour Division has seen its budget slashed, while the number of sweatshops have skyrocketed.

From New York to Los Angeles, all across this country, millions are being exploited by unscrupulous employers. In California and New York, studies have found that over half of all garment factories currently operating are sweatshops. Most shocking of all is how society's most vulnerable—our children—are being abused. How can we permit these people to be treated like this?

My colleagues, fly-by-night kingpins open sweatshops for just a few months and then close without warning. They collect money from manufacturers and pay workers a pittance—if anything at all. Then, as quickly as they appear, they disappear with the cash—only to open again somewhere else under a new name, to start the cycle of despair all over again. They operate a classic shell game, with women, immigrants and children as their pawns. These crooks must be stopped and we must begin by adopting this amendment.

Take a good look at this picture of workers in sweatshops. Note how the workers are hunched over their machines, how dirty and crowded the factory is. In many cases, women and children work behind bars and barbed wire that seem more like a prison than a workplace. I have seen first-hand the suffering these workers are forced to endure. This exploitation has left many maimed, blinded and scarred from a life in these sweatshops.

How would you feel if your child, your mother, or your sister was forced to work 60 hours a week, and only be paid a couple of dollars an hour? What if they were forced to work in a factory like this—crowded, filthy and with emergency exits that were blocked? What if they told you that they dared not complain for fear of being fired—worse yet, they worked even when sick for fear of losing their job and having no income.

The individuals slaving away in sweatshops are not the only ones forced to suffer. Legitimate American businesses and their employees are also victims, unfairly forced to compete against sweatshops. By allowing sweatshops to operate, in our own backyard, we are allowing the livelihood of many to be stolen. By supporting efforts to combat this problem, we are ensuring a level playing field and simple fairness for our workers and American businesses.

By adopting this amendment, we have a rare opportunity to help workers, businesses, and to support American-made products. This amendment is supported by labor groups, like UNITE, which represent workers. It is supported by business groups, like the National Knitwear and Sportswear Association, which represent manufacturers. This amendment is truly a win-win situation for everyone.

If you think this issue does not affect you or your district, think again. There may be people in this Chamber today that are wearing clothes made in sweatshops. If you shopped in stores like J.C. Penney or Macy's, or purchased a pair of Air Jordans, you are guilty of adding to this problem.

Let's show the American people and the world that Congress is no longer going to turn a blind eye and keep this dirty little secret, here or abroad. I urge you to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

□ 2045

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We believe that this amendment addresses a very serious problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we likewise congratulate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment, and support the amendment on this side.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Velázquez amendment to restore funding to the Department of Labor's wage and hour division and Department of International Labor Affairs. These funds are critical to the Department's ongoing efforts to combat worksite safety and fair labor standards violations, particularly in the garment industry.

Most Americans are aware of the recent news reports documenting sweatshop abuses in foreign nations. We have heard about the rampant wage exploitation of hundreds of thousands of workers—many of whom are children who produce popular American consumer goods and designer products, while laboring under inhumane working conditions.

However, many Americans are not aware of the fact that similar abuses are occurring daily

in places like Los Angeles, New York, Miami, and Texas. The unfortunate reality is that despite our Nation's historic tradition of protecting workers and the voluntary compliance efforts by reputable garment contractors, sweatshop exploitation is a pervasive problem in America. It is estimated that more than 7,000 garment shops nationwide can be classified as sweatshops.

There are numerous examples of the nature and extent of the problem. In August of last year, the raid of a garment sweatshop in El Monte, CA, exposed the working conditions of 70 immigrants enslaved in a factory ringed with razor wire. More recently, a February raid in Irvine, CA, found workers routinely working 12-hour shifts, locked in a windowless room with a single fire escape. In Dallas, a sweep of 11 garment shops found that 82 percent of these businesses were in violation of Federal labor laws. This is nothing less than a national disgrace.

The Department of Labor's wage and hour division and International Labor Affairs Department are important lines of defense against sweatshops. Currently, the wage and hour division is combining an aggressive enforcement strategy with an educational program that encourages retailers, manufacturers, unions, and consumer groups to work in partnership to address the problem. Limited resources, however, have cut the number of investigators at the wage and hour divisions by 18 percent at a time when the workload of the division has expanded to include the monitoring of over 110 million workers in 6.5 million workplaces. The funding reductions contained in this bill hampers their ability to police the garment industry, protect workers, and ensure their workplace safety.

I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to fight sweatshop abuses by voting in favor of the Velázquez amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, $242,450,000.

To carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, $130,550,000.

The funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services, ''Aging Services Programs'' following the enactment of legislation authorizing the administration of the program by that Department: *Provided,* That the funds shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I, and for training, for allowances for job search and relocation, and for related State administrative expenses under part II, subchapters B and D, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, $324,500,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For authorized administrative expenses, $132,279,000, together with not to exceed $3,096,111,000 (including not to exceed $1,653,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980, and including not to exceed $2,000,000 which may be obligated in contracts with non-State entities for activities such as occupational and test research activities which benefit the Federal-State Employment Service System), which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502–504), and the sums available in the allocation for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501–8523, shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1997, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by States through September 30, 1999; and of which $132,279,000, together with not to exceed $701,369,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund, shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998, to fund activities under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose, and of which $260,573,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary for additional State allocations to administer unemployment compensation laws to finance increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or changes in a State law: *Provided,* That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 1997 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2,828,000 an additional $28,600,000 shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center network may be obligated in contracts, grants or agreements with non-State entities: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, and title III of the Social Security Act, may be used by the States to fund integrated Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–87.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUMP

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUMP: Page 6, line 5, insert ''(reduced by $3,800,000)'' after the first dollar amount.

Page 18, line 15, insert ''(increased by $3,800,000)'' after the dollar amount.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for myself, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Employment and Training; and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee.

Our amendment would increase the funds available for administration of the Veterans Employment and Training Service by $3.8 million.

This increase would be offset by a reduction in funding from the national activities account of the Employment Service.

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

Mr. STUMP. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for offering the amendment. We support the amendment very strongly and have no objection to it.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STUMP. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we likewise think the amendment of the gentleman is a good one and accept it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Affairs Committee has worked hard this Congress to improve the operations of the Veterans Employment and Training Service and employment opportunities for veterans. And one again, we've done it in a bipartisan manner.

We've had great cooperation from the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, the Subcommittee on Civil Service, and the Labor Appropriations Subcommittee. This amendment would make a small but important addition to the bipartisan work already accomplished.

Veterans preference and reemployment rights are important benefits. For many veterans, they may be the only benefits ever used.

Simply put, at a time when the Federal government is down sizing, we must ensure that veterans preference laws are followed. These funds would also ensure that veterans reemployment rights are vigorously enforced in both the public and private sectors. This is vital at a time when we rely so heavily on our National Guard and Reserve forces.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will allow the Veterans Employment and Training Service to meet its expanding enforcement responsibilities, fulfill its Transition Assistance program training requirements, and find thousands more jobs for veterans.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Stump amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the Stump amendment to increase funding for the Department of Labor's Veterans' Employment and Training Service

[VETS]. Although this amendment would increase the VETS appropriation by only $3.8 million, this modest amount will significantly enhance the ability of VETS staff to provide employment services to veterans. The amendment would provide an additional $2.8 million for the veterans administration account. This will bring that account up to the funding level requested by the President. The additional $1 million will be used to fund new positions for investigators who will ensure that Federal and State governments and private employers meet their responsibilities to veterans.

The Veterans' Employment and Training Service, under the expert leadership of Assistant Secretary Preston Taylor, has done a great job helping veterans find good, permanent employment. VETS staff have also trained hundreds of thousands of separating service members how to make a smooth transition to life in the civilian community and workplace. I appreciate Assistant Secretary Taylor's hard work and commitment, as well as that of his entire staff. The men and women in VETS are dedicated to assisting and supporting our Nation's veterans. Congress must give them the tools they need to accomplish their goals.

I urge my colleagues to support the Stump amendment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I rise to express my strong support for the amendment to the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill offered by the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee [Mr. STUMP]. Under this provision, $3.8 million would be added to the funding level for the Department of Labor's Veterans' Employment and Training Service and $2 million for the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program.

On June 18, I spoke about my deep distress when the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Subcommittee slashed veterans' employment funding by almost $12 million below the level recommended by President Clinton—far below the level of funding that is needed to place our veterans into permanent, good-paying jobs. I shared with my colleagues the fact that 28,000 fewer veterans would be placed in jobs than proposed in the President's budget. I called attention to the Republicans' recommendation that the transition assistance program be terminated, a successful program that has trained hundreds of thousands of men and women so that they could quickly find good civilian jobs upon leaving the Armed Forces.

Fortunately, most members of the Full Appropriations Committee heard these concerns expressed, not only by me but by many other veterans supporters. An amendment offered by Mr. OBEY to restore most of the funding was approved.

This amendment, which we are now considering, will go a step further and fully restore veterans' employment funding to the level originally requested by the President. I thank the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for this responsible amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHRYSLER

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRYSLER:

Page 6, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $2,399,000)''.

Page 38, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,399,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. We do not have a copy of the amendment. We were not aware this was going to be offered. I would appreciate it if we can get a copy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, almost 4 million women were physically abused by their husbands or boyfriends in the last year. We owe it to those abused women to take a stand against domestic violence.

Domestic violence accounts for more than one-third of all emergency room visits by women. We owe it to those injured women to take a stand against domestic violence.

Child abuse is fifteen times more likely to occur in families where domestic violence is present. We owe it to those abused children to take a stand against domestic violence.

I appreciate the chairman's work to increase funding for domestic violence programs in the committee bill. Overall, the Violence Against Women Act programs are increased in the appropriations bill by over $8 million, to a total of $61 million.

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say, now that we have a copy of the amendment, I now understand what it is that is being offered and we have no objection to it on this side of the aisle.

I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], on the majority side, also has no objection to it.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, within the Violence Against Women Act programs is a special program that is very dear to me and the people of the eighth District of Michigan. I am referring to the battered women's shelter programs administered through the Department of Health and Human Services.

Although the committee has increased the dollars for battered women's shelters, my amendment would give the program an additional $2.4 million to fully fund the program at the President's request.

In my home town in Michigan, the LACASA women's shelter provides hundreds of abused women and their children shelter, food, and counseling. For many years, my wife Katie and I have worked arm in arm with the dedicated workers and volunteers of LACASA to find the scarce resources to keep their shelter operations continue. I am now in a position to do more as a congressman, and I intend to.

It's time for this abuse to stop. These women and children need our help, and they need our help now because there is simply no tomorrow for some of them.

Even with the hard work and dedication of groups like LACASA that are working for women around the country, the need for more services and more Federal dollars continues to increase. In Michigan, for instance, the nights of shelter provided each year to abused women has increased 23 percent since 1991.

However, even with these increased services in Michigan, the number of domestic violence victims denied shelter since 1991 has increased 25 percent.

This is one area of service where it seems we cannot do enough. When abused women and children need to get themselves out of terribly abusive relationships, they need to act quickly. We must provide a secure safehouse for battered women and their children. We must provide for them today.

My amendment takes another step forward to provide all the help we can to the women and children who most need it. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment to fully fund the battered women's shelter programs within the Violence Against Women Act.

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and dedication to the prevention of domestic violence, to the providing of help for victims of domestic violence, and particularly his commitment to providing for battered women's shelters. I believe he is showing the kind of leadership that we really need to have in Congress to address this very serious problem, and we strongly support his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, section 104(d) of Public Law 102–164, and section 5 of Public Law 103–6, and to the ''Federal uemployment benefits and allowances'' account, to remain available until September 30, 1998, $373,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 1997, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs and for carrying out section 908 of the Social Security Act,

$81,393,000, together with not to exceed $39,977,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, $65,783,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER: In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $300,000, which amount shall be for genetic nondiscrimination enforcement activities).''

In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $300,000)''.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment designed to take steps toward putting an end to genetic discrimination in health insurance. With progress being made through the human genome project and other genetic research, we are making new discoveries at a startling pace about the genes associated with different disorders.

Indeed, most geneticists say that with the exception of trauma, every disease of the body has a genetic component.

Genes have been located already that are linked to breast cancer, to Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, basal cell carcinoma, to name just a few. Unfortunately, some insurance companies are already using these medical advances to deny health insurance to consumers.

A woman carrying the BRCA01 breast cancer gene may find her insurer drops her coverage entirely or denies her coverage in the event that she develops breast cancer. In addition, some companies are discriminating against policyholders based on their blood relatives' genetic information. Children are being denied coverage for disorders that their parents develop.

Mr. Chairman, we should put an end to this reprehensible practice. My amendment will provide additional resources in the Department of Labor's Pension Benefits and Welfare Administration, which is responsible for regulating ERISA plans.

I am thoroughly committed to trying to make sure that the antidiscrimination legislation is passed by Congress and PBWA should be prepared to enforce this law when it is.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to support this amendment as well as my genetic nondiscrimination bill, H.R. 2748.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman PORTER. From the day I arrived in Washington, I have recognized in him a superb public servant, and, frankly, I consider him to be one of my best friends and one of the finest Members of Congress. I thank him for his consideration.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman for those very generous and kind words. We certainly think the amendment is a very important one and very strongly support it and thank her for her leadership in offering it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that on this side of the aisle we certainly accept the gentlewoman's amendment, and I would like to talk just a moment about it because I have such a deep personal interest in the issue myself.

I think often in the subcommittee a few years ago, when the human genome project just started to be funded, I was often misunderstood when I raised with NIH witnesses my concerns about the fact that science is getting ahead of the state of the law on the issue of genetics. It would be a tragedy if the billions of dollars which taxpayers are seeing invested on their behalf to discover the secrets of the human genetic makeup, if those dollars, instead of winding up producing a net good for the American people, wind up simply producing a greater ability for different powerful parties in this economy to discriminate on the basis of genes which individuals could not order beforehand but were stuck with after they were born.

It seems to me that there has been a very slow reaction to this on the part of both the legal profession and on the part of good segments of the scientific community as well. I very much commend the gentlewoman for her efforts on this. I think it highlights probably the most important fundamental long-term issue associated with this bill, and we very enthusiastically support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman PORTER.

The gentleman is to be commended for his support on behalf of the Job Corps Program. As he knows, Job Corps has been our Nation's most successful federally funded residential job training and education program for at-risk youth for over 30 years. Because of its proven record of accomplishment in providing opportunities to disadvantaged youth, it has historically generated strong bipartisan support.

□ 2100

Program year 1995 exemplifies the success of Job Corps with 73 percent of all Job Corps participants either obtaining employment, enrolling in the military, or attending an institute of higher education.

The Labor-HHS appropriations bill before us provides $1.138 million for Job Corps. Mr. Chairman, through the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman PORTER, Job Corps received an increase of $35 million over last year's appropriation, which fully funds the operations portion of the program. I commend the gentleman on this accomplishment.

However, I have two concerns. First is the possibility that the Senate may provide a lower operation funding level for Job Corps than the House level. Second, there still exists a $14.8 million shortfall in the construction and renovation budget for the program. Adequate funding for the repair and rehabilitation of Job Corps campuses is critical for safe training and efficient operations. These campuses serve as a positive alternative to the dangers of street crime and drugs that many of our Nation's young adults face daily.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to Chairman PORTER that, based on previous discussions that we have had, it is clear that the gentleman shares my strong commitment to Job Corps. Therefore, when the bill is sent to conference, I respectfully urge the gentleman to continue to exercise his leadership to ensure that the operation funding levels for Job Corps contained in the House bill are maintained and to support any increase to the construction and renovation budget of the program.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentlewoman that I am a very strong supporter of the Job Corps Program. I agree with the gentlewoman on its great importance, particularly for the most at-risk youth in our society, and I will clearly work toward a conference agreement that will provide, at the minimum, the House level of funding for the Job Corps and will fight to try that make that level even higher.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by

section 104 of Public Law 96–364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 1997, for such Corporation: *Provided,* That not to exceed $135,720,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, $258,422,000, together with $983,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain, and spend, until expended, in the name of the Department of Labor, all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91–0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992): *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3302, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 211(d) and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under Title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title 5, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the head ''Civilian War Benefits'' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; and sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 per centum of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, $213,000,000 together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided,* That such sums as are necessary may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further,* That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 1996, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further,* That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such sums as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through September 30, 1997: *Provided further,* That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration, $11,390,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Labor for expenditures relating to capital improvements in support of Federal Employees' Compensation Act administration, and the balance of such funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under Subchapter 5, U.S.C., chapter 81, or under subchapter 33, U.S.C. 901, et seq. (the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended), provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as such regulations may prescribe.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, $1,007,644,000, of which $961,665,000 shall be available until September 30, 1998, for payment of all benefits as authorized by section 9501(d)(1), (2), (4), and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and interest on advances as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act, and of which $26,071,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses, $19,621,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and $287,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General, for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(A) of that Act: *Provided,* That, in addition, such amounts as may be necessary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation, interest, or other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided further,* That in addition such amounts shall be paid from this fund into miscellaneous receipts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the administrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury for administering the fund during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(B) of that Act.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, $297,734,000, including not to exceed $66,929,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and, in addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to $750,000 per fiscal year of training institute course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education grants: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further,* That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of ten or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost workday case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act:

*Provided further,* That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, $191,810,000, including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 or to carry out that portion of section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements, with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, $302,947,000, of which $16,145,000 shall be for expenses of revising the Consumer Price Index and shall remain

available until September 30, 1998, together with not to exceed $52,053,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including up to $4,271,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, $137,504,000; together with not to exceed $297,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided*, That no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Solicitor of Labor to participate in a review in any United States court of appeals of any decision made by the Benefits Review Board under section 21 of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 921) where such participation is precluded by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Newport News Shipbuilding, 115 S. Ct. 1278 (1995).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed $178,149,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4100–4110A and 4321–4327, and Public Law 103–353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1997.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $42,938,000, together with not to exceed $3,543,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the compensation of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of $125,000.

