Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. The gentleman is correct. It is an excellent proposal that makes sure that we are really going to get the net gain in police we want. It is better, as the gentleman says, than anything that we had even in the last year's bill relative to this kind of restriction, so I thank him for offering it. I accept the amendment and encourage its adoption.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, with that I wholeheartedly support the amendment and ask that it be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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. BONILLA) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUNDERSON, 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. 748) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR ALL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW AND THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves: that all Committees of the House and their subcommittees have permission to sit tomorrow, February 14, and for the balance of the week while the House is meeting under the five-minute rule.

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I do not intend to take the full hour allotted to me.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], I would say that the hour is late, and I hope we will be able to adjourn shortly.

In the meantime, all Members should be advised that we are very likely to have one more vote before this evening is over.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules today approved an outrageous gag rule for the National Security Act. It cuts off debate. It blocks important amendments.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, to be clear for the RECORD, I yielded this time to the gentleman from Michigan for purposes of debate only.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has yielded for purposes of debate only. There is nothing to object to at this point.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman yielded 30 minutes without reservations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] clarified his yielding, and this is for purposes of debate only.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

□ 2120

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this rule that was put out this afternoon by the Republican leadership on the Committee on Rules is a gag rule for our National Security Act. It cuts off debate, it blocks important amendments, and it does so under a 10-hour time limit.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is too important. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider in this session of Congress or in this Congress.

The Republicans want to completely rewrite the foreign policy of the United States in 10 hours. They want to reconstruct the entire defense policy and return to the days of star wars in 10 hours. They want to restrict the military's ability to respond to emergencies around the world in 10 hours. They want to completely rethink our relationship with our NATO allies in 10 hours.

Mr. Speaker, this does not make any sense. We have tried throughout the day to negotiate without colleagues on this side of the aisle to give us adequate debate so we can take on these important issues which affect the national security of our country in a reasonable amount of time where Members of this floor can get up and express themselves with amendments that make sense for this country. And we find ourselves in a situation tonight where we have to object.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important pieces of foreign policy legislation to be considered by Congress in years.

Mr. Speaker, if you talk to the distinguished ranking Members on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and others who have labored in these areas for years and decades, they will tell you it is an outrage we are going to consider this piece of legislation for only 10 hours.

Why do my Republican colleagues feel that they need to rush this bill through without adequate debate, without an opportunity for Members to offer amendments? I will tell you why. Because they want to punch another little hole in their Contract With America. They want to check off another item on the list.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you do not write good laws by punching little cards, and you do not write good laws by rushing to judgment on issues that concern the national security of this country.

That is not the way to protect this Nation. We ask for a reasonable amount of time, and we have been told 10 hours is all you are going to get, for foreign policy, for defense policy, for policy that deals with our most important allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It just will not do. You could spend 10 hours on the debate alone between troop readiness and star wars, which is a piece of the debate we are about to have in this bill as we approach it in the next couple of days.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say as strongly as I can on behalf of myself and the rest of the Democratic leadership, we feel this is an injustice and we will not stand for it, and we want to make our voices heard this evening on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my dear colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this urge to measure legislation by sheer volume of bills passed has really now come up against reality. This 10-hour limitation was perfectly sensible for some of the bills we have been doing this week. They were single issue bills. We did 10 hours on prisons, 10 hours on the prevention police. We bump up against it a little bit, but they are reasonable.

This 10-hour model now is applying to an omnibus bill that takes in vast areas of national security, of foreign policy, and of defense. Remember out of the 10 hours comes rollcalls. If you have four or five rollcalls, you have eaten up a couple of hours by the amount of time they will take. We will debate what our relationship should be with NATO, what new nations will come into NATO, do we go back to star wars, what is our relationship to peacekeeping, what are our requirements when the United States participates in multinational peacekeeping, all in 10 hours.

By the way, the hard working majority plans to leave town at 3 o'clock on Thursday. This is 10 hours compressing the most important issues this Nation faces, so we can get out of town early.

Well, let us wait until next week, if the vacation is irresistible. Frankly, for those who are prepared simply to take marching and voting orders, 10

hours may be OK. If you have checked your independent thought processes at the door and are ready to walk in here and be told what to do, I suppose 10 minutes would probably do it, if you can check them off like that.

