

the amendment, so I will briefly for the Members review the amendments. There were three.

One, based upon the number of cosponsors and an indication that we want to extend it to every person who has had an affiliation with the House, whether they be Member or Delegate, that the oral history portion may in fact be of a considerable length, and so in the amendment, one of the items is that "in consultation with the Committee on House Administration" was added so that there could be some minimal institutional control over the history in terms of its overall purport and direction.

Secondly, there was a provision of changing "may" to "shall." The language was that "the librarian may use private funds" and it was changed to "the librarian shall use private funds." One only need pick up current newspapers and examine the way in which "may" and "shall" will be of significance.

There was to be an event in Lisbon, Portugal which was to be funded by private dollars. It turns out that they became public dollars, including an \$18,000 a month apartment for former Member Tony Coelho who headed that operation, and that was one of the reasons we stressed "shall" instead of "may."

And then finally, based upon the description about what folks thought was important in presenting this legislation to the Members, the third amendment, and probably ultimately the most important amendment, required that on the Internet, not, as the bill originally stated, excerpts of the history would be presented but, in fact, the entire history.

It seems as though as time goes on, people tend to have their own particular view of what was important and what was not, of who was important and who was not. And to ensure that no future majority is able to distort the full history of the House of Representatives, the third item was added, and I think all Americans will be supportive of the fact that the entire history is made available, not someone's version of what the history of the House of Representatives ought to be.

And so with those amendments, I am pleased to support the measure.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2303—The History Of The House Awareness And Preservation Act. I wish to commend my colleague from Connecticut for introducing this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how easy it is to forget our history. In the hectic days and weeks that make up our lives on Capitol Hill, many of us rush from meeting to meeting through this magnificent building, often not even glancing at the beautiful artwork that adorns its walls, or to consider the awesome achievements of the men and women who preceded us.

As a freshman legislator, I am still struck with a sense of awe when I walk in this chamber to cast a vote, representing more than

600,000 Americans in their national legislature. As I walk in Statuary Hall, I am still halted by the serene statue of Wisconsin's Fighting Bob LaFollette, a progressive champion who represented my district nearly a hundred years ago. What I think is great about this institution, and why it is valuable to record its history, is that members who have been here for decades still get those feelings too.

This legislation will help us all take a moment to reflect on the importance of what has been decided here and its context in history. By having the Library of Congress create the first history of the House of Representatives, the Nation will have a resource to remind us of the how and why the 13 colonies came together in something called a Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not fashionable to praise this body. I know that pundits and critics make healthy livings denigrating Congress and the work we do here. This legislation, this history, may give them pause to consider the underpinnings of this institution, and realize that the nobler calling of the Founding Fathers are still with us, and that all of us—Republican and Democrat—are still trying to do our best to live up to those high standards established more than two centuries ago.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2303, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 2303, the legislation just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING NON-CONGRESSIONAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO ENROLL THEIR CHILDREN IN THE HOUSE CHILD CARE CENTER

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3122) to permit the enrollment in the House of Representatives Child Care Center of children of Federal employees who are not employees of the legislative branch.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3122

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN OF OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHILD CARE CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 312(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting "; and"; and

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

"(C) if places are available after admission of all children who are eligible under subparagraphs (A) or (B), for children of employees of other offices, departments, and agencies of the Federal government."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to children admitted to the House of Representatives Child Care Center on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been a supporter of the House Child Care Center since its initiation. Actually the wife of one of our former colleagues, Al Swift, Mrs. Swift, was instrumental along with others, both staff and Members and spouses, in initiating the House Child Care Center. However, today, eligibility for that center is restricted, first to the children of House employees, then to the children of employees of the Senate, and other legislative branch agencies. While clearly the supportive costs were initiated by the House, this has become a self-funding structure. One of the concerns that we have is that this not be in direct competition with the private sector but that it be able to have a broad enough scope to sustain itself.

And so this measure provides for the extension of the House Child Care Center to a third category, which would assume its position below the others in terms of a prioritization of admittance of students, and that would be children of other employees of the Federal Government, i.e., the executive branch. This expansion of eligibility was requested by the board of directors, supported by the chief administrative officer and as evidence of our general support here on the floor of the House today.

As I said, there is no direct subsidy from the House of Representatives today, and, frankly, the budget for the House Child Care Center is one that is very tight. It performs a needed and very useful service to the legislative branch, and we would not just want this useful and needed service to fail because of our failure to extend it to other areas of the Federal Government. When a request for this change was made, the board of directors wrote this: "If we are allowed to fill vacancies with children of other Federal agencies, our budget will be augmented,