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration directly or through section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act for the development, promulgation or issuance of any proposed or final standard or guideline regarding ergonomic protection or recording and reporting occupational injuries and illnesses directly related thereto.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI: Page 19, strike lines 8 through 15.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] will each control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the Labor–HHS–Education appropriations bill would delete the rider that bans OSHA from protecting workers from musculoskeletal disorders which represent America's fastest growing workplace health problem.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is the legislative rider bans any ergonomic guidelines. Ergonomics is the study of force in motion. What we would like to see the ergonomics look at is how to redesign the workplace so as to put less force on the body. This is the force that is causing so many musculoskeletal disorders and represents the fastest growing workplace health problem, having multiplied sevenfold in the past 10 years. Current estimates range from over 700,000 lost work day injuries to 2.7 million accepted worker's comp claims annually, affecting meat packing, poultry workers, computer programmers, auto workers, and supermarket employees, among others.

Affected workers suffer pain, restricted life activities, lost work time, and often permanent disability. These repetitive motion injuries include carpal tunnel syndrome, of which you may be familiar, Mr. Chairman.

The legislation in this appropriations bill prohibits OSHA from using funds for the development, promulgation, or issuance of any proposed or final standard or voluntary guideline. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, voluntary guideline regarding ergonomic protection or recording or reporting occupational injuries or illnesses directly related to.

This language goes beyond the fiscal year 1996 language to ban OSHA from developing protections or even collecting data on the problem.

Mr. Chairman, worker's compensation costs arising from musculoskeletal disorders amount to an estimated $20 billion annually, accounting for roughly $1 of every $3 employers spend on such claims. Indirect costs such as hiring and training replacement workers add billions of dollars more. Unfortunately, many thousands of U.S. employers are unaware of the extent of this problem.

My amendment would allow OSHA to issue a proposed ergonomic standard. And what that would do is trigger OSHA's open rulemaking process. This process includes both lengthy comment periods and administrative hearings at which witnesses can cross-examine each other, designed to facilitate a thorough public debate to improve the standard and strengthen its scientific basis.

If enacted, the rider in the bill would ban OSHA from even developing such a proposed standard to permit the debate to begin. My amendment will allow the debate to begin.

A no vote on my amendment would preclude OSHA from even gathering the data, as I mentioned, on musculoskeletal disorders. Ignoring the fastest growing workplace health problem will not make it go away. Ironically, the rider's sponsors claim OSHA needs to improve the science upon which ergonomic protections would be based, but the rider would ban OSHA from gathering the data necessary to meet that need.

A no vote on my amendment would fly in the face of congressional efforts to reform the regulatory process to ensure that regulations are premised on sound science.

Mr. Chairman, I talked earlier about the cost to employers, and many of them would like the protection of guidelines. Even those employers who have recognized the problem are often unaware of the broad range of cost-effective solutions currently available.

Smaller businesses are particularly at a disadvantage since they typically cannot afford to hire safety and health consultants. These employers need help. My amendment would allow OSHA to issue voluntary guidelines to assist employers in controlling the soaring costs associated with musculoskeletal disorders as well as opening up this debate to go further, if it is determined in that open period of public comment.

Recently enacted legislation gives Congress a mechanism for modifying or disapproving Federal regulations through an expedited legislative process. My amendment would allow OSHA to move forward on ergonomics, but would retain this effective means of reviewing OSHA's protective standards before they even take place. This is not disruptive of changes that have occurred in this Congress, Mr. Chairman. In fact, it is in keeping with those changes.

Countless employers have already cut injury rates and saved millions of dollars in workman's compensation costs through simple measures that quickly pay for themselves. A ''no'' vote on this amendment would preclude OSHA from developing protective standards or even voluntary guidelines based on such cost-effective solutions. These ideas, the initiatives, assist business at the expense of thousands of employers struggling with soaring worker's compensation costs, and to the detriment of millions of American workers.

A yes vote would improve working conditions and safety, would save money for the employers and increase productivity of the American work force. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pelosi amendment. What we have here is a basic disagreement among those of us who feel very strongly that the private sector is capable of policing its own work force and its work environment, and those who believe that it cannot be done

without Big Brother stepping in with a whole ton of Federal regulations to tell them how to do it.

The language in the bill as it currently stands would be removed by the amendment proposed now. It is a funding limitation. It is not a legislative rider. Perhaps the gentlewoman who proposes this amendment is not clear on that particular point. It simply says that the Labor Department and OSHA cannot spend money on developing a ton of bureaucratic rules on ergonomics that would apply equally to businesses like restaurants, like professional athletic teams, like trucking companies, to parcel post carriers.

In other words the Federal Government is now poised and interested in trying to develop a new set of regulations that it would apply uniformly to every small business in America, and it is absolutely absurd to think that OSHA is capable of conducting such research to apply these rules.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite as an example, in the gentlewoman's own State of California, under a legislative mandate CALOSHA will issue an ergonomic regulation by the end of the year that is estimated to cost Californians $9.7 billion and cost more than 12,000 jobs, because anyone who has ever been in the private sector, as I have as a manager in a private business, understands that when you get a whole ton of regulations that suddenly come into our office, your productivity is automatically cut back.

The implementation of silly regulations suddenly causes additional costs and in some cases causes tremendous job loss, and that is what we are talking about here. Think about in California what 10 pages has done, as I have cited here, and I have an example here of so far what OSHA has developed on proposed ergonomic standards in the private workplace or small businesses in America across this country.

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine running a restaurant in this country or running any kind of a small business where you are trying to make ends meet, operate on very marginal profits, and suddenly you see this show up at your front door? Who, first of all, is going to be able to understand any of this? How much is it going to cost a small employer in this country to implement such regulations?

Mr. Chairman, I think what people who love big government fail to understand is that there is not a staff of people at every business in this country that is prepared to handle such a load of bureaucracy and rules and regulations just waiting to do that.

If any of my colleagues have ever managed a business or owned a business or worked in the private sector, done real work in this country, they know that everyone there is already interested in doing something, answering the phones, putting together, making a product, delivering a product. This kind of thing, Mr. Chairman, only adds to the burdens that so many people in the private sector have at this point.

Unlike what was pointed out earlier by my colleague from California, the language in the current bill does not prohibit OSHA from continuing to use ergonomics data collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and does not prevent research institutions such as the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] from collecting scientific research on ergonomics.

Mr. Chairman, OSHA relies on those organizations because it does not conduct its own scientific research. If I could be convinced that suddenly OSHA has qualified doctors and scientists to be able to develop these regulations, but I am not convinced that they are qualified to do this kind of research.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to look hard at this amendment. It is something that if my colleagues believe, as I do, that what distinguishes our economy in this world is the private sector and private sector jobs, that is what makes us the greatest economy on Earth.

Why do we want to put this monkey on their back and drive them back into the Stone Age because big labor is interested in promulgating such rules as I am holding in my hand? And this, Mr. Chairman, is only the beginning.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of our committee.

□ 2115

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a funny place. We get elected. We get into our offices out here, and every day we have visitors from home. And sure, some of them are on vacation and some of them are regular working people. But I would venture to say that at least 70 to 75 percent of them are people who are representatives of the business community.

They walk into our offices. They wear suits. They are good people, but they have a distinct economic point of view. And we hear a lot of it when they come and visit us in our offices. They are the people who can afford to come out here and lobby us directly from home.

Then we go home. Often Members go to the Rotary Clubs; they go to business lunches. They talk to people who are also wearing suits then, and they all generally see life from the upper side.

I think we need to get beyond that and we need to think about how the world looks to people who work for a living, whether they wear blue collars or white collars or pink colors, just name it.

I do not know what my colleagues do when they go home, but when I go home I often visit plants. I cannot begin to tell Members how many times I walk through a plant, and I have seen a woman wearing something on her wrist and I say, what happened? Carpel tunnel syndrome. I hear that time and time again.

Talk to people who have suffered lower back problems. I happen to have an insurance company in my district that is very skilled in the problems of worker compensation. If we talk to people in that field, they will tell us that there are many companies who want to avoid problems but they do not know how. They do not have the expertise to do it. What this amendment says is that it is going to be a long, long time before they learn.

OSHA is the agency which is charged with the responsibility to develop standards to protect the health and the well-being of workers. What the committee bill says is that that agency is not going to be allowed to perform its duty when it comes to just about the most expensive workplace injury problem around today, about a $20 billion problem, the most reliable estimate. And the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], is trying to correct that problem with her amendment.

I do not see why it is in the public interest for us to say that not only can OSHA not promulgate an official standard, they cannot even begin to develop one. They cannot even go about collecting their own data on the problem.

I do not see how that is in the interest of workers. I certainly do not see how it is in the interest of companies, many of whom do not know what to do to avoid the problem.

Just one example. My grandmother used to work for Pied Piper Shoe Co. a long time ago. One of Pied Piper's competitors was Red Wing Shoe Co. They paid $4.3 million in worker compensation premiums in 1990. After they implemented an ergonomics program and changed production techniques, that company reduced lost time days by 79 percent. By 1995, premium costs had dropped to an estimated $1.3 million from the original $4.3 million. That company knew how to deal with the problem. There are a lot of companies that do not.

The value of allowing OSHA to develop voluntary standards, I emphasize ''voluntary,'' is that that would mean that OSHA could do the work which would enable many other companies who are looking for the right way to attack problems to have some idea of how to do it. A lot of them are small companies. They do not have the ability or the financial ability to hire industrial engineers. This agency can help them do that. But it just seems to me that this Congress is lock, stock and barrel in the hands of people who wear suits 365 days a year. It apparently is not going to get beyond the views of those folks and to take into account the fact that there are many, many millions of Americans who have a right to expect that the Government is going to act on their behalf to see to it that they have the safest working place and the healthiest working place possible under existing circumstances.

That is what the Pelosi amendment tries to do. I think this Congress ought to be ashamed of itself, if it does not adopt this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], Republican whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, and I appreciate his work in this area.

All I can say is, after the gentleman from Wisconsin's remarks, here we go again. Class warfare. the only argument in favor of the Pelosi-Nadler amendment is that people that wear suits do not understand the working man.

I think we have to first understand that OSHA is not only not equipped to do this scientific gathering or scientific evaluation, nor does it have the authority to do the scientific gathering. What OSHA does is promulgate regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and it is really unfortunate that we have to fight this battle all over again. I do not understand why some Members of this body are so willing to allow OSHA to put forth a standard that has absolutely no basis in science. Just last month the American Academy of Orthopedic surgeons issued a report based on a comprehensive study of back injuries. Do you know what its findings were? There is no relationship between back injuries and work. That is not TOM DELAY saying that. That is the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons. Earlier this year, the Association of Hand Surgeons determined that there is not enough data available for the Federal Government to move forward with an ergonomic standard.

Further, the National Coalition on Ergonomics reported that OSHA cherry-picked and manipulated the data, which bureaucrats are so prone to do, that it gathered last year in order to put forth its proposal. My point is that there is no consensus in the scientific community over risks and remedies or implementing or failing to implement ergonomic policies.

There is certainly no consensus that a Federal ergonomic standard can actually have any positive impact on the working man or woman in the workplace and the impact on health and safety. Yet OSHA itself admits its draft proposal is likely to be the most expensive, the most far-reaching ever promulgated by this agency.

So by focusing on work spaces and stations, tools and equipment, lighting, typewriter keys and telephones, ergonomics virtually affects every aspect of American businesses large and small. It has been estimated that it could cost American businesses and cost us jobs to the extent of billions of dollars to implement.

The sheer magnitude of the paperwork required would impose an enormous and unnecessary burden. The number of professions that would be affected is potentially limitless.

A truck driver would be affected since he is exposed to vibrations for an extended period of time, sits in a truck cab, keeps bent wrists on a steering wheel and grips the steering wheel. It has been proposed that every hour that truck driver would have to sit down for 15 minutes because he has had too much vibration. Then there are hair stylists who open and close scissors for hour after hour. What about day care employees who have to lift children all day? Of course, there is the job of the golf pro who has got to swing a club over and over again, the florist who must wrap flower arrangements one after another, and the painter who has got to paint wall after wall.

After identifying an at-risk job, according to OSHA's draft proposal, the employer must control the job. The OSHA does not give any indication how this can be done. It simply mandates that the employers control the job.

If the employer cannot control the job, OSHA could require that the employer eliminate the job. Because of the lack of existing scientific data to support its draft proposal, OSHA has resorted unbelievably to creating its own data. Currently, OSHA requires employers to report work-related injuries and illnesses. In its proposal, OSHA would expand this recordkeeping requirement to include aches and pains which cannot be definitely tied to the workplace on injury and illness logs. The result would be a database of injuries that is outrageously inflated to show a far greater number of truly work-related injuries than there really are.

I cannot condone this kind of activity. The Bonilla amendment rightly prohibits OSHA from continuing to develop an ergonomics standard that involves the imposition of regulations costing billions of dollars on the private sector and a radical new level of government intrusion into the workplaces, work practices without scientific support. The Bonilla language does not prevent the scientific community from developing any necessary data to show a relationship between musculoskeletal disorders in the workplace.

Congress has given the authority to do this kind of research to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Nothing prevents NIOSH from continuing this research. OSHA's mandate is to promulgate work safety standards that are based upon sound science and statistics. Without regard to an ergonomic standards, the debate that should be taking place now is the scientific area, not in the regulatory area. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and in favor of sound science.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would say the gentleman talks about how it is okay for NIOSH to do this. I find it very interesting that this committee is short-sheeting NIOSH to the tune of $32 million because it is transferring to them all of the obligations laid on by the Bureau of Mines programs, but it is not funding those programs.

So the very agency my colleagues say will be allowed to continue is going to have a $32 million shortfall in their budget.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that we are not short-sheeting NIOSH. As a matter of fact, that shortfall of $32 million will clearly be made up in conference when we get there. There is no intention to not provide that funding. That was a transfer from the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and we simply never came to an agreement about offsets between our two subcommittees.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would say that that is a nice promise, but the fact is that the bill before us does in fact short-sheet NIOSH by $32 million. It does not allow NIOSH to meet the obligations that they are supposed to meet by accepting the Bureau of Mines programs.

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

I would like to respond to some of the comments made by my colleagues, in addition to Mr. OBEY's observation about the short-changing of NIOSH in this bill. Last year the proposal by this Republican majority in the Congress on NIOSH was to cut it by 25 percent. The flat funding this year is not in keeping with, does not even keep up with the responsibilities that it has. I do want to call to the attention of our colleagues the packet that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], held up and said, what would happen if this was laid on business? The fact is, that packet of information, and I question it because there have been no regulations released by OSHA, as that packet indicates, it does not contribute rulemaking or notice of rulemaking. So I think it is a little disingenuous to give the impression to our colleagues that that is a regulation that is being proposed by OSHA that is something that exists.

□ 2130

Second, I say to our colleague from Texas, Mr. DELAY, that part of his work in this Congress was to pass legislation that gives Congress a mechanism for modifying or disapproving Federal regulations through an expedited legislative procedure, and that would, of course, still be allowed under my amendment should he not like the information that the ergonomic studies provide in terms of data on the occurrence of repetitive motion illnesses.

The other point that I want to make is that, of course, this has to be based on science and scientific data. But this is not a one-sided issue. This is to protect businesses. Certainly it is to protect workers as well, and I do not have enough time allocated to me to read the entire statement of Mr. Dear when he came before our committee, but when I get my time again I would like to read from that statement, which talks about the need that some smaller businesses in particular have for the protection that voluntary guidelines and opening up of this debate would provide to them.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, in the balance of my time I wanted to make the case that this ergonomic study is to benefit workers and businesses. When I asked the very distinguished director of OSHA, Mr. Dear, to respond as to what the developing of voluntary guidelines and what the government-business response to such voluntary guidelines would be, he responded by saying:

> From my own experience in meeting with employers I know that injuries caused by repetitive motion are a serious problem of concerned employers. I have met with one after another after presentation made here on the Hill after the employers have specifically asked me, ''Aren't there any guidelines? Couldn't you give me some help?'' And I had to say, ''Well, I would very much like to, but I cannot.''

And that is what this rider in this legislation does. It prevents OSHA from giving any direction whatsoever to small businesses.

Again I say that support for my amendment will protect workers, protect businesses from excessive cost, and increase productivity. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is again a debate between those of us who believe that people who are out in the heartland operating, managing, working for small businesses are pretty smart people and they are what make our economy tick. After all, the small-business community in this country is the backbone of our economy and employs 80 percent of the workers in this country.

On the other side we have those who believe that they cannot police their work force and their work environment effectively without having a big set of Federal regulations handed to them, and Big Brother, after all, is smarter, according to the opposition on this debate, smarter than the people who are the entrepreneurs and those who pursue free enterprise ventures in this country. The bureaucrats are smarter, and the entrepreneurs are too dumb to implement ergonomic standards in their own workplace.

Oftentimes those who are opposed to this issue in the past somehow think that those of us who are trying to stop this regulatory burden on small business are not concerned about worker safety. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I do not understand why Federal bureaucrats and those who advocate big government do not understand that any business owner out there, any manager, is interested in keeping as many workers as they possibly can healthy and productive, on the job every day. When someone gets injured on the job, when they have got to pay Worker's Comp, productivity suffers, the product suffers; the people running the company, oftentimes they would have to make cuts in other areas. No one in this country in the private sector is interested in allowing unhealthy conditions and bad working conditions to exist in the workplace in this country.

And I think oftentimes we get mired in the debate, and some of those on the other side try to make it seem like we do not care about worker safety. We not only care about worker safety, we care about preserving jobs and about keeping the regulatory burden off the small-business community in this country so that they can continue to be more productive and to increase productivity and increase the number of jobs in their communities. That is what we are interested in doing.

Finally, I would like to just point out how voluntary standards that have been referred to here tonight can exist out in the workplace without the Federal Government coming out and saying: ''Hey, we have some paperwork here or some kind of new standard that you can voluntarily impose.''