But those of us who think this country is entitled to serious discussion of these issues understand, 10 hours is the most debasing and degrading approach to the legislative process I have ever seen, particularly when it is for the convenience of an early vacation.

One of the issues that I was hoping we would raise, and I have talked to Members on the other side, is burden sharing, which this House forced on the administration. It is bipartisan, the opposition to burden sharing. Republican and Democratic Presidents alike have resisted it, and we insisted on it. We cannot adequately do that in 10 hours.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deal with this large range of issues that have been put together. If you are, in fact, prepared simply to do as you are told, if you have presigned on and do not need to think about it, OK. But the notion that in 10 hours, with time out for votes, you can redefine our relationships to the United Nations and NATO, reconstruct our defense command structure, redefine the powers of the President, all within a 10-hour period, which will include general debate, which will include time for the rules, it is a degradation of the legislative process.

By the way, once again we are being told that one of the reforms the Republicans brought to us gets checked at the door. One of the great reforms was the reinstitution of the rule that said we will not have you on the floor when the committees are meeting. They apparently put that reform in so they could waive it every week. They have waived that rule more than they have waived the contract. That rule has been dispensed with virtually every week, so that Members will be expected to be on the floor and deal with the questions of NATO and SDI, et cetera, and at the same time simultaneously be in committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is taking the legislative process hostage so you can fulfill a political promise that turned out to be more difficult than you thought. No one would describe 10 hours as remotely adequate to deal with these very important issues. What the majority is trying to do is to cram into an obviously inadequate period of time a series of difficult issues, and in part, because this one is beginning to unravel. This one is beginning to engender opposition from Republicans who have served in high defense and national security positions.

The implications of this one will not bear scrutiny. Ten hours of debate is absolutely a breach of faith with the Democratic process and it will engender, I believe on our side, an appropriate response. People who tell us that we cannot take adequate time to deal with these issues cannot expect to be treated by us as partners in the ongoing legislative process when they have so dishonored it.

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

Mr. Speaker, just so the newer Members on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle understand historically what has happened on defense security issues, when we have had defense bills before this body, defense authorization bills, over the last several years, we have spent up to 2 weeks on those bills. We have had over 200 amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules, and we have considered 50 to 100 amendments on the House floor.

What you are doing to us now is allowing no more than three or four amendments to be considered, and that only in a limited amount of time. You are shutting off debate on such important issues as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out on burden sharing, which will require our allies to share some of the defense burden that we have picked up for so long.

That is not a fair way to do business. It is not a fair way to do business. And what will you have gained by all this? Do you think the other body, for all its faults, and it has faults, is going to stand by and let this happen? Do you think they are going to take your product of 10 hours and process it and deliver it to the President?

Nonsense. Nonsense. They are going to talk about NATO and give it the time that it deserves, and it is going to be your Republican colleagues and Senators in the other body who will lead the way on that. And they will do the same thing. They will talk about the defense issues and the security issues that we brought to you this evening.

So we are terribly upset about this, as you can obviously see, and we will be raising our voices today, tomorrow, and the next day to make sure that we get some justice and some due time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

□ 2130

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I am just curious, NATO has been rather important to this country for 45 years, almost 50 years. Were there extensive hearings in committee as we write new law to change that historic relationship?

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Minnesota, as I understand it, there were 3 half-day hearings to consider the defense, foreign policy issues and intelligence issues that are in this bill, 3 half-day hearings.

Mr. SABO. So it is not only a limited amendment, but it is something that sort of rushed through committee that is changing this historic relationship that our country has had with our allies?

Mr. BONIOR. Well, basically the whole contract has been rushed through. But we understand some of the concerns on the other side of the aisle over some of the issues that my friend from Massachusetts raised. They could be debated within a framework of a few hours or 5 hours or 6 hours. But we are talking about the national security of the American public and of this country. We cannot do that in 10 hours.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask my colleagues to consider for a moment what we are about here this evening.

This bill, H.R. 7, addresses many important topics. We have spent about $30 billion on star wars. There is a serious question of how much we should spend and whether we would do that and sacrifice the readiness of America's Armed Forces. That is worthy of a debate that all Members should be involved in.