We have been around long enough in this country to understand that once something becomes voluntary on paper via the Federal Government and OSHA and regulators, sure enough before too long it becomes a real regulation, and we are trying to stop that from occurring.

A lot of good employers in this country are already developing their own ergonomic standards. When I visited a lot of these good work environments across this country, I am delighted to hear people on the front line talk about the priority at companies these days, about worker safety. Safety, safety, safety is the most important thing now that more employers are recognizing how significant it is to increase their profits and become more productive and to employ more people, because after all, when they have more productivity and more profits, that means more jobs, more expansion and more people able to pursue the American dream in this country.

Once again, in closing on this argument, I want to emphasize that those who vote for the Pelosi-Nadler amendment are voting to burden small business in America with a whole new set of regulations that have no scientific data at all to back it up. We do not believe at this point that OSHA is made up of scientists, doctors and researchers that are capable of implementing these kind of regulations.

So vote with small business in America. Vote against the Pelosi amendment. I ask all my colleagues to support me in this cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Labor in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least fifteen days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 104. Funds shall be available for carrying out title IV–B of the Job Training Partnership Act, notwithstanding section 427(c) of that Act, if a Job Corps center fails to meet national performance standards established by the Secretary.

SEC. 105. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this title shall be disbursed without the approval of the Department's Chief Financial Officer or his delegatee.

SEC. 106. (a) GENERAL RULE.—In the administration and enforcement of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, employees who are 16 and 17 years of age shall be permitted to load materials, but not operate or unload materials, into scrap paper balers and paper box compactors—

(1) that are safe for 16- and 17-year-old employees loading the scrap paper balers or paper box compactors, and

(2) that cannot operate while being loaded.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of subsection (a), scrap paper balers and paper box compactors shall be considered safe for 16- or 17-year-old employees to load only if—

(1) such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors are in compliance with the current safety standard established by the American National Standards Institute;

(2) such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors include an on-off switch incorporating a keylock or other system and the control of such system is maintained in the custody of employees who are 18 years of age or older;

(3) the on-off switch of such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors is maintained in an off condition when such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors are not in operation; and

(4) the employer of 16- and 17-year-old employees provides notice, and posts a notice, on such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors stating that—

(A) such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors meet the current safety standard established by the American National Standards Institute;

(B) 16- and 17-year-old employees may only load such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors; and

(C) any employee under the age of 18 may not operate or unload such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors:

*Provided,* That this section is not to be construed as affecting the exemption for apprentices and student learners published at 29 Code of Federal Regulations 570.63.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended by the Department of Labor for the purposes of enforcement and the issuance of fines under Hazardous Occupation Order Number 2 (HO 2) with respect to incidental and occasional driving by minors under age 18, unless the Secretary finds that the operation of a motor vehicle is the primary duty of the minor's employment.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1997''.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL) having assumed the chair. Mr. WALKER, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

## TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS UNDER FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–242)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246) (''the Act''), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspensions under section 902(a) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for defense article exports to the People's Republic of China and the export of U.S.-origin satellites, insofar as such restrictions pertain to the Globalstar satellite project. License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis by the United States Government.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 9, 1996.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, DC, July 10, 1996.*

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Jim Dyer, currently the staff director of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *U.S.* v. *McDade.*

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
*Chairman.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, DC, July 10, 1996.*

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Deborah Weatherly, currently a staff assistant of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *U.S.* v. *McDade.*

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
*Chairman.*

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 2145

## PRESIDENT CLINTON'S FAILURE TO SIGN THE WISCONSIN WELFARE REFORM WAIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise during special orders to point out that today the countdown is up. Today marks the day that President Clinton should have signed the Wisconsin welfare reform waiver. Why is this important to me as a Californian? Because our Governor and State legislature have also requested from the Federal Government, specifically the Department of Health and Human Services, certain waivers to allow us in California to reform and streamline our welfare service to California residents.

I think we can all remember that a month ago the President said publicly that he approved of the Wisconsin reform plan. He did not just mention his approval of the plan in passing. This is the plan that was originally known as putting families first, or now, as it is known simply in Wisconsin, W2. The President devoted an entire weekend radio address to this subject.

Immediately after, though, he made those remarks his administration, encouraged by their liberal allies here in the Congress, Democratic allies, began to backtrack. Now it appears that the deadline today has come and gone with no waiver for the Wisconsin plan. I cannot really say that that surprises me too much, but I do not want to allow my cynicism to show too much. I actually had some hope that the President might at least in this one instance keep his word to the people of Wisconsin and the country.

He may someday sign this waiver, but not until Wisconsin has had to go through all kinds of contortions at the mercy of the Department of Health and Human Services. Wisconsin's difficulties in obtaining this waiver are not unique. As I mentioned, California and many other States have had to come to Washington, hat in hand, and beg for a waiver to implement their welfare reform plans. Some States, including California, have had to wait months upon months for their waivers to go through.

In fact, again in the case of California, we are still waiting to hear regarding three major welfare reform waiver requests to the Federal Government. The changes that are then required by the Washington bureaucrats have watered down so many of these State plans, of these State waiver requests,

that in some instances the Governors and the State legislatures which initially requested those waivers no longer want to implement them. In South Carolina, it cost millions of dollars to go through the waiver process, and when that waiver was finally approved it was so modified that the State of South Carolina deemed it no longer effective.

We Republicans in Congress over the last 18 months, as the new majority in the Congress, have twice passed genuine welfare reform that would eliminate the need for States to have to go through the cumbersome counterproductive waiver process. But President Clinton, who as Candidate Clinton in 1992 promised to end welfare as we know it, has vetoed the welfare reform legislation not once but twice.

This welfare reform controversy illustrates a key difference between Republicans and Democrats and between Bob Dole and President Clinton. Bob Dole and Republicans think it is absurd that the States, which really are the laboratories of democracy nowadays, and where the only genuinely successful welfare reform efforts have taken place, must come begging to Washington, to the very people who are the architects and protectors of the failed status quo, our current welfare system. It is Washington's disgraceful mess, after all, that the States are having to clean up.

Mr. Speaker, although Wisconsin has been the Nation's leader in successfully reforming welfare, witness again the President's promise in his radio address a couple of months ago, and again President Clinton and congressional Democrats still think that Washington knows better than the people of Wisconsin how to fix their welfare program. They think that power, money, and resources should stay in Washington.

The American people are sick of our disgraceful welfare system, which traps people in lives of dependency, illegitimacy, and despair, and which has led, according to the most recent statistics in America going back to 1993, to almost one-third of all births, 31 percent of all births being out of wedlock. The American people are sick of a heavy-handed Federal Government that thinks it is so much smarter than everybody else. And most of all, they are sick of a President who will say literally anything that the polls tell him the people want to hear, and then turn around and do just the opposite.

## THE ESSENTIAL 30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD IN WISCONSIN BEFORE ACTION ON WELFARE REFORM WAIVER REQUEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the following one-word reply to the gentleman who just spoke: Baloney. A two-word reply: Double baloney.

I represent Wisconsin. I take a back seat to no one in wanting to see massive welfare reform. I know that taxpayers are tired of seeing people collect money on welfare who are not willing to work to earn it, and I know that people are tired, and justifiably so, of seeing people in this society who often have their hand out but who are not willing to go to work in order to improve their own condition. I believe in personal responsibility, and I believe that people ought to be willing to accept the consequences of their own actions in their own lives.

But I want to make a few remarks that correct some of the wildly inaccurate statements just made by the previous speaker. There is no 30-day deadline for the President to consider Wisconsin's W2 program. There is simply, thanks to the fact that the Congress did not eliminate it, as the majority party tried to do, there is still the protection in law that allows every single one of my constituents in Wisconsin to have at least 30 days to comment on the deal that the politicians put together at the State level in Wisconsin. That 30-day requirement is simply a 30-day minimum requirement during which the public has a right to speak out before the politicians and the bureaucrats make their final decisions. I make no apology for insisting that that 30-day public comment period be retained. My citizens have the same right to comment that citizens from every other State have had before waivers were granted for their welfare reform proposals.

I wonder if the gentleman knows that in the original W2 waiver request which this party demanded that we pass, sight unseen, without any Member having read it on this floor, I wonder if the gentleman knows that Wisconsin later had to, at least the Governor and the welfare director, had to indicate they made a mistake in the presentation they made to the national government, and they recognized it needed to be amended.

Why? Because the press discovered during that 30-day public comment period that they tried to wipe out on that side of the aisle, the press in Wisconsin discovered that the W2 waiver proposal would have allowed employers to cut the hours of their regular workers, to cut the benefits of their regular workers, in order to make room for welfare workers in those plants.

It also inadvertently would have allowed employers to cancel promotions for their regular workers and, instead, give those promoted jobs to welfare recipients newly hired by the company. The State admitted that that was a mistake, but that mistake would not have been corrected if this House had rammed through the Senate the legislation which the majority party tried to ram through.

You bet workers are tired of seeing tax dollars gobbled up by people on welfare who will not work. You bet taxpayers are tired of that. But I can tell the Members something taxpayers do not want to see even more. They do not want to see their jobs gobbled up by welfare recipients.

So if we are going to solve welfare reform, let us solve it by correcting the behavior of people whose behavior needs to be corrected. Let us not solve it by whacking the ability of workers to maintain their wages, to maintain their hours, to maintain their benefits at work, and to maintain their rights to be considered for promotion before newly hired workers who just the day before were on the welfare rolls.

I would simply say that I want Wisconsin's welfare program to be approved, but only after my constituents have had ample time to examine that waiver request to make certain there are no other mistakes which wind up threatening the welfare of workers.

## REVISED 602(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY LEVELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 606(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Budget Act), as amended by the Contract with America Advancement Act (P.L. 104–121), I hereby submit revised 602(a) allocations and other appropriate budgetary levels. Section 606(e) of the Budget Act provides for an adjustment in the various budgetary levels established by budget resolutions to accommodate additional appropriations for conducting continuing disability reviews (CDRs) under the Supplemental Security Income program.

Section 606(e) of the Budget Act directs the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to revise the discretionary spending limits, 602(a) allocations, and the appropriate budgetary aggregates when the Appropriations Committee reports appropriations measure that provides additional new budget authority and additional outlays to pay for the costs of CDRs.

For fiscal year 1997, the adjustment reflects $25 million (and $160 million in outlays) specified for additional CDRs in the report accompanying H.R. 3755, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations on July 8.

These revised levels will supersede those established by H. Con. Res. 178 and the accompanying joint statement of the managers (H. Rept. 104–575) and shall be binding for purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The revised allocations and other budgetary levels are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

| | Budget authority | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| Discretionary spending limits | 492,692 | 535,699 |
| 602(a)/302(a) allocations | 497,375 | 538,772 |
| Budget aggregates | 1,311,309 | 1,307,081 |

If you have any questions, please contract Kathy Ormiston or Jim Bates at extension 6–7270.

## WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I speak on the issue of working families and what is happening to working families in my district and what I think is happening to working families all over the Nation, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to make some additional comments about the Wisconsin welfare reform plan and Republican plans to truly reform welfare, to stop talking about reforming welfare and actually start doing it.

### WISCONSIN'S WELFARE REFORM PLAN

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate that just when I thought we were hopefully going to have a constructive debate on welfare reform, the gentleman from Wisconsin marches off the floor. He has taken his ball and apparently he is going home. If he was still here, my response to him would have been baloney, double baloney, and triple baloney, or see your baloney and raise you one, because the reality is he is not going to support welfare reform in any form or in any version.

He not only has voted with the Democrats twice against our welfare reform proposals, but he is actively now attempting to thwart and to delay and to obstruct the efforts of the Wisconsin State legislature and the Governor of Wisconsin, Tommy Thompson, the Governor of his own State, to obtain a reasonable welfare reform waiver from Washington, the big government bureaucracy back here.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is he talks about taxpayers and working people, but the current welfare system is fundamentally unfair to working American families. It pays for non-work, it reinforces personal abhorrent behaviors and values which harm parents, children, and families. It is another classic ''Let's rob Peter to pay Paul'' scenario.

The Washington liberal establishment, make no mistake about it, despite all his populist rhetoric the gentleman from Wisconsin is very much a part of that Washington liberal establishment, and they refuse to accept the fundamental reforms demanded by a majority of Americans.

Where has the Democratic Party in the last 3½ years that President Clinton has been President and the leader of their party, where have they been on welfare reform? They did not put forward a welfare reform proposal in the last Congress when they had control of both the legislative and executive branches of Government. The gentleman from Wisconsin could have been a leader in those efforts, had he had the courage of his convictions and brought forward a proposal.

So let us be real clear whose interests are being served here by protecting the status quo: the current welfare system. It is the whole political constituency of dependency we have built up in this country. We are not addressing the concerns of workers whose taxes have paid for the unfair and broken welfare system, but we are, of course, seeing the consequences of preserving a system which the President and his liberal allies in the Congress are desperately fighting to protect.

What we believe, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, we believe that we ought to respond to the demands of hard-working American men and women. That is why we have passed welfare reform that restores individual dignity by requiring able-bodied recipients to work in exchange for their benefits, encouraging personal responsibility by discouraging illegitimacy, and toughening child support enforcement, putting time limits on welfare benefits, because we want welfare to be a safety net, not a permanent trap into dependency, empowering those closest to the problem, States and local communities to address welfare needs with innovative and flexible solutions, that is the very essence of W2 or the Wisconsin plan.

I just would remind Members again and remind the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], if he wants to walk his talk, in 1992 candidate Clinton appealed to working families. This was one of the things that allowed him to posture himself as the centrist new Democrat. He appealed to working families with a promise to end welfare as we know it; yet since his election and during the last Congress when the Democrats had sole control over this House, lock, stock, and barrel, or should I say House Bank and Post Office, going back to my first term in office, the President aligned himself with the Washington liberal elite and has repeatedly vetoed legislation that would end welfare as we know it.

It is too bad that the President and the gentleman from Wisconsin and their liberal Washington friends want to defend a failed welfare system rather than work with millions of hard-working taxpayers who want real welfare reform.

□ 2200

## THE FORGOTTEN AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, every day in this country men and women get up at the crack of dawn, pack their lunches, send their kids off to school, go to work and work harder than ever in their lives, and then realize they are taking home less money. The reason they are taking home less money is that Government is taking more of their money, and Government is taking more of their money because Government is too big. It is too big at all levels, at the local, at the State and the Federal level. These people, who are laboring in the fields and working harder than ever in their entire lives and taking home less money because Government is too big, are the forgotten Americans.

In 1950 the average family in America paid 2 percent of their income for Federal income taxes. Today it is 26 percent. If we add State and local taxes, it is around 40 percent. Just think of that. Forty cents of their dollar earned goes for taxes.

While taxes increase, your take home pay decreases. The more Government takes, the more Government taxes, the less freedom we have. We work from January 1 through May 7 just to earn enough to pay taxes. Just think of that. The American worker has to work more than 4 months just to pay taxes. In fact, if a husband and wife are working, one of them is working almost solely to pay for taxes.

If Government taxes you 10 percent, then it controls 10 percent of your life. If Government taxes you 20 percent, then it controls 20 percent of your life. If Government taxes you 30 percent, it controls 30 percent of your life. If Government taxes you 50 percent, it controls 50 percent of your life.

How does Government control our lives by taxes? It does so by making choices for you that you cannot afford to make for yourself. Big Government chooses to spend money on welfare for immigrants while you worry where you are going to get money to pay for your kid's braces.

At the same time President Clinton claimed that the era of big Government was over, he increased your taxes in 1993 with the biggest tax increase in American history. The American family is hurting because taxes are too high.

The Republican-controlled Congress set out to free the American family from this tremendous tax burden. The Republican Congress passed the $500-per-child tax credit so that American families could decide how to spend their own hard-earned dollars, as opposed to Washington, but it was vetoed by President Clinton.

If President Clinton had not vetoed this bill, 1.3 million families in Ohio and the same number in Illinois would have been eligible. That means that these households in Illinois and Ohio would have had an extra $1,000 per year to spend on clothing, education, food and shelter. But people who like big Government do not trust Americans to make those decisions because they want Government to spend money that rightfully belongs to the hard-working Americans.

The Republican Congress passed the $2,500 interest deduction on student loans so that families could better afford to send their kids to college, but President Clinton vetoed that, also. The Republican Congress passed a meaningful welfare bill so that the

hard-working Americans could take home more of their money, and the President vetoed that bill, also.

So who is the friend of the working person in America, the forgotten American, the one who is lost in the shuffle of big taxes, the one who is lost in the cloud of big Government? Certainly the friend of the working person is not the ones who insist on taxing more and more. The friend of the working people insists that Government is too big, it is too intrusive, it is too invasive, it takes too much money, it is robbing the American family of the ability to support themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point in American history where the debt is so big because of a runaway liberal big Government mentality, with a $5 trillion debt that, according to a chapter in the budget called Generational Forecasts, if we do not put a rein on Government, by the time children born after 1993 go into the work force, they will pay between 84 and 94 percent of their income in taxes. That is no future for Americans. That is no future for our children.

This Government is too big. It has to shrink. This Government has to lower the taxes on the working people. This Government has to allow working people to keep more of their money. The message is this: The forgotten American, the one who works hard, the one who asks for nothing but freedom, the one who wants to raise his children in a society where he can afford to send them to college, the forgotten American covered by a sea of redtape and taxes, deserves a break. He deserves freedom in government, he deserves freedom from government, he deserves these Republican proposals to allow him to keep more of his hard-earned dollars.

## VISIT OF ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU AND TRIBUTE TO ALONZO SUDLER, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I first want to compliment the comments of the prior speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO]. I think they are well taken in regards to the working man and woman and how much we need to do to make sure that our pro-people and pro-economy philosophies that the gentleman just outlined certainly need to be adopted in this Congress, and I compliment the Congressman for his hard work in moving that agenda forward for America's workers.

Today was a historic day in the Congress, Mr. Speaker. We had a visit from the new prime minister of Israel. Unlike prior visits which have been certainly important to the country, I had a more personal involvement today because Binyamin Netanyahu, the new prime minister, and I share the same alma mater. We went to the same high school.

While he was born in Israel and is now Israel's prime minister, he was taught at a Montgomery County school, Cheltenham High School, in my district. I think people should know that his focus of seriousness of purpose, of vision for the future is one of peace and progress, and someone who certainly has good values and good morals and principles for the community and having the world's interest at heart as well as this country. Binyamin Netanyahu is certainly a credit to Israel and to the relationship with our country.

It was interesting to note in his speech today, which I think was very important, that he says that we can have peace in the Middle East and in our lifetime but we need 3 pillars of that peace.

The first, security, and end to terrorism; two, reciprocity, to make sure that we in fact have on both sides, whether it be Israel or whether the Arab neighbors, that there be peaceful resolutions and to have agreements actually held up to and actually abided by; and, third, having a strengthening of the democracy and of human rights in that region of the world.

I was also happy to hear from the prime minister that he is working on trying to make sure that they have a free market economy in Israel and one that would reduce taxes, that would lead to deregulation and of Israel's economic self-reliance. That is certainly taking a page out of the majority House leadership, I think, from this year, and that is certainly an example we can live up to.

I also want to take a moment of the time of my colleagues tonight to talk about an American hero, someone in my district who recently died, Alonzo Sudler, Jr. This gentleman was the chief pharmacist of our largest hospital in the district, Abington Memorial Hospital. He was married for 45 years to Winifred and loving father of Julia and Steven and the grandfather of twins Alexandra and Zachary. He was a great father and a great husband but beyond that a great community leader. He was involved with the Red Cross, involved with all community activities, and a humble man who cared deeply about his neighborhood, about his family, and about progress in Montgomery County and in Pennsylvania. He gave all this free time back to the community and his family. There is nothing he would not do for others.

For me, he was an American hero, who died prematurely at the age of 71. There are many more years I would liked to have had time to spend with him. He was like a father figure to me in teaching me lessons about life. He was almost a pastor in many respects because of the lessons he taught to younger people about how they should lead their lives.

To Alonzo Sudler and his family and to those who will hear about him, I hope that we all can live our lives in his image and in his memory. I ask God's blessings on his family and we remember them tonight.

## REVISITING THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in 1994 Republicans were elected to the House in great numbers, 73 new Republican freshmen. They came to Washington with lots of reforms in their mind. But since then they have been called extremist, mean-spirited, callous, fanatical and so forth and that has become their label. Yet when we see what their agenda really was, this thing called the Contract With America, what was it designed to do? It was designed to reduce the size of government, to cut wasteful spending, to lower taxes, to balance the budget, to reform welfare, and to increase personal freedom.

The folks I talk to back home in the grocery store checkout line, they do not consider these things extremist ideas. They think that they are commonsense ideas and reforms that we need to do.

Let us look at this in a little more detail. Do you think it is extreme to try to balance the budget the way you and I have to in our household at the end of each month? Do you think it is a good idea to do something about the $20 billion that we spend each month just in interest on the national debt? Do you think we should pass this legacy on to our children? Or do you think we should do something about it? And do you think, Mr. Speaker, that it is extreme to try to balance this budget in a 7-year period of time, so that you do not pull the rug out from under anybody? Do you think that lowering the rate of spending is extreme, so that one day the revenues that come in, tax dollars, and our spending will be equal? I do not believe that is extreme, Mr. Speaker.

What did the Democrats do when they controlled this House? They say what we are trying to do is extreme. They increased domestic spending $300 billion. Years and years of overspending, on tilting the scale toward big bureaucracy, has left us with 163 different Federal job training programs, 26 different Federal food and nutrition programs, and 180 education programs. A lot of duplications in that, Mr. Speaker. I think we can do something about it.

Let us talk about taxes. Under the Democrat rule, we had a tax increase of $245 billion, a gas tax increase of 4.3 cents a gallon, a tax on Social Security, and a tax on small businesses and partners. What do the Republicans want to do, these so-called freshman extremists? They want to cut taxes. One of them is a $500 per child tax credit. Do you think that your friends and neighbors and your people that you see

in car pool lines deserve a $500 per child tax credit? Do you think that they could use that to buy a few more pairs of tennis shoes, T-shirts and back packs for their children? Do you think the workers of America deserve that? Do you think that they have paid enough and maybe something like that would help them?

Let us talk about some of these other taxes that we are accused of giving a tax cut for the wealthy. Do you think that our senior citizens should get the tax relief on their Social Security when the President increased taxes on Social Security in 1993? Do you think it would be fair to take that tax off of our seniors? Do you think that it would be fair to let seniors work longer without being penalized on their Social Security? I do not think that is extremist.

What about the capital gains tax? If we pass a capital gains tax, will Ted Turner benefit from it? He will. I do not have a problem with that, Mr. Speaker, because who else will is all the widows in my area, which is a growth area, who have bought their house 30 years ago, it is now paid for, but the house that they bought for $50,000 in the 1960s is now worth $300,000 and they could benefit from a capital gains tax cut.

Welfare. Let us talk about welfare. We have been accused of extremism in welfare and all kinds of quotes that almost are hard to recognize. The President, as you know, promised to end welfare. He did not offer a welfare reform bill. When we tried to offer one, we were accused, here is one, of Representative LEVIN, ''You use a meat ax against the handicapped children and their parents.''

President Clinton said in February 1995, ''What they want to do is declare war on the children in America.''

Here is another quote from a Member of the House of Representatives on the House floor said, ''These people,'' they are talking about these Republican freshmen, ''are practicing genocide with a smile. They are worse than Hitler.''

Here is another one. These are all from House Members. ''There is a similarity between NEWT and Hitler. Hitler started out getting rid of the poor and those he said were a drag on society and NEWT is starting out the same way.''

These words have been said on the floor of the House by Democrats.

□ 2215

Now I ask, does that sound a little extreme in terms of rhetoric? Is that based on reality? What is the Republican welfare bill?

## SUPPORT THE CHILD TAX CREDIT FOR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. You are truly a gentleman for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on an issue that I think is of critical importance to the people in my district, and that is the people who I believe truly are the forgotten people, and those are the people that work day in, day out to try to struggle to make ends meet.

It is really a privilege to be in this body, it is really a privilege to try my best to represent the people of my district. But one of the things that bothers me and that honestly I am sick and tired of is that there are thousands of people in my district who I honestly feel are ignored, their concerns, their interests are overlooked by the politicians in this city. They are the people who dad works, dad works two jobs to try to make ends meet, mom is working as a cashier at the supermarket to try to make ends meet, and honestly at the end of the month, at the end of the day, they frequently do not have enough money to try to pay for the things that they need.

They are trying to set aside money for college, and they cannot do it. They do not know how they can pay for braces for the kids. The car needs new tires, and they do not have enough money after they pay the rent. They do not have enough money after they buy the food to be able to put new tires on the car. So what do they do? They drive around with a car that needs new tires.

And one of the biggest problems for these working families is the burden of the taxes that forces them to have to put mom out to work when she does not want to or forces dad to have to work that second job and, as a consequence, he cannot spend the time with the kids that he really needs to.

We Republicans, we were trying to do something about that this year. We put forward a $500 per child family tax credit. Those families today in America, typically the working family today in America, they are sending 25 percent of their income to Washington, DC, and 40 years ago when I know when my mom and dad were raising us, when I was a kid growing up, they were sending 4 percent or 2 percent of their income to Washington, DC.

It is the burden of government, of the bureaucracy, of the programs after program after program, the wasted money that is shackling and hurting our working families in this country. So we put forward a $500 per child tax credit, a tax credit that I thought was really going to help some of those working families, working families like the Tanner family in my district, who Bill Tanner works as an electrician. His wife, Anne, just recently had their fifth child, and our $500 per child tax credit would have meant $2,500 more for Bill and Anne Tanner to put toward the new tires on the car, to put towards money for college for the kids, to help them make ends meet.

The President of the United States, he opposed us on that $500 per child tax credit after he ran in 1992 promising a middle-class tax cut, and we put forward a reasonable proposal, and the Democrats in this body opposed us on that $500 per child tax credit.

I think it is wrong for politicians to come up here to Washington and say that they are working hard and they are fighting for those working families, those families that are having trouble making ends meet, and what happens, what is the end result: that they oppose the proposals that we are trying to put forward to honestly try to help them.

They even opposed us on the balanced budget. The economists tell us if we could balance the budget, interest rates in this country could drop 2 percentage points. What that means for those working families is a car loan that is 2 percentage points less, a mortgage that could be 2 percentage points less. That can translate for those working families into more money in their pocket, and that is money again that they could turn around and use for their families.

This government has gotten too expensive. It has gotten to be too costly. Oliver Wendell Holmes said that taxes are the price we pay for civilized society. I believe that the price is too high and that working families in this country need a break. The President and the Democrats in this body need to change their position on this issue. They need to support the family child tax credit. They need to support our balanced budget effort.

## ISSUES OF THE DAY AMONG AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted tonight to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] to join me in probably about 30 or 35 minutes of a dialog regarding issues facing the American people today. With that, I have asked my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, if he would be the floor manager of this discussion. With that, I will ask him to initiate the discussion.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we have just returned from some time back in our districts, and I do not know about the rest of my colleagues, but we have had a chance to hear what some people have had to say on the issues of the day. I had, I think, eight different town meetings, I was involved in about nine parades, did one special meeting with seniors in my district, and so I think I got pretty good feedback, and

I thought maybe we could talk a little bit about some of the things we heard during the district break.

But I know that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] has some points that he wants to make and so I would like to yield to him for as much time as he may consume, if that would be all right, then we can get more into a discussion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to address something that I think is dear to your heart, and that is the label that Republican freshmen have been getting hit with about being called extremists. Your class came to Washington with a spirit of reform and yet the press and the Washington establishment, who likes the status quo, has called you extremist, mean-spirited, callous, and so forth. The reason why is because you have tried to do this thing called the Contract With America. The Contract With America is a legislative package designed to reduce the size of government, cut waste, lower taxes, balance the budget, reform welfare and increase personal freedom.

Now, my friends and neighbors that I see at the grocery store at checkout lines do not consider those extreme ideas. But let us examine this in detail. First of all, do you think it is a good idea to balance the budget? Do you think we should do something about the $20 billion in interest we pay each month on the national debt? Do you think we should pass this legacy on to our children? Do you think it is extreme to try to balance the budget in a 7-year period of time? I think not. I think that is a responsible legislative agenda, and I am glad that you are taking it. I applaud the gentleman for it.

What did the Democrats do before when they were in the majority? Well, they increased domestic spending another $300 billion. They created over a period of time 163 different Federal jobs training programs, 26 different food and nutrition programs, 180 education programs. We may need more than one, but do we need all that duplication in Washington? Do we need all that bureaucracy?

What did the Democrats do about taxes? Well, in 1993, President Clinton passed a $245 billion tax increase, which included a four cents per gallon gas tax, a tax on Social Security, a tax on small businesses and partnerships.

What do the Republicans want to do? Well, we extremists have been accused of wanting to give tax breaks for the rich and the elderly. One of these taxes is a $500 per child tax credit. I ask the Members, is it extreme to give the working families of America a $500 per child tax credit so that they can buy a few more tennis shoes, a few more lunch boxes, a few more books, a few more clothes and so forth? I do not think that is so extreme.

What about our seniors, shouldn't they be able to work longer without being penalized on their Social Security? That is one of the tax relief ideas that we had, allowing seniors to work longer.

What about the capital gains tax cut? Now, will Ted Turner benefit from a capital gains tax cut, and all the wealthy people? Yes, this he will. Do you know who else will? All the widows in my district who bought property in a growth area during the 1960's. They bought a house that was worth maybe $35,000 at the time, and today it is worth $200,000, and they can sell that money for long-term personal care home or a medical emergency and not be taxed at the highest tax bracket because of this thing called the capital gains tax.

What about the marriage tax penalties? Should we give the same tax rate to people who are married as we do to the people who live together? Right now, a couple can live together and they pay less taxes than a couple that gets married. Is that right? Is it extreme that Republican freshmen want to change that? And what about welfare? Members know, we tried to change that.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Georgia, I just wanted to further refine and clarify something he said about working people. Is it not true in America today that the average working family will spend more on paying taxes than that same average working family will spend on clothing, housing or food? Have you heard that?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is absolutely right. Another statistic I have heard is that the real Independence Day is July 3 instead of July 4th, because from January 1 to July 3, that is when you are working to pay for all the cost of the government at every level plus the cost of regulation at every level, and that is right out of working people's pocket.

Mr. JONES. Is it not true also, according to the General Accounting Office, known as the GAO, that in 17 years without a balanced budget, which the Republican Party is committed to achieving, without a balanced budget in 17 years, according to the GAO that average working person will pay 80 cents out of a dollar to taxes? Have your heard that?

Mr. KINGSTON. I have heard that, and all I can say is that family will quit working.

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. KINGSTON. There comes a point when the mule cannot pull the load anymore.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about welfare. The President promised to end welfare as we know it, never introduced a bill when the Democrats held the Senate and the House, and yet when the Republicans did, what were we accused of? And these were quotes, actual quotes that I got out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we were accused of by our Democrat colleagues: These people, the Republicans, are practicing genocide with a smile. They are worse than Hitler.

And here is another quote: There is a similarity between Newt and Hitler; Hitler started getting rid of the poor and those he said were a drag on society, and Newt is starting out the same way.

Here is another quote: But not since the biblical day of King Herod have our children been in such grave danger. But unlike King Herod, who went only at the male child, the Republicans are going after all children.

Now, what is it that we were doing that was so extreme, so hard for the Democrats to take, so that they were accusing us of declaring war on the children? Well, the main thing we are trying to do is say able-bodied people who are on welfare who can work are required to work. Is that extreme? Is it fair for a guy who is out there working 40, 50, 60 hours a week paying for somebody to stay at home, is it extreme to say to the guy who is able to get to work and join him to be required to work? I do not think it is.

What about illegal immigrations? We said no more permanent benefits for illegal aliens, people who are not American citizens. Is that extreme? I would say it isn't. That was part and that was one of the things the President vetoed.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], we recently, as you were talking about welfare reform, if my colleagues remember, the House of Representatives passed a bill, and I am going a little bit off your subject but it does tie in, about we are talking about late-term abortions, and the President of the United States, the highest office in this land, when the majority of people in America said, even women and men that were pro-choice said, that late-term abortions are wrong when a child in the 7th and 8th month of life in the womb of a mother, is murdered, and yet the President vetoed a bill that Democrats on that side and Republicans on this side said that we need to ban late-term abortions in America.

□ 2230

And yet the President vetoed it. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota how his people in Minnesota feel about that issue.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, I think it ties together with what we are talking about, because when we are advancing what I think is a commonsense agenda, and I think it is commonsense whether you are from North Carolina or Georgia or Minnesota, of putting the Federal Government on a diet, making the Federal Government live within its means in advancing policies, whether it is the Defense of Marriage Act or eliminating or making illegal these diabolical late-term abortions where the baby is literally pulled from the mother's womb, all except the head, the head is left in, scissors are inserted in the back of the baby's brain and literally the baby's brains are sucked out

with a suction device, I think everywhere outside this Beltway that is considered extreme.

The agenda we have advanced is commonsense. The extremism, if there is any here in Washington, DC, is I think confined to our liberal friends.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not true that two of the most liberal Democrat leaders, the gentleman from Missouri, DICK GEPHARDT, and the gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, voted to ban these partial birth abortions?

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yet the President still vetoed it.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is a good point. Many of our friends on the other side, who you would consider liberal, joined us in that particular vote, and hopefully this Congress is going to have another opportunity to revisit that issue and we are going to have a chance to override that veto.

Because I do not know about you, and we have talked about going home over the Fourth of July, I was at one county fair, and I must tell you that was the number one issue that people wanted to talk to me about, because they had learned the facts about this procedure and they said you have to do everything in your power to override that veto, to make certain that that stops.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not true this procedure is so gruesome that the extremists who are against the legislation did not want to allow the sponsor to have a postor, a chart that actually showed the procedure, and they tried to vote not to allow it on the floor? Is that not the case?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is exactly right. And it was a very simple medical type diagram to demonstrate exactly what happens in this procedure. But again it comes back to what the gentleman has been talking about what we have been advancing, whether we are talking about regulatory reform, balancing the budget, or allowing families to keep more of what they earn. And your point was made as well that back in the 1950's when we were growing up, I am not sure about you, Mr. KINGSTON, you are quite a bit younger than us, but when we were growing up, my parents, and we talked a little too about working families, my dad worked in a factory all his life, union man, member of the AFL–CIO, and my folks raised three boys and my mother did not work. She stayed home.

Now, we did not have a lot of the things that people think that they have to have today, I am sure, but we never considered ourselves poor. But there was a big difference back in the fifties. Most of the families raised their kids on one income. And why couldn't they? They got to keep 95 percent of what they earned. The average family today has to raise their kids on less than 60 percent of what they earn. Huge difference.

Mr. JONES. In my district, as a candidate for Congress and now as an elected Member of Congress, and going back in my district every weekend since I have been here 17, 18 months, except for about four, the people keep telling me, Congressman, we are tired, we are working harder, we are working longer, but we are taking home less money, what can you do to help us?

I think the Congresses of the past that have been the Democratic controlled Congresses kept increasing programs, increasing the size of government, and when we increase the size of government programs we are taking more money out of working people's pockets.

What has happened in America is that frustration. That is why I think we are the majority now. People are looking for us to reduce programs, particularly those that do not work, which there are plenty, and they are looking to us to say please give us a chance, let us work harder but let us keep more of our money.

I see this frustration every time, every weekend I go home, because I see people at the grocery stores, I see people at church, I see people down the street and they say to me, Congressman, we like what you all are doing, please give us a chance to earn and to have a chance to do for our families what we think we should have a chance to do.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the examples I like to point out in terms of the Federal registration, which is the book of all the Federal regulations, and so forth, it has grown from 41,000 pages 10 years ago to 68,000 pages today, and we have over 130,000 Federal bureaucrats that basically just look over your shoulder to make sure that you are behaving right and telling you how to do things from educating kids, running a poverty program, to health care, to running your business, to your home. Everything.