There is also a question in this bill as to the role of Commander in Chief of the United States. Over the 12 years that I have served in this body, I can remember many, many times when we have taken days and often weeks to debate the application of that constitutional provision in terms of the security of the United States.

There are questions in this bill as well about the future of NATO. And it has been alluded to here that this is one seminal debate on our new relationship in this so-called new world order.

I might say to my colleagues that they may dismiss this as just another check mark on the TV Guide ad. It is much more than that to a lot of different people.

During the last week or two, since the 3 half-days of debate on this bill, I have had people come to me, Americans, who have friends and relatives who live in parts of the world who have traditionally been our allies, genuinely concerned about the impact of this bill on the future security of these nations.

Finally, of course, this bill addresses peacekeeping, and that, my colleagues, literally addresses life and death issues for America's young men and women.

That is how serious this bill is. I know there is a strong partisan feeling on this floor, and I have seen it manifest many times on both sides of the aisle over the years. But I would like to address this comment to the new Members on both sides of the aisle.

Many of my colleagues did not serve, and probably did not witness, one of the most important debates in the history of this institution. I was privileged enough to be here for that debate. It was the debate over the entry of the United States into the Persian Gulf war.

A decision was made by the leadership of the House that this issue was so critically important, involving the life and death of American citizens, that if necessary we would stay in session around the clock so that every Member would be able to express their heartfelt

feelings. When it was over and the debate ended, most people credited that debate as one of our finest hours in the House of Representatives.

We took the time to do it right, because the issue was so important.

I beg my colleagues now, we would not do it this evening, but tomorrow, when Members meet with their Republican leaders, ask them to pause and give some consideration to the fact that this, too, is a life or death issue. We owe the people we represent the time to sit down, deliberate, and make the right decision.

I hope that my colleagues will prevail on the Committee on Rules and their leadership to give us the time to adequately address these critically important issues.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that Rome was not built in a single day, only the Republican majority, though, could think they can build the entire U.S. relationship with the world in 10 hours.

What we are debating, will be debating in that brief period of time, ranges literally the world. It is what our sons and daughters do in the Armed Forces. It is what the role of the Armed Forces is. It is, what role does the United Nations have. What about burden sharing, our relationship with many other parts of the world.

I cannot believe that anyone seriously want to spend just 10 hours on it. I understand there is a contract. But does that contract really go further than the water's edge in terms of our national security?

Members can say that, ''No, BOB, we don't limit you. It is an open rule in the sense of you can offer any amendment you can.''

But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that they have limited the time. And when they limit the time and add in to that the debate or the vote time, what they do is they do limit amendments. And by adding in the time to actually come over and vote, what they have done is forced Members to decide, do I debate or do I vote? Do I ask for a vote on some of these crucial, crucial issues?

I guess what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that under this rule, as I understand it, it will be 10 hours to debate this entire bill. The Republican majority is going to spend less time debating this bill than it actually will take to fly to some of these countries one day to see what their concerns really are. Indeed, if a congressional delegation's flight time was measured by these bills, these planes would not be able to make it past Hawaii as we explore Asia or other parts of far distant Europe.

I would just urge, Mr. Speaker, for Members to think about this overnight. I do not pretend to be a very senior Member around here, but I remember on some of the military bills and armed services bills, spending 30 or 40 hours because Members thought it was that important. Incidentally, 30 or 40 hours basically taking up amendments from the other side, from this Republican side of the aisle.

I would urge Members to reconsider this and the Committee on Rules to reconsider this. Surely, our country's national security deserves more than 10 hours debate with vote time included.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since very early in this session of Congress, I have been addressing on a number of occasions the process by which we deliberate and consider laws for this country.

I debated and took issue with the cutting off of debate on an important bill in the Committee on the Judiciary. I have debated on a number of occasions on this floor the process by which we consider issues. It seems to me that we have now gotten to the point where it is not the process of debate or the process for reaching a reasonable result that is at issue but simply reaching that result because some Contract With America or contract on America was made with the people.

Our primary obligation, Mr. Speaker, is to deliberate and study the issues that come before us and to debate those issues for the American people. The value of this body is the diversity that we bring to this body and the ability to hear the various perspectives of people from throughout this Nation that 435 Representatives bring here and offer in the debate.

□ 2140

If there is not sufficient time to debate, then that diversity cannot be honored.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to reconsider this issue. Give us ample time to debate it. Do not tell the American people on one hand that we are opening up the process and having a deliberative form of government, that we are going to have 10 hours of debate while we count the voting time, 15 minutes for each vote, so if we offer 10 amendments, more than 2½ hours will be gone just in the amendment and voting process. Let us be honest with the American people, and if we are going to tell them that we believe in an open society, believe in open debate, let us demonstrate it here on the floor of the House and have open debate, and have unlimited time for the debate of these issues.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I take the well not because I want to delay our departure, but because I think what we are doing with H.R. 7 is we are engaging in playing politics with one of the most important jobs we have here. That is measuring what we think is needed for the national security of our country and for our leadership in this new and evolving world that is so difficult for all of us to understand.

Mr. Speaker, what are we doing in this bill? Think about this. We are communicating to the rest of the world that we are not going to play in the United Nations anymore, we do not like the way it is run, so forget the humanitarian missions, the Americans will not be there. Boy, there is a heavy message.

We are also saying, ''We are going to tell them which countries ought to come into NATO.'' Mr. Speaker, any country that is in NATO as a full member means that we are committed to defend their security, so if Chechnya had been allowed into NATO we would now have troops over there fighting. Now maybe that is a good idea, but do we do that with 10 hours of debate? Do we do that without consulting our allies? Do we have any idea that the United Nations and NATO are bodies that have other countries that belong, and they think they should have some input in this, too, and the administration should?

Mr. Speaker, we are also taking and giving the Pentagon a nanny. We are giving them a commission, a political commission. We are politicizing all of this. Mr. Speaker, that is real smart. That is what we need, are more layers, more layers, and we are going to do that in the 10 hours.

When we look at the commitments we are making budgetarily, Mr. Speaker, we are committing to a space-based defense: bring back star wars for nostalgia's sake. There is applause over there, they cannot wait. The guess is going to be that is $40 billion for the opening shot, and heaven only knows where it goes and if it will ever work, at a time when readiness is a much more critical concern, I think, and when, if we look at the real fear, it is the fact that somebody could bring nuclear weapons in and do another World Trade Center.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what space-based defense is going to do against a world issue. I know it is funny, and I know that people think, ''Let's just hurry on and punch this hole in the contract,'' but I think the rest of the world is going to look over here and say, ''What is going on?'' I must say as a Member who has been here a while, Mr. Speaker, if we as Democrats had ever done this, the other side of the aisle would have gone crazy, to come in here and say we are going to redo all of the U.N. stuff, we are going to redo NATO, we are going to not deal with burdensharing, we will keep being the policeman of the world, we are going to run everything, we are going to do star wars, we are going to do it in 10 hours, and we are going to put a politicized commission running

the Pentagon. This is an absolute outrage. I really hope people think about this.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me.

I know the hour is late, but I happen to represent over 40,000 Army soldiers at Fort Hood, TX. I do not come to this floor often. If Members will look at my record over 4 years, I seldom come this floor in a partisan manner.

However, Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor at this late hour in saying to my colleagues that this is an important issue. We ought to look beyond partisanship in deciding how much time is it worth for us to debate our national security issues.

I am a hawk on defense, Mr. Speaker. I believe we ought to spend more on defense. If I could get to the right of the gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE WILSON, on defense, I would do it. I believe national defense, along with many of my colleagues, is the single most important responsibility of the Federal Government, and it deserves more than 10 hours of debate.

If it does not deserve it, Mr. Speaker, then certainly the lives of our men and women in the Services deserve it. How much is the life an one Army soldier worth? 10 Hours? How much is the life of one Marine worth? 10 hours? How much is the life of thousands and thousands of American servicemen and women worth? Certainly it should be worth more than 10 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that the Contract that we sign as Members of Congress to try to protect the lives of the men and women brave enough to put their lives on the line for us, that that contract is more important than the time schedule of a Contract for America.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority whip for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest surprises I have had since I have been on the Committee on Rules was today, when I was told about this other contract that the Republican party had come up with.

We are not talking this bill up until Wednesday. I asked what the purpose was of not giving us at least 24 hours, to go around the clock, to bring these amendments forward, because it deals with three very heavy subject matters.