Some of it is good. I certainly want to have a safe and sound government, but I want to have a commonsense government, one that is balanced. And is that not what we are saying? Is it not that we want to give the people back home more decisionmaking power and more personal freedom, and is that an extreme position?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think the two fundamental questions, and this comes up in my town meetings as well, and I am sure you hear it, and it comes down to two very important questions. The first question is who decides? Is it going to be the Federal Government or is it going to be decided by local units of government and, more importantly, by families?

And second, and I think it is almost the same question, but who knows best? And I think an attitude has developed here in Washington, and I agree that is one of the reasons they sent so many of us here in the last election cycle, was that the attitude that had developed here in Washington that Washington knows best, whether you are talking about raising broccoli or raising kids, there is this attitude that somehow Washington knows best.

I think it was exemplified a few months ago in a hearing in the Senate when one of the education experts ultimately said to one of the Senators that he really felt that he cared more about children than the average parent. And the Senator finally stopped him and he said, well, if you care more about my kids than I do, then please tell me their names.

And when you get right down to it, the truth of the matter is parents care more about kids than bureaucrats and it really is a question of who decides and who knows best. And we have tried to say that we think families know best. We think we ought to allow them to keep more of their own money, to make more of their own decisions so that they can do more for their kids, so that they can save more, so that they can take mom out for supper on Saturday night and leave a little more in the collection plate on Sunday morning.

That is what this is all about. This is not some mean-spirited accounting exercise; it is about renewing the American dream. And for too many Americans that dream is dying today.

Mr. KINGSTON. I had a town meet in the little town of Darien, GA. A teacher came there and she said, you know, each week, or each day I spend 2 to 3 hours on paperwork, most of it for the Federal Government. Now, that is 2 to 3 hours a day, equaling 10 to 15 hours each week, 10 to 15 hours a week she is not teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic to the kids.

Now, the question is, who do you think best knows how to educate the kids in Darien, GA, that teacher or Washington bureaucrats down the street from where we stand right now? And as you have pointed out, as much as these bureaucrats love children all over America, I still think because they are in Washington they might not be able to teach them as well as the teacher who is right there in Darien, GA.

And I do not know why everybody outside of Washington, DC, understands that, but the bureaucrats here just do not get it.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But the story gets twisted. The unfortunate thing is the story gets twisted somehow between what we are trying to do and as it goes through this cycle here and as it gets filtered through sometimes the dominant media culture out there that somehow if we decide to reduce the size of the bureaucracy, the educational bureaucracy, for example, to follow up your point, that if we vote to reduce the size of the educational bureaucracy then we are hurting kids, when in fact there is no real proof that what we are doing right now is helping kids. Test scores have gone down as we have increased the size of the educational bureaucracy here in Washington.

Mr. JONES. During the week at home during July Fourth, just like I am sure you as well as the gentleman

from Georgia, I attend four or five church services that were called God and Country Day.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I am glad to hear that now. You deserve it. You need that.

Mr. JONES. I am going to give this back to you in a moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I did 15 services myself.

Mr. JONES. Well, I want you to speak about yours in just a moment. I attended four or five church services about God and Country Day and Return to Glory Day, and I must say that it helped, it inspired me for this reason. As you know, both you gentlemen know, and I am on the bill and maybe you both are, I am on the bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma, ERNEST ISTOOK, called the Religious Liberties Amendments, and I had this discussed many times. Why do you in Congress, when you have behind the Speaker's chair ''In God we trust,'' why do you not allow our students to have voluntary prayer in school?

And I was pleased to tell them that ERNEST ISTOOK, a second or third termer from the State of Oklahoma, has introduced a constitutional amendment, and that is the way it should be, to give voluntary prayer back to the States and the schools. And these people applauded in church when I told them that I was on a bill that would help, if it passes the House and the Senate and goes back to the legislatures.

As you and I, all three of us know, and those listening, 38 out of 50 State legislatures have to pass the legislation before it becomes an amendment to the Constitution. But people in America are ready for the clarification of our religious freedoms that the writers of the Constitution promised us, whether you are a Jew, Catholic, Protestant or Moslem.

I will share this and then I will yield to you, the gentleman from Minnesota or the gentleman from Georgia. It so happens that last year, in 1995, a Federal judge in Santa Fe, TX, I think his name was Kent, I apologize if I am mistaken, sent a notice to a high school graduating class that if you were going to use the word ''Jesus'' in a prayer, and it was a Protestant-Catholic group, 90 percent of it, then he would have to have you removed by the Federal marshals.

So what ERNEST ISTOOK and those of us who have joined in this legislation have done is to say all we are asking is that we clarify our constitutional rights to practice religious freedom in America, whether you are a Jew, Catholic or Protestant or Moslem.

So I am pleased to tell you that back home in my district, in eastern North Carolina, and I am proud of this district, we care about religious freedoms in this country, and that is what I think the Constitution is all about.

Mr. KINGSTON. All I will say about that Federal judge is he obviously wanted to go to hell and he did not want to wait in line.

I think it is real important that we understand that what we are trying to do is just get decisionmaking out of Washington. Think about this. In Minnesota, North Carolina, if your county welfare agency knew that it was in their hands and in their power to end poverty in your home county, what a difference it would make, because really we do not look at poverty as our problem.

The thing about Americans is we see a problem, we want to fix it. And so what we have found ourselves subconsciously doing in many cases is ignoring problems because we see something like poverty and we think, well, we cannot fix that. You know why we cannot fix it? Because there are too many rules and regulations.

If somebody is on welfare, a 16-year-old with a baby, she needs health care, she has education needs, she has transportation needs, she has child care needs, and under our current welfare bureaucracy different agencies do different things, and so if you wanted to you cannot solve her problem because there are too many bureaucrats who are telling you this is my territory; this is my territory, and I get her here and I get her here and we do not want you just to have one A to Z program to get this young woman independent.

So, as a result, we all kind of tend to back away from it. But if you knew in your hometown you could make a difference, then you would make a difference.

Mr. JONES. Is it not true that since the mid-1960's, when the Great Society program was established under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson, that it has cost the American people $5 trillion? This Nation today is about $5.3 trillion in debt. So welfare has cost the American people $5 trillion.

In addition to that, what the Republican majority has proposed that even Democrats supported and the President vetoed is a program that would save the taxpayers in 7 years in outlays about $58 billion and lend the programs, or I should say direct the programs back to the States, which most of them want, and the President vetoed it.

□ 2245

Is that not correct, please?

Mr. KINGSTON. It is correct. I think, there again, the President was acting from an extreme point. There is nothing extreme about requiring able-bodied people to work. There is nothing extreme about discontinuing permanent benefits for illegal aliens or telling local folks they can get involved in their own poverty program through State grants.

But the President decided to go for the status quo, and if the American taxpayers have paid $5 trillion, is it not time that we tried something different because of no results?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the important point. We have spent $5.2 trillion on the war on poverty. It is terrible in terms of the cost in dollars, but the real tragedy of the welfare system we have created in the United States is not the cost in terms of dollars; it is the cost in terms of human potential.

As I say so many times, we do not have to walk very far from this Capitol building to see the effects of what we have done on people. Go to any of the housing projects. In fact, 85 percent of the violent crime in this city is committed within 3 blocks of a Federal housing project.

We see the despair and despondency and dependency that we have created. The cost is astronomical in terms of dollars, but the cost is so much higher in the cost of human potential. The real reason is when we try to substitute Washington-run welfare systems for those old-fashioned traditional values that really made this country work, things like work, and family, and faith, personal responsibility, those are the cornerstone values that really have made this society work. The problem with the welfare system is not the cost in terms of taxes; it is that it erodes and destroys and eats away at those cornerstone values.

That is why we need to reform the welfare system, not just to save money for taxpayers this generation or the next. We need to reform the welfare system and move away from a Washington-run welfare system because we have destroyed all of those basic values. Look at the families that have broken up, and people do not see themselves as personally responsible anymore. We do not encourage faith. All of those things made this country work.

In the 1840s there was a French gentleman who traveled the United States and he wrote several important books. One was called ''Democracy in America.'' I am talking about Alexis de Tocqueville, and he said it in so many ways so beautifully. It was this volunteerism that really made America work. He talked about religion.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] talked about ERNEST ISTOOK'S bill that I am cosponsoring as well. De Tocqueville said religion is the first instrument of democracy. Yet somehow we have driven religion and faith from the public square. The only welfare system was through the churches and faith institutions, and now we have said they cannot participate.

I do believe that we have to reform the welfare system and help the President keep his campaign promise. It is much more about human potential and the waste that the Washington-based welfare system has created.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the things about welfare, in preparation for Father's Day I was doing some research and found out that police departments unfortunately use as an indicator of crime in the neighborhood, not the drug use and not the location or the geography but how many fathers live at

home. Ninety-two percent of the children on welfare do not have a father at home. Those are the kids that do drop out of school, do have teenage pregnancy situations, do have violent crime and so forth.

The fact was unbelievable, but it is that breakup of the family unit. Why is the dad not at home? Because we have a stupid, insane government policy that says if he stays at home, they get kicked out of the housing project because their income will make them ineligible. Does that make any sense?

Would it not make sense to have a housing project where we have stable mom-and-dad relationships, where we can have some model citizens that other folks who live in the housing project can look up to? Does common sense not dictate that we do that?

Instead, we have a Federal Government that says, ''No, dad, you are out of here. If you stay here, she is going to lose her benefits,'' and she cannot go out and find a job and get the benefits and the child care and the health insurance, and she needs that. I do not blame her.

Mr. JONES. The points have been well made. What we are trying to do is to give a program to the States with a financial support because we believe the States throughout America, the 50 States, as has been proven in Michigan and Wisconsin, that the people of the State know what will help those that are dependent on welfare.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is right. Most of the people on welfare would like to have an opportunity to get off of welfare, but we have a system that punishes them, whether it be that they live in public housing and they go out and get a job and start making a little more money, and they raise the rent and they cannot get caught up. It is the same way with those that want to work.

The point is that we have got to develop a system. I think the States can do a better job—that has been proven—than the Federal Government of saying what works in my country, Pitt County, North Carolina. The State of North Carolina knows better than some bureaucrat that we made reference to 10 minutes ago telling North Carolina or Georgia or Minnesota what works better in their State. Let the people decide. Let the people help people. That is what it is all about.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield, I have had 75 town meetings since I was elected. I did not realize that until we counted.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is extreme.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is extreme, but every one of them, I feel better. Certainly we have a few people that disagree with us, and that is part of a democracy as well.

But there is so much common sense among the American people, and they understand exactly what was just said. They understand that the Washington-based, one-size-fits-all, whether we are talking about education, the environment, whether we are talking about welfare, we can take any issue and they know instinctively that it can probably be run much more efficiently and frankly more compassionately if it is run locally and if we allow people to volunteer and to work together. They know that.

It comes up at my town meetings and I suspect it comes up at every town meeting, that the common sense, the decency and the compassion of the American people is overwhelming. But somehow all of that that we talk about here in Washington is called extreme by some of our friends here in the Congress and by some of the folks in the media, and certainly by the people down in the White House.

But outside of this beltway there is tremendous good common sense among the American people. They understand this. Frankly, I have said this before, I think they are way out in front of us. The things that we are talking about I think the American people understand instinctively.

I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] wants to share some thoughts with us tonight. I wonder if we can kind of wrap up. I do want to talk about some of the other things that we may have heard or learned while we were back in our districts over the Fourth of July break. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] have any? I have a couple of other points I might share.

While my colleagues think about it, I will share a couple. I was surprised in my district how often the issue of the FBI files came up. Frankly, again, I think the American people are out in front of us and I think they put their fingers on the correct questions.

The first question that they cannot seem to understand and I do not understand is how people could be heard in the White House and not know who hired them.

Mr. JONES. Would the gentleman yield? I am not going to take his time, but I must tell him that is the question that was asked of me numerous times. How could Mr. Livingston have such an important job and nobody knows who hired him? That is the point he is making.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I want to make sure we are all on the same page. The question is who hired Mr. Livingston, and he is the political operative who illegally obtained over 900 FBI files on private citizens and invaded their privacy by looking into those files illegally, and has yet to give us an explanation of what he was doing with them, why and who ordered them, and how he is saying he did not even know who hired him.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. One of my constituents raised a point that I had forgotten, and that is that a number of years ago a guy by the name of Chuck Colson went to jail for mishandling one FBI file, and he went to jail for 3 years.

I think there is an instinctive understanding among the American people that if they can misuse the FBI against Republicans here in Washington, that they can misuse the FBI against anybody. It can happen to them. It is a grave concern to the American people.

They are happy that Congress is looking into it, but they also suggested that we have to be very careful that this does not become just a partisan political witch-hunt. I think we have to do our jobs and exercise oversight without becoming overly partisan.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman would yield, because we may in 1 minute yield the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] so he can have a full hour, but I would like to add to the point very quickly that you, with a badge on your lapel that says that you are a Member of Congress, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], you will have a very difficult time, as I would or anyone else in this membership, to get into the White House. Yet we have a man running a security that nobody knows how he got there. It is absolutely ridiculous and crazy.

I think I have about 2 or 3 minutes left. I would like to yield, if the gentlemen would agree, the remainder of my time.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If I could, just for 1 minute, one other very important question was raised. I think this is one of the best questions that I heard. I am embarrassed that I did not think of it. If this is an innocent bureaucratic snafu, why is it that the bureaucrat who was most responsible when he was called before the Senate, why did he take the fifth amendment? There are a lot of unanswered questions and I think the American people are expecting us to get to the bottom of it.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Georgia for participating with me tonight.

## FBI FILES SCANDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to continue joining me in this discussion, and then I will use the last half-hour or whatever I have left to go on about the patent issue, which is an issue that I have been championing here, and will go into great detail for the record after we are done with this discussion.

Let me just note that I worked in the White House for 7 years. I was a speech writer for Ronald Reagan during that time period. I am fully aware of the apparatus in the White House, and I was absolutely horrified to see what was going on there in terms of these FBI files.

Let me also note that I was horrified when Billy Dale, who was a hard-working, just regular human being, a civil

servant who spent his time in the Reagan administration but before that the Carter administration, so Democrat and Republican administrations, sacrificed his life, had done a terrific job, always having to improvise because every time it was a crisis getting people here and there, and then to have this person fired dramatically, right off the bat.

This President showed what he thinks of the working people and the standard operating procedures of the White House by firing this civil servant, and trying to replace him with who? Some Hollywood producer who had a travel agency, in order for them to get this person into a position to basically make some money off getting people to and from Presidential functions.

Well, that was totally out of line, the procedure was totally out of line, but the President did that, and now we find out that that was just basically the first significant indication of what this White House was going to be like.

We would not even know about the FBI files, the hundreds of FBI files that are in the hands of a political operative, actually two political operatives, Democrat political operatives people who had been active in campaigns. Not only active in campaigns, but their job in the campaigns was opposition research, dirt diggers.

These people ended up with hundreds of FBI files in their position, and would we know about it if the Republicans had not won control of this body? We had to subpoena these documents. We had to force the While House to give us the documents which eventually led to the information they had violated the procedure, that they were such scofflaws at the White House that they permitted this to happen.

□ 2300

Let us note one thing, Chuck Colson, I was a reporter prior to becoming Reagan's speechwriter, I remember Chuck Colson. I was a reporter during the White House and Watergate years. I remember what Chuck Colson went to jail for. He went to jail because he was in possession of one FBI file and showed half of one FBI file to one person who was not qualified to see that FBI file. And now this administration has put hundreds of FBI files in the possession of political hacks.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wanted to make a point. I have a staff member whose file was pulled. I want to give you the background, because when you think about this political operative left over from the Al Gore campaign, this Livingston and Marceca fellow, you think that they are checking out NEWT GINGRICH's file or maybe DANA ROHRABACHER's file, but here is a profile of somebody who they checked on: hometown girl from Savannah, GA, mid-twenty's, graduated from the University of Georgia, comes to Washington, idealistic, as we all see thousands of young people each year, comes to Washington, gets a job, maybe making $18,000 a year in the White House. She is not in the inner circle. In fact, she never sees the President. But it is fun and exciting and in her own way she got to help change America. Well, 2 years of that, Clinton wins, she is out. She has moved up the ladder. I hired her for $25,000 a year in her late twenty's. This is the kind of person we are talking about.

Now she finds out that her FBI file has been pulled and that some sleazy political operative is looking at her college education transcripts, her speeding tickets, her employment records, if a neighbor said something bad about her.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Every dirty little thing that anybody can say, totally unsubstantiated rumors are put in FBI files. And they are put in there so that later on if there is a problem, people might follow up, the FBI might follow up to see if there was someting valid to this terrible rumor.

So this young lady that you are talking about, if she is ever made an enemy of somebody by stealing somebody's boyfriend, if that person is jealous and says terrible things about her moral character, that is in those FBI files.

Mr. KINGSTON. If they can invade her privacy, none of us are safe.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield, I would come back to a very important point that Representative ROHRABACHER raised. That is this whole story started with the firing of the White House Travel Office, and we heard the testimony. We have the documentation, sworn testimony that the reason was they wanted their people out, they wanted out people in. We need those slots. That was a direct quote. That was a direct quote.

What really disturbs me about this story probably more than anything else was they had every right to fire those people. The truth of the matter is, they had the right to fire them. They were at will servants. They could be fired at any time. But they were not satisfied just to fire them. They had to make the story better. They had to embellish the story. They had to besmirch these people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. They charged them with crimes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I will tell you what, what really eats at me more than anything else, maybe it is because my dad is getting on and my father-in-law is now gone, but what really bothered me more anything about that story was that two of the seven of those individuals had to bury their fathers while their fathers went to their graves not knowing that they were not crooks.

In other words, their dads went to their graves not knowing that their sons were not crooks because the White House fabricated these stories. They used the FBI. They abused the IRS. That is all part of the testimony.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We know what happens when someone is put into this situation. Ordinary working people, they say, you can defend yourself against these charges. We know what that means. That means that someone's life savings is gone. That means that someone who has been saving up for maybe all their life in order to have a little house at the lake or something or a dream vacation with their wife, that is gone. That is over with. Any of the niceties that they wanted to save up for, gone, because the money that should be going into that which they have worked for and struggled for all their life goes to pay some lawyer to defend themselves from going to jail so that the President of the United States can put a crony in that position.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is true that the money cannot be replaced. What really cannot be replaced is your reputation. I cannot imagine much worse than having my daughter call me, as I think Billy Dale's daughter did call him when she saw the story on the national news, where they were accusing him of fraud and so forth. And his daughter said to him, Dad, say it is not so. I do not know how you could talk to your family. I do not know how you could face your family when on the national news you are being besmirched this way.

I sat in these hearings. I was absolutely certain, absolutely convinced that they were wronged and that I told them I hoped that whoever was responsible, and I think we have a responsibility to try and get to the bottom of who is culpable under this, but I told them that I hoped that whoever was responsible would have to pay and pay dearly because it seems to me that where this whole story started with the seven White House travel office employees and then you see the pattern that has evolved, and it is always denial, delay, an they do not want to give the documents.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. How this ties in, of course, is that Billy Dale's FBI file was pulled in order to what? In order to destroy that person, in order to give cover to the President and his clique. They were going to destroy this man, and those are the people now who are in possession of hundreds of other FBI files. This is totally outrageous.

Chuck Colson goes to jail for one half of one FBI file and these people and these media, I might add, who are sitting and letting this thing go by, yes, there is some criticism, there is some criticism, but have we seen the follow-up questions and the follow-up questions at the press conferences that we would have seen if this would have been a Republican administration?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. As the one fellow said, if this was an innocent bureaucratic mistake, why is the bureaucrat most responsible taking the fifth amendment: If it is innocent, I would think they would be eager to get all this information out. They would be eager to get it all cleared up.

But somebody said, Well, the people in the White House should come clean. It only helps to come clean if you are

clean. And the fear and the suspicion that is building here, and I think among the American people, is that there are people inside that White House who are not clean. And there has been things going on there that they are not proud of, no one is proud of. The only way it is going to stop is if the Congress exercises its constitutional responsibilities and actually, the whole system is built on a system of checks and balances. It would not happen if it were not for the Republican Congress.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. This would never have happened, the American people would never know about this had the Republicans not won a majority in this body. Even with the Republican majority, the White House tried to stonewall us every step of the way in getting this information.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am going to close. I just want to share one other thing that I learned from one of my constituents, and it is a very important thing. He said, this was several months ago when I was home, he said, sometimes, and we get into this, Republican versus Democrat, he said, it is not Republican versus Democrat. In fact, he said, it is not even really right versus left. He said, it is right versus wrong. And what we have been talking about, some of the instances that we have been talking about tonight, it really is right versus wrong.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to mention to you on the subject, I sit on the Appropriations Subcommittee, Treasury, Post Office, White House. We fund the White House and we put in an amendment that said that if you worked for the White House, that unless it involves national security, you are not allow to look at anybody's FBI file, period. That amendment was passed on a bipartisan basis. We had a few Democrats who voted ''no'', but the ranking member supported it and so forth and we passed it.

Because exactly what your constituent said, this is not Democrat versus Republican, this is right versus wrong. If you are over at the White House and you need to look at somebody's files for national security purposes, particularly with all the people who are falling out of airplanes and jumping over the White House fence, I want the President to be protected. I want him to grow to be an old man. I want him to enjoy his last few months of being President peacefully. But the fact is that we do not want people over there on an extracurricular basis invading the privacy of normal citizens.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. This is totally consistent. Even before Billy Dale was fired, I remember when this administration came in, I remember it like it was yesterday, all of a sudden they started calling taxation, what, contributions. And they started calling government spending an investment. Remember that? They would not use the word ''taxation'' and they would not use the words ''government spending.''

And when I knew that when someone who is so disciplined to do something so, what I considered disrespectful as to try to just change the words so the American people do not even know what is going on, so they cannot make a decision based on what policies they like or do not like because they are just corrupting the whole language so the American people will not understand what they are talking about, I said, this is one of the most heinous administrations that I have ever seen.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is almost 1984. It goes back to that book. But I will say this, again, I will close becasue I know you want to talk about patents. I think it is really refreshing to go home and have town meetings. And, frankly, I think the American people are a lot smarter than some of the polls and some of the newspaper people and some of the media people and some of the people in this city give them credit for. I think they are beginning to figure this out.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I had faith that the American people would know that taxes are not a contribution and that all government spending is not just an investment. I think we can trust the American people. It says in God we trust, but was also trust the American people. And we hope that God works his will through the American people. So I wanted to thank you both.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

THE STEAL AMERICAN TECHNOLOGIES ACT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I appreciate being part of that discussion.

I would like to now talk a few minutes about another issue that is, I believe, perhaps just as disturbing as anything we were talking about in terms of what is going on down at the White House.

I have spoken on the floor on many occasions on this issue. But it has yet to come to the floor because there seems to be some maneuvering going on. The issue I am talking about is whether or not the American patent system will survive as was envisioned by our Founding Fathers and whether the patent rights of the American people will be protected or whether the patent rights as we know them will just totally be destroyed and another system, totally alien to the patent system of the United States, superimposed on us, destroying our rights as Americans and hurting our ability to compete and to produce new technologies.

I have spoken on this so many times that everywhere I go people are asking me, how is it possible that after I have given so many speeches and I have been on so many talk shows that Congress still may pass, and there is a very good chance that this bill still may pass when it comes to the floor, and that is H.R. 3460, I call it the Steal American Technologies Act, how is it possible that a bill like this, like H.R. 3460, that will basically destroy the American patent system as we know it and that will mandate every American inventor to fully disclose all the details of every new invention that he is working on, even before the patent is issued, how is it possible that patriotic Members of Congress may well pass this travesty into law? This attack on America's future may well pass this body and this Congress.

I am standing here basically by myself tonight. So how is it possible, when this room is filled with all of these people, 435 Representatives, that they could possibly pass a bill like this. Because once you know the basics, that it is going to mandate that every inventor disclose to every thief in the world every secret of new American technology even before patents are issued, that does not take a rocket scientist to know what the outcome of that is going to be.

Yet I am telling you today that when this vote comes to the floor, if it comes soon, it will happen, there is a good chance that the 435 Members of this body will vote to make that part of the law. They will vote to take, which is another part of H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, they will vote to take the current patent office, which has been part of the United States Government since our Constitution, since Benjamin Franklin wrote it into our Constitution, and obliterate it, eliminate it as part of the Government and resurrect it in a new form, which is a post office like, quasi-corporate entity that, once resurrected, would be under the control of one director who could not be removed for policy decisions but instead only for cause. Once he is in there, he has almost dictatorial power over the patents issued to the people of the United States.

How is it possible that we would be willing to take this system that we have got that has done so well for America and come up with this result?

Well, it is possible, number one, because there are powerful foreign multinational and even domestic corporations that want to steal people's patents. Surprise, surprise. Is anyone really surprised when they hear that? Is it odd that a foreign corporation or some multinational corporation or even a huge domestic corporation would like to steal people's ideas and not pay them for royalties for their new ideas and their new creations?

□ 2315

Well, that is not odd at all when you think about it. That is not odd at all. It is odd, however, that 435 Members of Congress are going to listen to big corporations and perhaps not take it one step further and say: ''Wait a minute. What does this mean to the American people?''

Their interests basically, these very, you know, big multinational corporations, their interests are not the same as those people who are part of the citizenry.

Now, that is not hard to understand as well, and basically these large corporations, unlike the American citizenry, have money to pay for lobbyists,

they actually have access to congressman, they have access to me as well, just like every other congressman. We will listen to the big corporations in our district because they employ a certain number of people in our district, but we have to understand that when we are talking to corporate representative, that that representative may not even represent the interests of his own working people. He may only represent the interests of the people who own that corporation. And Lord know who own these corporations these days. Might be national interests, might be foreign interests, might be who know who is really controlling the board of directors of many large corporations?

But one thing is for sure: That corporate entity does not necessarily speak for the well-being of the community, or the State, or the country, or even the employees of that corporation, to some degree.

Now, they claim, the big corporations claim, that the reason why they are backing, the most of the large corporations are backing, this H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, they claim the real reason they are doing that is to stop a few inventors from gaming the patent system. It is called submarine patenting. That is what they claim is the reason that they want to make these drastic changes in the patent system of the United States of America: because these few people, they are gaming the system, and by doing so they extend the length of time that the patent will be actually in force in the outer years when that time period would not really be due to them had they not, quote, elongated the system and worked it.

Well, to stop this submarine patenting, these powerful forces claim that we must destroy the whole payment system. That is a patent system that has served us well since the founding of our country. We cannot do other things that will perhaps try to solve the problem for administrative, you know, focus on the problem. We cannot do things by trying to basically just single out submarine patenting and say these are the things we need to do to solve that. No, we have to basically destroy the American patent system and replace it with something else. That is their excuse, that is the basic excuse that they are using for their actions, the submarine patent issues.

Basically it is like a doctor saying: ''Well, you got a hangnail. Oh, yeah, I see you're in pain, and I really sympathize with that. Hangnails are problems, and hangnails are bad. Look at how evil hangnails—here is a giant picture of hangnails.'' And then you hear lectures about hangnails, lectures about hangnails, and in the end the doctor says, ''And by the way, we're going to amputate your leg in order to cure the hangnail.''

You say: ''Wait a minute, doctor, I just want my hangnail cured. Can't you just sort of cut the nail off or something?''

''No, no. We're not going to think of anything else. If you want to talk about anything else, we know you're in favor of hangnails. We're going to amputate your leg.''

Well, if you get a doctor giving you that type of, you know, that approach to solving your hangnail problem, you better get yourself a new doctor or you better question what that doctor's motives—or you better question his sanity.

To stop a few inventors from having a couple of extra years on their patent term, the idea of destroying the patent term as we know it, eliminating the guaranteed patent term of 17 years, it is absolutely ridiculous. You basically are declaring war in order to stop some petty theft at a local store.

We must basically—what they are asking us to do is to force all our creative people in the name of stopping a few submarine patentors who are gaming the system to elongate their patent by a little bit—basically we are, in the name of doing that, we are going to force every one of the inventors of the United States of America, every one of our creative geniuses, to expose and to publish every detail of the new technologies they are working on. They are saying, on top of that, we are going to obliterate the Patent Office as part of our Government and resurrect it as a quasi-independent, post office-like government corporation.

Now, that does not make sense, that in order to solve that problem that we have got to go to those lengths to do it. That is why I happen to believe that the submarine patent issue is what we call a straw-man argument. I mean it is something that has been created there for people to argue with, and it is really not—you know, really you are not fighting against the submarine patent because the submarine patent issue may or may not be real. It is a problem, but compared—but obviously it is such a small problem as compared to the incredible solution that is being offered us that that may not be the real force that is driving the changes in our patent system.

By the way, one of the things that they are suggesting as a solution to the submarine patent problem is this new system, of course a new patent office, totally new patent office, obliterate the old one that has been serving us since the Constitution, and in the new Patent Office the patent examiners who decide—these patent examiners, they work hard, and they decide who owns these new technologies that are worth billions and billions of dollars. Some of these new technologies will be creating billions of dollars of wealth. The new patent examiners in this new quasi-government, quasi-private corporation will be stripped of their civil service protection, which is an invitation to people from the outside to try to influence the process, and it is an invitation to corruption because these people now will not have their civil service protection to protect them against being fired for unjust reasons.

Now, this is a scenario that we are going to take these civil servants who have been protecting us, that we are going to change the system that has been protecting us and that we are basically going to force our people to publish everything so every thief in the world can see it.

This is an obscene and an insane proposal, and I have no doubt that some of those pushing the H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, actually believe that this destruction of the American traditional patent system is necessary because a few inventors, so-called submariners, are gaining a few extra years out of the system.

But I also have no doubt that for many of the multinational corporations pushing H.R. 3460, this submarine issue, like I say, is nothing more than a front, and what they really want to do, what they really want to do is to steal and to control the new wealth-producing technologies that are being invented by Americans, especially those in the years ahead.

So there are some people who are very sincere and, I am sure, have been taken in by the argument. There are also some people who know very well, the corporate interests who are out in the hinterland pushing this, know very well that they want to take American technology and use it without paying for it.

I mean this is an incredible scenario. People can say: Can this really happen in the United States of America?

Yes, it can, and the 435 Members of the body here could possibly pass this bill.

It is heinous, and it is evil, and basically, if they get away with it, they will be not only stealing technology, but they will be stealing the standard of living of the American people's children today. If we Americans lose our technological edge, the standard of living of our people will go down, and our children will suffer because of it. Our Nation will not be able to compete as we are today.

What gives us the competitive edge today? What gives us the competitive edge is the fact that you know people making more money, they have better technology in order to our-compete those poorly paid people overseas.

Yet as I said, Congress may pass H.R. 3460, and why? Because many Members, perhaps a majority of my fellow colleagues who are going to vote on this issue, do not know a thing about it. They do not know about this bill. They are at home now asleep or they are with their families or out to a movie or they are reading their work for tomorrow, their paperwork for tomorrow's committee session. Whatever it is, most of my colleagues are not listening to this. But if your Congressman does not know about it, your congressman, a Congressman from anywhere in the United States could vote on this bill, and you know about it, but that Congressman does not. Someone who is reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or

listening in over C-SPAN will now know more about this bill than their own Congressman, and it is vital, if democracy is to work in an atmosphere like this, that the people get involved in the process because you make a difference; every citizen makes a difference when it comes to a situation where a bill may come to this floor when people out there listening to C-SPAN know more about this bill than their own Representative in Congress does.

By the way, this bill already passed through subcommittee and committee, and it passed through in a breeze. There was almost no opposition in the committee.

Now, I am not a Member of either one of those committees, but I did ask members of the subcommittee and the committee if they knew that the bill that they had voted for would mandate the publication of all of our American ideas to every thief in the world so every thief in the world would know it even before the patent is issued. And I will tell you that Members I talked to said:

''Oh, no. It doesn't do that. No, no, you're kidding me. That bill doesn't do that.''

I said:

''Yes, it does.''

''No, no, no. It doesn't. No one would put that bill in front of us like that.''

The members of the subcommittee, several of the members I talked to, would not believe me that that is in the bill. Because they could not believe that the committee would actually pass something so stupid.

Well, how about eliminating the Patent Office and ripping away the civil service protection from our patent examiners? I asked several of my Democratic colleagues about that.

''Oh, no. That's not in the bill. I didn't vote for that. That's not what happened.''

But it was, and the fact is those colleagues that I talked to are very concerned about public employees and whether or not Government people who work for our Government, Federal employees, are being treated fairly, and they could not leave believe that was in the bill. They had just voted for it.

It takes telephone calls and letters from constituents to get the attention of many people who are voting on this floor, especially when they are being approached by powerful interest groups like huge corporations from their own district.

Now, basically there is only one thing that I believed in, can basically stop this underhanded attack on America's future, and that is if our system, as our Founding Fathers envisioned it, works, and meaning that the people of America start working at making sure that our system works. Basically people have got to call their Congressmen or their Representative here in the House and insist that he or she oppose H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act and support the Rohrabacher substitute. That is my substitute that I will offer on the floor if this bill gets to the floor, and, as I say, there is some back-room maneuvering going on now that may—that you know, I will have to watch out very carefully for and the American people may have to mobilize to oppose H.R. 3460 at a moment's notice.

My substitute will eliminate the provisions of H.R. 3460 that would critically wound our patent system and replace them with the language in the bill that restores American patent protection. Basically we are going to restore something that was taken away, and most Americans do not even know this was taken away.

Up until this Congress passed the GATT implementation legislation, Americans, as a right just like any other right, the right to go to church, the right to speak, the right to assemble, you name it, that we have a right to a guaranteed patent term of 17 years. This is something we have had. It was 14 years for about the first 50 years of our country, and then after that it was 17 years of a guaranteed patent term. It was always our right to have a guaranteed patent term, meaning no matter how long once you applied for a patent, no matter how long it took you to get your patent, you were guaranteed after that patent was issued that you would have 17 years of protection.

Well, has already been obliterated because into the GATT implmentation legislation we snuck a provision that was not required by GATT. This was not something that we agreed to in the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. We did not agree to changing that. These people just snuck this provision in even though it was not required by GATT, knowing that we would have to vote for the Whole GATT—you know if we did not, if we wanted to stop this, we would have to vote against the entire world trading system.

□ 2330

So they have already eliminated that. My bill, by the way, H.R. 359, which is my substitute to the Steal American Technologies Act, would restore, would take their language out and put language into the law that restores the guaranteed patent term that was taken away 1½ years ago.

This battle is so vital that I would hate to think that Members are going to vote on this and not be fully aware of what they are voting on. We cannot sit back and expect that that is going to happen on its own. Many Members may think that this bill, when they come in here to vote on it, is just a routine bill that has no interest to their constituents and no long-term interest to the United States of America, because what we have is huge corporations with a lot of money pushing H.R. 3460 on one side, and a bunch of little guys on the other side. We have the Inventors' Association, small business people.

Many of America's universities are on the side of the Rohrabacher substitute, because they rely on the royalties from their own patents to sponsor much of their research at American colleges, and they have come out, MIT and Harvard, many of the major universities in our country, 60 of them have come out in favor of my substitute.

But basically they do not have the money to put in to fight this. They do not have big PR firms coming down to talk to us and lobby us. So basically we have to make sure, the American people have to make sure, that the people representing them in Congress know how important this is.