I am sure that Star Wars sticks in some people's throat when they talk about it. Probably the quicker they get through speaking about it, the better they will feel. However, when we are talking about an item that can go up to $46 billion, and the Republicans can spend hours in the Committee on Rules on bills that we sent on the suspension calendar, when they can break the police bill up into 8 hours, and yet, give less than 12 hours on something as important as this, because they have to know what their schedule is, well, I told them they do not have to know what their schedule is. They have the votes, they can vote it.

However, I think this is one of the votes that the Republican Party will never forget. This is a very giant vote. It is something I have never seen in all my time on the Committee on Rules. We used to get accused of gagging people, but on this one, they have a tourniquet right around all our necks.

They just do not want to allow anybody, and they think it is funny over there, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to see this appear in every one of their newspapers, on how little they care for the defense of our country when it come to intelligence, when it comes to star wars, when it comes to other matters contained in this bill; the bailout.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in this country. The desert war was a great day, when it was a wide open rule, anybody could speak.

Maybe I should not have said that, because every day the term ''open rule'' gets changed. I am waiting for the new Republican dictionary to hit my desk, so I really know what they mean by an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, they accused us of violating the open rules, and it was a difficult description of what they now say is an open rule. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that people over there, first-termers, at least, will take a very close look at this, because as I said, this is going to come back to haunt all of them.

□ 2150

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentleman is advised that he has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. May I ask how much time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman wish to use any of his time?

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Let me be very clear that the majority does not wish to respond to our concerns and requests this evening.

Let me just close by suggesting to all of us here this evening that when it comes to our national defense, there really is no time limit, and what we are about to do this Wednesday and Thursday is to gag this institution in a way that frankly I have not seen in a long time.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman from New York knows full well what I am speaking about. When we had a national defense bill on this floor, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] spent a full 2 weeks each and every time he would bring it to the floor. Amendments were made in order so all Members of this body had an opportunity to participate in a free and a fair way. We are not having that now. We are dealing with the most important and crucial issues that will face this institution and this body in this Congress, the defense of this Nation, the safety of our young men and women who are defending this country.

When you talk about peacekeeping, when you talk about Haiti or Bosnia or the Middle East or Somalia, you are talking about whether or not we are going to have peace or we are going to have war. And 10 hours is not enough time. There is no time limit on our national defense.

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall use.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the body that the motion before the House is that all committees of the House and their subcommittees have permission to sit tomorrow, February 14 and for the balance of the week while the House is meeting under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard since January 4 and we have already accomplished a great deal. House Republicans have applied the laws of the land to a Congress which for years saw fit to exempt itself from what it imposed upon others.

With bipartisan support House Republicans brought up and passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. With bipartisan support we passed legislation ending unfunded mandates, and we have already passed wide-ranging crime legislation including strong and effective death penalty legislation.

Oftentimes Democrats have voted with us and we appreciate it as do the American people who have been demanding these and other reforms for years. But we have much, much more work to do and we will get it done in 100 days as we promised.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to moving the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No 122]

YEAS—222

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
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Crane
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
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
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
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
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
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Becerra
Berman
Clement
Clinger
Cox
Crapo
Dooley
Fattah
Gibbons
Hefner
Jefferson
Leach
Martinez
Matsui
McDade
Oxley
Rose
Shuster
Tucker
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson

☐ 2209

Mr. DEAL and Mr. WARD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. KELLY changed her 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. BONILLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 191, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

AYES—220

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
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Crane
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
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
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
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
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
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
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy

McDermott	Payne (VA)	Stenholm
McHale	Pelosi	Stokes
McKinney	Peterson (FL)	Studds
McNulty	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Meehan	Pickett	Tanner
Meek	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Menendez	Poshard	Taylor (MS)
Mfume	Rahall	Tejeda
Miller (CA)	Rangel	Thompson
Mineta	Reed	Thornton
Minge	Reynolds	Thurman
Mink	Richardson	Torres
Moakley	Rivers	Torricelli
Mollohan	Roemer	Towns
Montgomery	Roybal-Allard	Traficant
Moran	Rush	Velazquez
Murtha	Sabo	Vento
Nadler	Sanders	Visclosky
Neal	Sawyer	Volkmer
Oberstar	Schroeder	Ward
Obey	Schumer	Waters
Olver	Scott	Watt (NC)
Ortiz	Serrano	Waxman
Orton	Sisisky	Wise
Owens	Skaggs	Woolsey
Pallone	Skelton	Wyden
Parker	Slaughter	Wynn
Pastor	Spratt	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Stark	

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra	Gibbons	Oxley
Berman	Hefner	Rose
Clement	Jefferson	Shuster
Clinger	Leach	Tucker
Cox	Martinez	Whitfield
Crapo	Matsui	Williams
Dooley	McCrery	Wilson
Fattah	McDade	

□ 2226

Mr. WATT of North Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, THE NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–31) on the resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 555

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill H.R. 555.

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

There was no objection.

MIDDLE CLASS BILL OF RIGHTS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–34)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the ''Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995.'' I am also sending you an explanation of the revenue proposals of this legislation.

This bill is the next step in my Administration's continuing effort to raise living standards for working families and help restore the American Dream for all our people.

For 2 years, we have worked hard to strengthen our economy. We worked with the last Congress to enact legislation that will reduce the annual deficits of 1994–98 by more than $600 billion; we created nearly 6 million new jobs; we cut taxes for 15 million low-income families and gave tax relief to small businesses; we opened export markets through global and regional trade agreements; we invested in human and physical capital to increase productivity; and we reduced the Federal Government by more than 100,000 positions.

With that strong foundation in place, I am now proposing a Middle Class Bill of Rights. Despite our progress, too many Americans are still working harder for less. The Middle Class Bill of Rights will enable working Americans to raise their families and get the education and training they need to meet the demands of a new global economy. It will let middle-income families share in our economic prosperity today and help them build our economic prosperity tomorrow.

The ''Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995'' includes three of the four elements of my Middle Class Bill of Rights. First, it offers middle-income families a $500 tax credit for each child under 13. Second, it includes a tax deduction of up to $10,000 a year to help middle-income Americans pay for post-secondary education expenses and training expenses. Third, it lets more middle-income Americans make tax-deductible contributions to Individual Retirement Accounts and withdraw from them, penalty-free, for the costs of education and training, health care, first-time home-buying, long periods of unemployment, or the care of an ill parent.

The fourth element of my Middle Class Bill of Rights—not included in this legislation—is the GI Bill for America's Workers, which consolidates 70 Federal training programs and creates a more effective system for learning new skills and finding better jobs for adults and youth. Legislation for this proposal is being developed in cooperation with the Congress.

If enacted, the Middle Class Bill of Rights will help keep the American Dream alive for everyone willing to take responsibility for themselves, their families, and their futures. And it will not burden our children with more debt. In my fiscal 1996 budget, we have found enough savings not only to pay for this tax bill, but also to provide another $81 billion in deficit reduction between 1996 and 2000.

This legislation will restore fairness to our tax system, let middle-income families share in our economic prosperity, encourage Americans to prepare for the future, and help ensure that the United States moves into the 21st Century still the strongest nation in the world. I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 13, 1995.*

WORKING WAGE INCREASE ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–33)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration and enactment the ''Working Wage Increase Act of 1995.''

This draft bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage in two 45 cents steps—from the current rate of $4.25 an hour to $4.70 an hour on July 4, 1995, and to $5.15 an hour after July 3, 1996. The pattern of the proposed increase is identical to that of the last increase, which passed the Congress with a broad bipartisan majority and was signed by President Bush in 1989. The first increment of the proposal simply restores the minimum wage to its real value following the change enacted in 1989.

If the Congress does not act now, the minimum wage will fall to its lowest real level in 40 years. That would dishonor one of the great promises of American life—that everyone who works hard can earn a living wage. More than 11 million workers would benefit under this proposal, and a full-time, year-round worker at the minimum wage would get a $1,800 raise—the equivalent of 7 months of groceries for the average family.

To reform the Nation's welfare system, we should make work pay, and this legislation would help achieve that result. It would offer a raise to families that are working hard, but struggling to make ends meet. Most individuals earning the minimum wage are adults, and the average worker affected by this proposal brings home half of the family's earnings. Numerous empirical studies indicate that an increase in the minimum wage of the magnitude proposed would not have a significant impact on employment. The legislation would ensure that those who work hard