Let us get down to basics, get down to the basics of why it is important. America has had the strongest patent system in the world since the founding of our country. This is basic to what our Founding Fathers believed in. We needed up, because we had this patent protection, with more freedom and a higher standard of living than any other country in the world. Average people were living well. They had rights. They had decent lives. We were not created by people who thought we were going to be a country where just the elites lived well.

We have seen that erode over the years. But before this time, during the last century and even now, America has been the world's innovator. McCormick, the one that invented the reaper, and Fulton, the steamboat; it was Samuel Morse who invented the telegraph, and Bell the telephone; Edison the electric light; and of course two fellows, two ordinary Americans, two fellows who did not have a big college education, who worked in a bicycle shop, two brothers invented the airplane, invented manned flight.

If they had to change the rules back then, who knows, the Wright Brothers, would they have kept their invention? Maybe Mitsubishi would have come by and stolen their ideas, because it had not been published, so Mitsubishi would hear about it and read about it, and then come into court. And you tell me who is going to win in court, the guys in the bicycle shop, or this huge megacorporation over in Japan trying to steal the patent. Tell me who is going to win in court in a situation like that. We would have ended up with an aerospace industry in Japan, and we would end up with working people in the United States impoverished.

Instead, our Founding Fathers knew the importance of technology and put that right into our Constitution. It did not just happen. Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, they understood that. They planned for it. Thank God for our Founding Fathers, thank God for their foresight.

Now we are taking that idea of technology and freedom, and people right now are maneuvering behind the scenes to destroy that basic concept. Other countries, of course, will own their patent systems over the years. Those patent systems were established to help

who? It was totally different than our system. Their patent system was based on the idea that what we want to do is have a patent system so that we can get the information out to as many people as possible, so that our corporations will be able to have all this information, and they will be able to put it into their production processes.

That is a totally different concept than what emerged here in the United States. There they felt it was more of a collectivist approach, and the system was set up to help the hierarchy. Here we believe that patent protection is like the protection of property rights.

In fact, a patent as established by the Constitution is a property right, just like owning a small farm. Our Founding Fathers did not put things in about collective farms, like they did in Russia and all this stuff, because they knew if the individual farmer owned his own land, that we would produce more wealth from it.

They knew also that if you had patent protection, that our creative genius, our American people would come up with ideas that would produce enormously more wealth, and they would do it because we were protecting that new idea as their right for a given period of time, a guaranteed patent term. That served us well because we looked at the invention of new ideas as the creation of new property, of new wealth.

With this, with this idea, as compared to the Japanese system and the European system, which looked at a patent system as just a distribution of information, America became an unmatched economic dynamo in the world. We were on the cutting edge of all new technologies for a century and a half, because we had a patent system that encouraged our people, and that is why we prospered.

Some people say Americans worked so hard. That is why America is a prosperous country, because Americans worked so hard. I hate to tell you this, Mr. Speaker, I have been all over the world and there are a lot of people who work really hard. They work hard. They struggle and they slave and they sweat, and they get nowhere. They have no standard of living, they are treated like dogs. They have no decent living for their family and they have no hope that their family will ever live any better.

Why is that? Because when our people worked hard, our people had the benefit of cutting edge technology. Our people were always equipped with the best technology so they could produce more wealth. When they worked hard, it was as if 20 or 30 or 50 or 100 other people in other countries were working hard, because those people were basically working as slaves. Our people were working as independent, proud laborers and were provided the technology they needed because we had a system that encouraged people to invest in technology; because it was a guaranteed patent term, people would invest in it, and also inventors could come up with new ideas because they would benefit from that guaranteed patent term.

Basically, with that technological edge, we defeated our enemies in war. We did not win the cold war because we matched the Communists may for man. We did not win the cold war because of that. Everybody knows that. Look back at our other wars. We did not win these wars because our people just, you know, had human wave attacks against our enemies. It was because our people were equipped with the best technology, and we could send them into battle with the dignity of knowing their lives counted, and we were trying to do our best to help them do their mission and come home safely, because we invested in the technology.

That was the same reason we were winning the economic wars. We beat our economic competitors because we had technology. Coupled with the hard work and responsibility of our people, this new technology made sure America beat our competitors and ensured a higher standard of living for our people.

That has not escaped, by the way, the attention of our adversaries. That is very easy to see. Our adversaries understand that fact, that it has been our technology that gave us our leverage. So should it surprise anyone that today our patent system is under incredible attack, and that it is kind of a hush attack, people do not know not know much about it? Even the Members of Congress do not know about it. Even the 430 Members of Congress who are going to vote on this do not know about it.

But I can tell the Members, our economic adversaries know exactly what is going on. They understand that America's patent system has provided us the edge to defeat them in the past, so what they are going to do is just totally change and destroy our American patent system. If it is done in the way, the manner that is going on, they may just succeed.

How we can see this is really easy. Bruce Lehman was appointed by Bill Clinton to head our Patent Office. He is the head of our Patent Office. One of the first things he did was go to Japan, and there in Japan he signed a hushed agreement. I have a copy of that and I put it in the CONGRESSSIONAL RECORD a couple of weeks ago.

He signed a hushed agreement with the head of the patent office in Japan, and here are two unelected officials, and what was the agreement? The agreement was to harmonize the American patent system with Japan's. It did not say anything about submarine patents. They are going to claim the reason they are doing everything is the submarine patent, get rid of those submarine patents. But in reality that agreement in Japan mentioned nothing about submarine patents.

What it did say was that our system was going to be cast off, and instead we were going to have the Japanese system superimposed on us. That is what harmonization means. Harmonization does not mean we are bringing the Japanese up to our level of protection. It means that our people are going to lose protection and our system is going to become like Japan's. What kind of system does Japan have? Let us just remember this.

How many new inventions have come out of Japan in the last 100 years? The Japanese are accurately known as people who are basically copiers and improvers, and basically people who perfect other people's ideas and other people's inventions. They do not, they are not known, because they do not really develop a lot of new technology on their own.

Why is that? Under the Japanese system, yes, they have immediate publication. What happens when they have immediate publication in Japan? Immediately the big guys, the huge corporations and these Japanese conglomerates and these monopolists surround the little guy, and this little guy, or maybe it is just two bicycle shop owners, just two brothers who work in a bicycle shop or something, but whoever it is who has the idea, they are confronted with the most powerful economic forces in society and they are beaten down. They are beaten down and they are destroyed if they try to resist.

The Japanese have had to put up with this, and Japan has been the worse for it, because their creative people have not had the outlook the American people have had. Thus, they have had to rely on the United States and others to produce the technology they need for their whole industrial infrastructure. Now people in our Government are trying to maneuver to make our system identical to what Japan has had in these last 50 years. It is absolutely mind-boggling.

Basically, how are they going to achieve this? Step No. 1, as I said, already happened. It already happened. We had our guaranteed patent term of 17 years and they snuck that change into the GATT implementation legislation, and it sailed right on through. I will tell the Members, I was outraged. I felt betrayed, because I had supported the GATT implementation legislation. I voted for fast track, knowing that there was an agreement that they would not put anything into the GATT implementation legislation unless it was required by GATT itself, and that way they could bring the whole bill here. That is what fast track means, they could bring the whole bill before this Congress and there could be no amendments, you would have to vote up-or-down on it. They snuck this provision in as if it did not mean anything, but it has tremendous implications for our future.

I raised hell about it, and the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, and other leaders of the Republican Party guaranteed to me that I would

be able to have a chance to rectify that on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is why I then authored a bill, H.R. 359, and submitted that legislation, because I had that guarantee that they would have a chance to rectify it, because it should not have been in the GATT implementation legislation in the first place.

Guess what, H.R. 359 was tied up in subcommittee for over a year. Eventually what came out of subcommittee was not H.R. 359, but H.R. 3460, which is officially the Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act, which I am calling, and I think more accurately is reflected by the title, the Steal American Technologies Act. So at least, however, I have been guaranteed that if that bill, H.R. 3460, comes to the floor, that I will have a chance to offer my bill, which restores the American patent, guaranteed patent term, as a substitute for 3460.

Basically, I believe H.R. 3460 would finish the job, and if we take a look at it, this is what the provisions are, it would finish the job of harmonization started with this underhanded change in the GATT implementation legislation. America's huge corporations have apparently bought off on the idea that we should have a global economy, and that our harmonization of patent law with the Japanese is the first step toward this global economy.

I happen to believe that global commerce is a good thing. I am not an isolationist and I am not someone who is a protectionist. I believe in free trade between free people, and I make absolutely no apologies for that. If American companies cannot compete, they should not be protected by the Government.

But we should make sure that we set the ground rules up so Americans are protected from having their technology stolen from them and used against them, and basically H.R. 3460 would take us toward global harmonization, a global economy, by destroying the rights of the American people, by attacking our ability to create a high standard of living in America. In other words, they are trying to bring down the standard of living of the American people in order to achieve a global economy; you know, dilute our rights as Americans. It is ridiculous.

□ 2345

What does H.R. 3460 do?

No. 1, it demands that any idea, when an inventor comes in and applies for a patent after 18 months if that patent is not issued, that inventor is going to see his ideas published so every thief, every Asian copycat, every pirate in the world will be able to see it and steal it. No. 2, it obliterates the Patent Office as we have known it since it was put into the Constitution and resurrected some quasi-governmental or quasi-private corporation which is basically run under the dictatorship of one man who is appointed by the President but cannot be kicked out without cause, not just for policy disagreements. The patent examiners there will lose their civil service protection and there is an invitation to steal our technology and an invitation to corrupt the whole system at the Patent Office. Basically we will have established a czar of the Patent Office for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need czars or dictators or kings in the United States of America. We need Government officials who are accountable to the American people for the decisions that they are making. Basically this is a formula for catastrophe. We are basically trying to remake the American patent system into the Japanese system.

I had a Member of Congress tell me today, ''Well, you know, if those other countries have certainly gotten their systems ahead of ours and they're more modern than ours, we should have a patent system like theirs.''

I wanted to basically explode when I heard this idea that the Japanese system—that has fostered no new improvements, that has kept the Japanese people at the mercy of these huge corporate interests—that that is a better system than ours which was established by our Founding Fathers to guarantee the property rights of our people and has basically given birth to a standard of living and a degree of freedom that the people of the world have never seen before, that the Japanese system is better than ours? Basically there are many people who have influence on the people who will vote on this. There are large corporations, there are people who maybe honestly believe that we have to have a global economy and if it means sacrificing the American people, so be it, because a global economy will bring world peace and all the blah-blah-blah. Well, those people may believe in it. Those people may really believe and there may be some who honestly believe that the submarine patents are so heinous that we can destroy everything in order to get to those few submarine patenters. Let me add this about submarine patenters just to let you know. Ninety-nine percent of all people who apply for a patent in the United States beg and plead to have their patent issued immediately. ''Please give me my patent right away,'' because they know until they get the patent issued to them, they cannot go out and start earning money from it because they cannot get investors, that very few investors will invest in patent pending. But if you have got your patent issued, they will pay attention to you. They are pleading, please, and they know, and these, quote, submarine patenters they are talking about, if they elongate the system, they might find out that they are left behind because new technologies have come along and just left them behind and made their, quote, great technologies obsolete. They know that. The submarine patent issue, some people may believe in it. I hope they listen to the arguments I am presenting because I believe it is a totally fallacious argument that is being used to justify a horrible, horrible change in our system that will bring about terrible consequences for the United States of America. How can we stop this juggernaut? Those people who honestly believe in submarine patents, if they do, they do. You try to give them the logical arguments. But those other people, those other companies, those other corporations and those people, the influence peddlers they hire, we can stop them because democracy works. We can stop them if people will contact the man or woman who represents them in Congress and say, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, has to be defeated, and the Rohrabacher substitute has to be put in its place. If we get enough people doing that, we will make the system work, I believe it will work, and I believe we will triumph over this, because 200 years ago when our Founding Fathers and mothers established this country, there were so many hardships and there were so many challenges and they knew that people would be coming at us just like this. Our Founding Fathers knew this. They knew that people would say, ''Hey, where is America's Achilles' heel?'' They knew that. They knew they would come straight forth. But they also knew you could trust the people, you could count on people to defend their standard of living and their families and their freedom. That is what we are up against today. It is a fight for the future of the United States of America. I hope and I pray that the American people will become activated after the Fourth of July and that we will win the day.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. DUNN of Washington (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LONGLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:30 p.m. and the balance of the week, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 5:30 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. LINCOLN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and on July 11.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROTH, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,337.00.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ENSIGN.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. CRAPO.
Mr. KING.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. ALLARD.
Mr. COBLE.
Mr. ZELIFF.
Mr. MICA.
Mr. DELAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VENTO.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
Mr. LEVIN.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. DEUTSCH.
Mr. REED.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. RAHALL.
Ms. HARMAN.
Mr. MASCARA.
Mr. KLECZKA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROTH.
Mr. HALL of Texas.
Mr. PETERSON of Florida.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. KLINK.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3121. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3121. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 1996, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4034. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Regulations and Policy Statements issued under the Packers and Stockyards Act (Group III) (RIN: 0580–AA45) received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4035. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Regulations and Policy Statements issued under the Packers and Stockyards Act (Group III) (RIN: 0580–AA44) received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4036. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Agricultural Loan Loss Amortization (12 CFR 324) received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4037. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Joint Agency Policy Statement; Interest Rate Risk [Docket No. R–0802] received July 9, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Education, transmitting final priority—Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

4039. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's report on the notice of final funding priorities for fiscal years 1996–97 for a Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

4040. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Pension and Welfare Benefits, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Interpretive Bulletins and Regulations Relating to ERISA (RIN: 1210–AA51) received July 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

4041. A letter from the Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, transmitting the 12th annual report to Congress on the activities and expenditures of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10224(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

4042. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Energy Program [Docket No. EE–RM–96–402] (RIN: 1904–AA81) received July 9, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4043. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Test Rules and Enforceable Testing Consent Agreements/Orders (FRL–5378–3) received July 9, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4044. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 1996 [MD Docket No. 96–84] received July 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4045. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Germany for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–53), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4046. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Morocco for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–54), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4047. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–52), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4048. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of export license agreement for the temporary export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Russia/Kazakstan (Transmittal No. DTC–28–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4049. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report required by section 502 of the Freedom Support Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5852; to the Committee on International Relations.

4050. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (Public Notice 2410) received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4051. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–284, ''Excepted Service Positions Designation Temporary Amendment Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4052. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–286, ''Interference with Medical Facilities and Health Professionals Amendment Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4053. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–287, ''Department of Corrections Employee Mandatory Drug and Alcohol Testing Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4054. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–290, ''Mutual Holding Company Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4055. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–295, ''Sport Commission Conflict of Interest Amendment Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4056. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–296, ''Automobile Insurance Amendment Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4057. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–297, ''Noise Control Amendment Act of 1996'' (received July 10, 1996), pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4058. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List—received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4059. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting an accounting statement covering Federal stewardship property, investments, and responsibilities that was recently recommended by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board [FASAB] and approved in its entirety by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget [OMB], and the Comptroller General, pursuant to Public Law 101–576, section 307 (104 Stat. 2855); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4060. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4061. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Government National Mortgage Association [Ginnie Mae] management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4062. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, and the semiannual report of management on final actions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4063. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

4064. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Eastern Aleutian District and Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 960129019–6019–01; I.D. 070596A] received July 9, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4065. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington DC., on March 12, 1996, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4066. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Disclosure, Publication and Notice of Change of rates and Other Service Terms for Rail Common Carriage (STB Ex Parte No. 528) received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4067. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Disclosure and Notice of Change of Rates and Other Service Terms for Pipeline Common Carriage (STB Ex Parte No. 538) received July 8, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4068. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an updated report concerning the emigration laws and policies of the Russian Federation—Received in the United States House of Representatives June 28, 1996, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b) (H. Doc. No. 104–240); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

4069. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an updated report concerning the emigration laws and policies of Romania—Received in the United States House of Representatives July 8, 1996, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b) (H. Doc. No. 104–241); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

4070. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-out Inventories (Revenue Ruling 96–36) received July 9, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 474. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage (Rept. 104–666). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Science discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1514 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2823. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes: with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than July 23, 1996, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(s), rule X. (Rept. 104–665, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAESLER:

H.R. 3767. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to identify and demonstrate feasible alternatives to demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions under the baseline incinerator program; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BLUTE:

H.R. 3768. A bill to designate a United States Post Office to be located in Groton, MA, as the ''Augusta 'Gusty' Hornblower United States Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. BUNN of Oregon:

H.R. 3769. A bill to provide for the conditional transfer of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands, the Coos Bay Military Wagon Road Grant Lands, and related public domain lands to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 3770. A bill to make the antitrust laws inapplicable to the negotiations between a coalition of health-care professionals and a health-care service plan regarding the wages, rates of pay, hours of work, and other terms and conditions of a contract between a member of such health-care professionals coalition and a health-care service plan, and to their carrying out such terms and conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GOSS, Ms. GREENE of Utah, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 3771. A bill to amend the formula for determining the official mail allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 3772. A bill to establish certain disclosure requirements relating to franked mail sent by Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 3773. A bill to prevent Members of the House of Representatives from making mass mailings during an election year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 3774. A bill to change from 500 to 250 the number of pieces of mail constituting a mass mailing in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MICA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WARD, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 3775. A bill to authorize funds for construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, and Mr. LARGENT):

H.R. 3776. A bill to amend the Crime Control Act of 1990 with respect to the work requirement for Federal prisoners and to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the use of Federal prison labor by nonprofit entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 3777. A bill to approve a settlement agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Oroville-Tonasket Irrigation District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. FROST, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. FRAZER):

H.R. 3778. A bill to provide grants to the States for drug testing projects when individuals are arrested and during the pretrial period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3779. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to reward States for collecting Medicaid funds expended on tobacco-related illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 3780. A bill to protect residents and localities from irresponsibly sited hazardous waste facilities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 3781. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to update its report on hate speech, especially as it relates to hate speech on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GUTKNECHT (for himself, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FROST, Mr. HORN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WELLER):

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that each State should enact legislation regarding notification procedures necessary to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Energy should suspend spent nuclear fuel and radio active target material reprocessing activities; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

236. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 96–2452 memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to facilitate the development and approval of new drugs and biologics; to the Committee on Commerce.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 103: Mr. LONGLEY and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 104: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 303: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 382: Mr. YATES.
H.R. 797: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 878: Mr. KLUG.
H.R. 1281: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1386: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1462: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. HORN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1484: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1513: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1797: Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 2026: Mr. ENSIGN and Mr. PARKER.
H.R. 2092: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2138: Mr. JACOBS.
H.R. 2143: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2244: Mr. LINDER and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 2320: Ms. MOLINARI.
H.R. 2407: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 2416: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2422: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2480: Mr. KLUG.
H.R. 2508: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 2579: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2727: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 2822: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 2834: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2892: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2900: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NEY, Mr. FORD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BASS, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.
H.R. 3037: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3100: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 3195: Mr. MONTGOMERY.
H.R. 3213: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3274: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 3385: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 3393: Mr. TORRICELLI and Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 3418: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3423: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. LIVINGSTON.
H.R. 3424: Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 3433: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3447: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 3460: Mr. MCHALE.
H.R. 3496: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3505: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 3514: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 3565: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3573: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3586: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3629: Mr. MARTINI and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3631: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
H.R. 3636: Mr. ALLARD and Mr. FLANAGAN.
H.R. 3645: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 3648: Mr. THOMPSON.
H.R. 3677: Mr. STARK and Mr. ENSIGN.
H.R. 3687: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. EWING, and Mr. COOLEY.
H.R. 3710: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FROST, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YATES, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 3715: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOKE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 3735: Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 3749: Mr. HOUGHTON.
H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. SANDERS.
H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. NEY and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Res. 286: Mr. MCHALE.
H. Res. 452: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of the rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. CHRYSLER

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 6, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $2,399,000)''.

Page 38, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,399,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. CONDIT

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 87, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 515. The amount provided in this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and entrant assistance'' is increased, and each other amount provided in this Act that is not required to be provided by a provision of law is reduced, by $487,000,000 and 0.9 percent, respectively.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 70, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,923,000)''.

Page 73, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,923,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. GOODLING

AMENDMENT NO. 22:

Under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH''—

(1) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $48,902,000)'';

(2) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $29,581,000)'';

(3) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,499,000)'';

(4) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $17,270,000)'';

(5) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $15,826,000)'';

(6) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $31,124,000)'';

(7) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,175,000)'';

(8) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $13,293,000)'';

(9) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $6,816,000)'';

(10) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,058,000)'';

(11) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,947,000)'';

(12) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,319,000)'';

(13) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,566,000)'';

(14) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NURSING RESEARCH'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,385,000)'';

(15) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,857,000)'';

(16) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,377,000)'';

(17) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $14,462,000)'';

(18) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $9,311,000)'';

(19) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL CENTER FOR HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $6,923,000)'';

(20) in the item relating to ''JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $490,000)'';

(21) in the item relating to ''NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,251,000)'';

(22) in the item relating to ''OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,450,000)''; and

(23) in the item relating to ''BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $19,118,000)''.

In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SPECIAL EDUCATION'', after each of the two dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(increased by $291,000,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTKNECHT

AMENDMENT NO. 23. Page 87, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 515. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1.9 percent.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 24. Beginning on page 43, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 44, line 7.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MRS. LOWEY

AMENDMENT NO. 25. Page 22, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,400,000)''.

Page 26, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,400,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MRS. LOWEY

AMENDMENT NO. 26. On page 59, line 3, after ''V–A,'' insert ''V–B,''

On page 59, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

On page 65, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MRS. LOWEY

AMENDMENT NO. 27. At the end of title III of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 307. The amount provided in title III for ''School Improvement Programs'' (including for activities authorized by title V–B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) is increased, and the amount provided in title III for ''Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement'' is reduced; by $2,000,000, and $2,000,000, respectively.''

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. MCINTOSH

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 87, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 515. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Labor may be used to enforce section 1926.28(a) of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to any operation, when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such enforcement pertains to a requirement that workers wear long pants and such requirement would cause the workers to experience extreme discomfort due to excessively high air temperatures.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 87, after line 15, insert the following:

TITLE VI—HEAD START CHOICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

**SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the ''Head Start Choice Demonstration Act of 1996''.

**SEC. 602. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this title is to determine the effects on children of providing financial assistance to low-income parents to enable such parents to select the preschool program their children will attend.

**SEC. 603. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

(a) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve, and make available to the Comptroller General of the United States, 5 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year to carry out this title, for evaluation in accordance with section 608 of Head Start demonstration projects assisted under this title.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount remaining after compliance with subsection (a) shall be used by the Secretary to make grants to eligible entities to enable such entities to carry out at least 10, but not more than 20, Head Start demonstration projects under which low-income parents receive preschool certificates for the costs of enrolling their eligible children in a Head Start demonstration project.

(2) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary shall continue a Head Start demonstration project under this title by awarding a grant under paragraph (1) to an eligible entity that received such a grant for a fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, if the Secretary determines that such eligible entity was in compliance with this title for such preceding fiscal year.

(c) USE OF GRANTS.—Grants awarded under subsection (b) shall be used to pay the costs of—

(1) providing preschool certificates to low-income parents to enable such parents to pay the tuition, the fees, and the allowable costs of transportation (if any) for their eligible children to attend a Head Start Choice Preschool as a participant in a Head Start demonstration project; and

(2) administration of the demonstration project, which shall not exceed 15 percent of the amount received in the first fiscal year for which the eligible entity provides preschool certificates under this title or 10 percent in any subsequent fiscal year, including—

(A) seeking the involvement of preschools in the demonstration project;

(B) providing information about the demonstration project and Head Start Choice Preschools to parents of eligible children;

(C) making determinations of eligibility for participation in the demonstration project for eligible children;

(D) selecting students to participate in the demonstration project;

(E) determining the cash value of, and issuing, preschool certificates;

(F) compiling and maintaining such financial and programmatic records as the Secretary may prescribe; and

(G) collecting such information about the effects of the demonstration project as the evaluating agency may need to conduct the evaluation described in section 608.

**SEC. 604. PRIORITY.**

In awarding grants under this title, the Secretary shall give priority to eligible entities that propose to carry out Head Start demonstration projects—

(1) in which Head Start Choice Preschools offer an enrollment opportunity to the broadest range of low-income children;

(2) that involve diverse types of Head Start Choice Preschools; and

(3) that will contribute to the geographic diversity of Head Start demonstration projects assisted under this title, including awarding grants for Head Start demonstration projects in States that are primarily rural and awarding grants for Head Start demonstration projects in States that are primarily urban.

**SEC. 605. APPLICATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any eligible entity that wishes to receive a grant under section 603 shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each application described in subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) information demonstrating eligibility of the eligible entity to carry out a Head Start demonstration project;

(2) with respect to Head Start Choice Preschools—

(A) a description of the types of potential Head Start Choice Preschools that will be involved in the demonstration project;

(B)(i) a description of the procedures used to encourage Head Start Choice Preschools to be involved in the demonstration project; and

(ii) a description of how the eligible entity will annually determine the number of spaces available for eligible children in each Head Start demonstration project;

(C) an assurance that each Head Start Choice Preschools operated, for at least 1 year prior to accepting preschool certificates under this title, an educational program similar to the Head Start project for which such preschool will accept such certificates;

(D) an assurance that the eligible entity will terminate the involvement of any Head Start Choice Preschool that fails to comply with the conditions of its involvement in the demonstration project; and

(E) a description of the extent to which each Head Start Choice Preschool will accept preschool certificates issued under this title by eligible entities as full or partial payment for tuitionand fees;

(3) with respect to the operation of the demonstration project—

(A) a description of the geographical area to be served;

(B) a timetable for carrying out the demonstration project;

(C) a description of the procedures to be used for the issuance and redemption of preschool certificats issued under this title by eligible entities;

(D) a description of the procedures by which a head Start Choice Preschool will make a pro rata refund to an eligibility entity, of the cash value of preschool certificate issued under this title by such entity for any participating child who withdraws from the demonstration project for any reasons, before completing 75 percent of the preschool attendance period for which the preschool certificate was issued;

(E) a description of the procedure to be used to provide the parental notification described in seciton 607;

(F) an assurance that the eligible entity will place all funds received under this title into a separate account, and that no other funds will be placed in such account;

(G) an assurance that the eligible entity will provide the Secretary periodic reports on the status of such funds;

(H) an assurance that the eligible entity will cooperate with the Comptroller General of the United States and the evaluating agency in carrying out the evaluations described in section 608; and

(I) an assurance that the eligible entity will—

(i) maintain such records as the Secretary may require; and

(ii) comply with reasonable requests from the Secretary for information; and

(4) such other assurances and information as the Secretary may require.

**SEC. 606. PRESCHOOL CERTIFICATES.**

(a) PRESCHOOL CERTIFICATES.—

(1) CASH VALUE.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the cash value of a child's preschool certificate received under this title shall be determined by the eligible entity, but shall be a cash value that provides to the recipient of the preschool certificate the maximum degree of choice in selecting the Head Start Choice Preschool the child will attend.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to such rules as the Secretary may issue, in determining the cash value of a preschool certificate under this title an eligible entity shall consider the additional reasonable costs of transportation directly attributable to the child's participation in the demonstration project.

(B) PRESCHOOLS CHARGING TUITION.—If a child participating in a demonstration project under this title was attending a public or private preschool that charged tuition for the year preceding the first year of such participation, then in determining the cash value of a preschool certificate for such child under this title the eligible entity shall consider—

(i) the tuition charged by such preschool for such child in the preceding year; and

(ii) the cash value of the preschool certificates under this title that are provided to other children.

(3) SPECIAL RULE.—An eligible entity may provide a preschool certificate under this title to the parent of a child who chooses to attend a preschool that does not charge tuition or fees, to pay the additional reasonable costs of transportation directly attributable to the child's participation in the demonstration project.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—The cash value of the preschool certificate for a fiscal year may be adjusted in the second and third years of a child's participation in a Head Start demonstration project under this title to reflect any increase or decrease in the tuition, fees, or transportation costs directly attributable to that child's continued attendance at a Head Start Choice Preschool, but shall not be increased for this purpose by more than 10 percent of the cash value of the preschool certificate for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

(c) MAXIMUM CASH VALUE.—The cash value of a child's preschool certificate shall not exceed the then most recent national average per child expenditure for children participating in Head Start programs, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) INCOME.—A preschool certificate received under this title, and funds provided under such certificate, shall not be treated as income of the parents for purposes of Federal tax laws.

(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede or modify any provision of a State constitution or State law that prohibits the expenditure of public funds in or by religious or other private institutions, except that no provision of a State constitution or State law shall be construed or applied to prohibit any grantee from paying the administrative costs of a program under this title or to prohibit the expenditure in or by religious or other private institutions of any Federal funds provided under this title.

**SEC. 607. PARENTAL NOTIFICATION.**

Each eligible entity receiving a grant under section 603 shall provide timely notice of its Head Start demonstration project to parents of children residing in the area to be served by the demonstration project. At a minimum, such notice shall—

(1) describe the demonstration project;

(2) describe the eligibility requirements for participation in the demonstration project;

(3) describe the information needed to make a determination of eligibility for participation in the demonstration project for a child;

(4) describe the selection procedures to be used if the number of children seeking to participate in the demonstration project exceeds the number that can be accommodated in the demonstration project;

(5) provide information about each Head Start Choice Preschool, including information about any admission requirements or criteria for each Head Start Choice Preschool participating in the demonstration project; and

(6) include the schedule for parents to apply for their children to participate in the demonstration project.

**SEC. 608. EVALUATION.**

(a) ANNUAL EVALUATION.—

(1) CONTRACT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall enter into a contract, with an evaluating agency that has demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, for the conduct of an ongoing rigorous evaluation of the demonstration program under this title.

(2) ANNUAL EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to annually evaluate each demonstration project under this title in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in subsection (b).

(3) TRANSMISSION.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to transmit to the Comptroller General of the United States—

(A) the findings of each annual evaluation under paragraph (1); and

(B) a copy of each report received pursuant to section 609(a) for the applicable year.

(b) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish minimum criteria for evaluating the Head Start demonstration program under this title. Such criteria shall provide for—

(1) a description of the implementation of each demonstration project under this title and the demonstration project's effects on all participants, preschools, Head Start programs, and communities in the demonstration project area, with particular attention given to the level of parental satisfaction with the demonstration program; and

(2) a comparison of the educational achievement of all children enrolled in preschool in the demonstration project area, including a comparison of—

(A) such children receiving preschool certificates under this title; and

(B) such children not receiving preschool certificates under this title.

**SEC. 609. REPORTS.**

(a) REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENT.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under section 603 shall submit to the evaluating agency entering into the contract under section 608(a)(1) an annual report regarding the demonstration project under this title. Each such report shall be submitted at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information, as such evaluating agency may require.

(b) REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall report annually to the Congress on the findings of the annual evaluation under section 608(a)(2) of each demonstration project under this title. Each such report shall contain a copy of—

(A) the annual evaluation under section 608(a)(2) of each demonstration project under this title; and

(B) each report received under subsection (a) for the applicable year.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a final report to the Congress within 9 months after the conclusion of the demonstration program under this title that summarizes the findings of the annual evaluations conducted pursuant to section 608(a)(2).

**SEC. 610. NONDISCRIMINATION.**

Section 654 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9849) shall apply with respect to Head Start demonstration projects under this title in the same manner as such section applies to Head Start programs under such Act.

**SEC. 611. DEFINITIONS.**

As used in this title—

(1) the term ''eligible child'' means a child who is eligible under the Head Start Act to participate in a Head Start program operating in the local geographical area involved;

(2) the term ''eligible entity'' means a State, a public agency, institution, or organization (including a State or local educational agency), a consortium of public agencies, or a consortium of public and nonprofit private organizations, that demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, its ability to—

(A) receive, disburse, and account for Federal funds; and

(B) comply with the requirements of this title;

(3) the term ''evaluating agency'' means any academic institution, consortium of professionals, or private or nonprofit organization, with demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, that is not an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

(4) the term ''Head Start Choice Preschool'' means any public or private preschool, including a private sectarian preschool, that is eligible and willing to carry out a Head Start demonstration project;

(5) the term ''Head Start demonstration project'' means a project that carries out a program of the kind described in section 638 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9833);

(6) the term ''local educational agency'' has the same meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(7) the term ''parent'' includes a legal guardian or other individual acting in loco parentis;

(8) the term ''preschool'' means an entity that carries out a program that—

(A) is designed for children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance; and

(B) provides comprehensive educational, nutritional, social, and other services to aid such children and their families; and

(9) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

**SEC. 612. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, to carry out this title.

**SEC. 613. OFFSET.**

The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for the following account is hereby reduced by the following amount:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for general departmental management, including hire of six sedans, and for carrying out titles III, XVII, and XX of the Public Health Service Act, $15,000,000.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Page 19, strike lines 8 through 15.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 31: Page 74, beginning on line 6, strike the colon and all that follows through line 10 and insert a period.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 32: Beginning on page 86, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 87, line 3.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 87, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 515. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to make any payment to any health plan when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such health plan prevents or limits a health care provider's communications with respect to a current, former, or prospective patient's physical or mental condition or treatment options (other than trade secrets or knowing misrepresentations) to such patient, or a guardian or legal representative of such patient.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. SLAUGHTER

AMENDMENT NO. 34: In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $300,000, which amount shall be for genetic nondiscrimination enforcement activities)''.

In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $300,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. SLAUGHTER

AMENDMENT NO. 35: In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $300,000, which amount shall be for genetic nondiscrimination enforcement activities in accordance with the provisions of H.R. 2748 (104th Congress))''.

In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $300,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. SOUDER

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 22, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $192,592,000)''.

Page 23, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $192,592,000)''.

Page 26, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $192,592,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. VELÁZQUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $7,500,000)''.

Page 17, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $11,000,000)''.

Page 17, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,500,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. VELÁZQUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Page 57, after line 15, insert the following new title:

TITLE II–A—ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR PROGRAMS

ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR PROGRAMS

The amounts otherwise provided by titles I and II are revised by increasing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'' (consisting of an increase of $10,000,000 in the amount made available for ''Employment Standards Administration—Salaries and expenses'' and an increase of $3,500,000 in the amount made available for ''Departmental Management—Salaries and expenses''), and reducing the amount made available for ''National Institutes of Health—Buildings and facilities'' (consisting of a reduction of $13,500,000 from both the aggregate amount and from the amount specified under such heading for the clinical research center), by $13,500,000.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. VELÁZQUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 39: Page 59, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $11,000,000)''.

Page 59, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $11,000,000)''.

Page 59, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $11,000,000)''.

Page 59, line 26, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $11,000,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 40: Page 26, line 25, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $24,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 22, insert after the dollar amount ''(decreased by $24,000,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 26, line 25, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 22, insert after the dollar amount ''(decreased by $24,000,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 26, line 25, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 22, insert after the dollar amount ''(decreased by $3,000,000)''.

H.R. 3755

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill, after the last section (preceding the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to order, direct, enforce, or compel any employer to pay backpay to any employee for any period when it is made known to the Federal official to whom the funds are made available that during such period the employee was not lawfully entitled to be present and employed in the United States.

H.R. 3756

OFFERED BY: MR. BROWNBACK OF KANSAS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 118, after line 16, insert the following section:

SEC. 637. For purposes of section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(2)), no adjustment under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to have taken effect in fiscal year 1997 in the rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems.

H.R. 3756

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTKNECHT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 119, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 701. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1.9 percent.

H.R. 3756

OFFERED BY: MR. HEINEMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of title VI (relating to governmentwide general provisions), insert the following new section:

SEC. . For purposes of section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(2)), no adjustment under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to have taken effect in fiscal year 1997 in the rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems.