Mr. Speaker, I am new to this body, but as one who has kept a watchful eye on its goings on, I can clearly remember year after year Republican charges that Democrats are cutting defense when in fact Democrats only sought to slow the growth of Pentagon spending.

What is good for the goose is good for the gander, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues from the other side of the aisle cannot have it both ways.

When the tax cut is going to help not working Americans but those who have it already, I would say let the other guys miss a meal. I do not want our children to miss a meal. Let us not cut school breakfast and school lunches. Our children of America simply need to eat.

□ 1045

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The Chair will remind people in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VOLKMER moves that the House do now adjourn.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOLKMER), there were—yeas 6, nays 2.

Mr. THOMAS. 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 49, nays 367, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—49

Abercrombie
Andrews
Becerra
Bonior
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Danner
Dellums
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Hefner
Hilliard
Holden
Johnson (SD)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Manton
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Mollohan
Moran
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Roybal-Allard
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Thompson
Velazquez
Volkmer
Watt (NC)
Wise

NAYS—367

Ackerman
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
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 (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Sabo
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
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Fattah

NOT VOTING—17

Allard
Bereuter
Blute
Crane
Cubin
Fazio
Frost
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Martinez
McCrery
Metcalf
Moakley
Parker
Rose
Roth
Woolsey

□ 1105

Messrs. DEUTSCH, CLAY, GILLMOR, KLUG, BISHOP, MINETA, and ROYCE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YATES, and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. LOFGREN and MESSRS. HILLIARD, PAYNE of New Jersey, and OWENS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. FATTAH changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Oversight, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 107) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 104th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 107

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fourth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses of each committee named in that subsection, including—

(1) the expenses of all staff salaries;

(2) the expenses of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); and

(3) the expenses of staff training under section 202(j) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)).

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $7,590,139; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, $8,786,054; Committee on the Budget, $10,038,000; Committee on Commerce, $15,648,577; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, $9,687,275; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, $13,639,857; Committee on House Oversight, $6,394,121; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $4,622,090; Committee on International Relations, $10,551,875; Committee on the Judiciary, $9,683,190; Committee on National Security, $9,981,615; Committee on Resources, $10,926,383; Committee on Rules, $4,435,817; Committee on Science, $8,642,826; Committee on Small Business, $3,812,580; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,090,150; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $12,414,469; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $4,341,605; and Committee on Ways and Means, $10,338,340.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1995, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1996.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committee and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $3,961,388 (of which $30,000 may be used for consultant services and $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Banking and Financial Services, $4,286,579; Committee on the Budget, $5,013,000; Committee on Commerce, $7,625,910 (of which $25,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, $4,815,332 (of which $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, $6,618,689 (of which $25,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on House Oversight, $3,250,783 (of which $500,000 may be used for consultant services and $20,000 may be used for staff training); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $2,277,210 (of which $3,200 may be used for staff training); Committee on International Relations, $5,097,254 (of which $10,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on the Judiciary, $4,672,187 (of which $8,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on National Security, $4,769,362 (of which $40,000 may be used for consultant services and $12,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Resources, $5,210,815 (of which $45,000 may be used for consultant services and $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Rules, $2,200,567 (of which $500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Science, $4,211,654 (of which $20,000 may be used for consultant services and $15,800 may be used for staff training); Committee on Small Business, $1,873,290; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $1,063,650 (of which $50,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $6,057,934 (of which $5,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $2,084,500 (of which $10,000 may be used for staff training); and Committee on Ways and Means, $4,976,231.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1996, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1997.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $3,628,751 (of which $15,000 may be used for consultant services and $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Banking and Financial Services, $4,499,475; Committee on the Budget, $5,025,000; Committee on Commerce, $8,022,667 (of which $25,675 may be used for consultant services); Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, $4,871,943 (of which $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, $7,021,168 (of which $25,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on House Oversight, $3,143,338 (of which $130,000 may be used for consultant services and $22,000 may be used for staff training); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $2,344,880 (of which $3,200 may be used for staff training); Committee on International Relations, $5,454,621 (of which $10,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on the Judiciary, $5,011,003 (of which $10,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on National Security, $5,212,253 (of which $40,000 may be used for consultant services and $15,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Resources, $5,715,568 (of which $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Rules, $2,235,250 (of which $500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Science, $4,431,172 (of which $20,000 may be used for consultant services and $16,500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Small Business, $1,939,290; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $1,026,500 (of which $50,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $6,356,535 (of which $5,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $2,257,105 (of which $10,000 may be used for staff training); and Committee on Ways and Means, $5,362,109.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert following:

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fourth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses of each committee named in that subsection, including—

(1) the expenses of all staff salaries;

(2) the expenses of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); and

(3) the expenses of staff training under section 202(j) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)).

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $7,406,899; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, $8,645,054; Committee on the Budget, $9,912,000; Committee on Commerce, $13,686,823; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, $9,621,539; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, $13,520,037; Committee on House Oversight, $6,177,608; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $4,519,890; Committee on International Relations, $10,028,093; Committee on the Judiciary, $9,553,190; Committee on National Security, $9,085,743; Committee on Resources, $9,588,953; Committee on Rules, $4,433,817; Committee on Science, $8,411,326; Committee on Small Business, $3,791,580; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $1,981,150; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $10,878,981; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $4,220,605; and Committee on Ways and Means, $10,219,358.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1995, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1996.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $3,866,148 (of which $30,000 may be used for consultant services and $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Banking and Financial Services, $4,161,579; Committee on the Budget, $4,940,000; Committee on Commerce, $6,663,227 (of which $25,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, $4,777,196 (of which $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, $6,576,369 (of which $25,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on House Oversight, $3,092,920 (of which $400,000 may be used for consultant services and $20,000 may be used for staff training); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $2,226,210 of which $3,200 may be used for staff training); Committee on International Relations, $4,953,472 (of which $10,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on the Judiciary, $4,577,187 (of which $8,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on National Security, $4,245,134 (of which $40,000 may be used for consultant services and $12,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Resources, $4,795,970 (of which $45,000 may be used for consultant services and $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Rules, $2,199,567 (of which $500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Science, $3,991,154 (of which $20,000 may be used for consultant services and $15,800 may be used for staff training); Committee on Small Business, $1,863,290; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $1,009,450 (of which $50,000 may be used for consultant services and $500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $5,386,171 (of which $5,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $2,024,500 (of which $10,000 may be used for staff training);

and Committee on Ways and Means, $4,916,740.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1996, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1997.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $3,540,751 (of which $15,000 may be used for consultant services and $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Banking and Financial Services, $4,483,475; Committee on the Budget, $4,972,000; Committee on Commerce, $7,023,596 (of which $25,675 may be used for consultant services); Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, $4,844,343 (of which $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, $6,943,668 (of which $25,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on House Oversight, $3,084,688 (of which $130,000 may be used for consultant services and $22,000 may be used for staff training); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $2,293,680 (of which $3,200 may be used for staff training); Committee on International Relations, $5,074,621 (of which $10,000 may be used for consultant services); Committee on the Judiciary, $4,976,003 (of which $10,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on National Security, $4,840,609 (of which $40,000 may be used for consultant services and $15,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Resources, $4,792,983 (of which $1,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Rules, $2,234,250 (of which $500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Science, $4,420,172 (of which $20,000 may be used for consultant services and $16,500 may be used for staff training); Committee on Small Business, $1,928,290; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $971,700 (of which $50,000 may be used for consultant services and $600 may be used for staff training); Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $5,492,810 (of which $5,000 may be used for consultant services and $5,000 may be used for staff training); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $2,196,105 (of which $10,000 may be used for staff training); and Committee on Ways and Means, $5,302,618.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 6. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded will be for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to come to the floor of the House with a resolution to fund the committees of the 104th Congress. Anyone who has been in previous Congresses knows we have had a relatively difficult time in the past of deciding on what would be appropriate funding for committees.

At the beginning of the 104th Congress, the new Republican majority cut committee staffs by one-third.

Not all committees were cut equally. Some committees have new assignments because we eliminated certain committees and restructured other committees. But on average, the staffs of the committees were cut by fully one-third.

Since most of the committee funds go to staffing, it seemed appropriate that we should make, then, commensurate adjustments in the funding of committees. The successor to the old House Committee on Administration, the Committee on Oversight, is charged with that task. In the 104th Congress, the Committee on Oversight received the budget of one additional committee of the House, that being the Committee on the Budget.

So, as of today, all standing committees of the House, save one, the Committee on Appropriations, have their funding resolutions go to the Committee on Oversight.

Similarly, we changed the way in which committees were funded. In the past, the process looked like this column on the left on this chart. This is from the 103d Congress. The blue portion was that portion subject to public hearings in the Committee on House Administration at the time.

The portion of funding subject to House hearings and public hearings was less than a majority of the funding, $101 million. The red portion was known as the statutory funding that was moved through the Committee on Appropriations, kind of an automatic funding under the law.

The yellow portion is generally headed as other, and that is primarily legislative supplies, and detailees, those individuals from other agencies that were assigned to committees for a brief period of time.

The total of the so-called investigative, statutory, and other funding was $223 million. As chairman of the committee, I bring to you a resolution which passed unanimously, no ''no'' votes.

I want for the RECORD to indicate that the Republicans on the committee are Mr. VERNON EHLERS of Michigan, Mr. PAT ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. JOHN BOEHNER of Ohio, JENNIFER DUNN of Washington, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and ROBERT NEY of Ohio.

The Democrats—and I am sorry to say that the ranking minority member, Mr. FAZIO, is not with us today because of concerns over his wife and a hospital question.

But Mr. FAZIO of California was supportive. Mr. SAM GEJDENSON of Connecticut was supportive. Mr. STENY HOYER of Maryland was supportive. And ED PASTOR of Arizona was supportive.

What is so significant about a unanimous vote on a bipartisan basis out of the Committee on House Oversight is that the funding resolution, for all but one of the committees of the House, is $156 million. That is a 30-plus percent cut from the 103d Congress.

On a bipartisan basis we said we can live with less. We can live 30 percent less. We can do the job for American people by tightening our belts here in this institution in the funding of our committees.

Staff has been reduced by one-third. Committee funding has been reduced by more than 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend all the members of the Committee on Oversight for a job well done.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, all time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by acknowledging the absence of our distinguished ranking minority member, Mr. FAZIO. Unfortunately, VIC is with his wife, Judy, who is undergoing surgery. Our prayers go out to Judy and VIC for a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 107 is a much different committee funding resolution from those this House has considered in the past, and I applaud many of the changes contained in the measure. Later today, we will be considering a rescissions package that will cut over $17 billion from a number of Federal agencies and departments. It is only fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we consider this funding resolution first. For before we seek to make those cuts, it is only proper that we look to ourselves first.

This biennial resolution, the first of its kind, reduces spending for 21 House committees and the Select Committee on Intelligence, in the aggregate, by 30 percent from the 104th to the 103d Congress. Including committee franked mail allocations, funding has been reduced by $67 million, from $223,335,419 in the 103d Congress to $145,332,129 for the 104th Congress. While three committees from the 103d Congress have

been abolished, this is nonetheless a significant reduction in spending that tells the American people that Congress is ready, willing, and able to tighten its belt and function more efficiently with less money. What is a loss, Mr. Speaker, in committee funding is a gain for the American taxpayers. I commend Chairman THOMAS and Mr. FAZIO for working to make these very difficult cuts a reality.

I know that there may be some committee chairman and ranking minority members who feel their committee is deserving of more dollars. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I tend to agree. We in Congress have a tremendous responsibility to ensure that the work we do on behalf of the American people is of the highest quality. The livelihood of our constituents can, and does, literally depend upon what transpires within this Chamber and the walls of committee rooms. In this regard, we must be careful to ensure that in our efforts to reduce the House's budget, we do not sacrifice the quality of work that is performed here. To the credit of Chairman THOMAS, Mr. FAZIO, and the rest of the House Oversight Committee, I believe this funding resolution strikes that necessary balance.

As you have heard already, and I am sure you will hear again, this resolution does allot to the minority a greater percentage of resources than have been historically apportioned. For many years, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle passionately argued for a one-third allocation of committee resources, including staff, to the minority. The report accompanying House Resolution 107 notes that progress has been made in this area—nine committees in the 104th Congress have now achieved this goal. While this is a fine start, we are still far short of reaching the one-third goal for all the committees of the House. I know that Chairman THOMAS is committed to this goal, and I look forward to working with him to see it realized as soon as possible. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will work to ensure that all ranking minority members have complete latitude in determining how their allocations of committee resources are to be used.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted, this is the House's first attempt at implementing a biennial funding resolution. It is indeed difficult to project funding needs for 1 year, much less 2. With this biennial measure we are literally traveling into unknown territory. I know that the committee chairman and ranking minority members had a particularly demanding time estimating their needs over the course of 2 years, a task whose difficulty was compounded by the 30-percent overall reduction in committee funding. Many items in committees' budgets were necessarily estimates, that will undoubtedly undergo revision as we experiment with this new budgeting process.

In this regard, I was particularly struck by the wise variation in funds the committees had alloted for overtime pay. As you know, Mr. Speaker, with the signing into law of the Congressional Accountability Act, Congress is now subject to the same provisions of laws governing overtime pay as other governmental agencies. As a result, there is an expectation that many committees will have increased expenditures in this area. Yet, committee budgets for overtime pay vary from tens of thousands of dollars to no money at all. Mr. Speaker, this great variation points to what may be considerable inconsistencies among committees in abiding by the Congressional Accountability Act. It is my hope that the Oversight Committee will look at this area closely to guarantee that all employees of all committees are treated in an equitable manner under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the hard work and fine efforts of Chairman THOMAS, Mr. FAZIO, my colleagues on the House Oversight Committee, and the committee's staff in developing this committee funding resolution. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 107, the Omnibus Committee Funding Resolution for the 104th Congress. For the first time, this resolution authorizes for the 2-year term of the 104th Congress all committee salaries and expenses for the 20 standing committees of the House of Representatives, except for the Committee on Appropriations.

I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, for the forthright manner in which the committee compiled, evaluated, and adjusted the committee budget submissions. As the new ranking minority member of the House Oversight Committee, I want to especially acknowledge the good faith strides the new Republican committee chairmen have made in allocating an increased proportion of committee resources to their committee ranking minority members. This constructive legislative climate led to the unanimous bipartisan approval of this resolution by the members of our committee.

For the first time, this resolution consolidates the former statutory, investigative and other funds into a single biennial authorization process to achieve greater public accountability. For example, the primary Expenses Resolution providing for investigative and other expense of committees in the 103d Congress accounted for only 45.4 percent of total committee expenditures. The remainder was granted by statutory formula and other legislative accounts.

The resolution under consideration today provides for total committee funding for the 104th Congress of $156,332,129. This amount represents a $67,003,129 cut from the 103d Congress funding level of $223,335,419—a 30 percent concrete reduction. This $67 million savings has been realized from primarily two organizational reforms: a 13 percent reduction in the number of standing committees, and a 33 percent reduction in the number of professional committee staff.

With the beginning of the 104th Congress, the jurisdiction and related functions of Committees on the District of Columbia, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Post Office and Civil Service were consolidated into the remaining 20 standing committees. In the 103d Congress, the budgets for these three committees amounted to over $24 million. This current committee streamlining process builds on the initiatives of the Democratic leadership when in 1993, the Select Committees on Aging, Children, Hunger, and Narcotics were eliminated. This first step yielded a savings of over $3.5 million.

The bulk of the reduction in Committee funding levels is a direct result of reducing committee professional staffs by one-third. In 1994, the aggregate number of committee staff equaled 1,845. Today, that number is 1,233. Over 600 professional staff members have been terminated in this institutional downsizing.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution builds on efforts launched by Speaker Foley and the Democratic leadership to reduce the costs of operating the People's House. Reforms made since 1991 to Member franking allowances will yield savings by the end of this year estimated to be over $190 million—a savings representing more than a 50 percent reduction of franking costs without the 1991 reforms.

In 1992, the Democratic leadership directed that committee budget levels be frozen at their 1991 amounts. Thereafter, the aggregate authorization for the primary committee expense resolution was reduced by 5 percent for both 1993 and 1994—yielding savings over $5 million.

Mr. Speaker, as you may remember, President Clinton, Speaker Foley, and Senate Majority Leader Mitchell announced in February 1993, a concerted policy to reduce executive and legislative branch full-time personnel. Accordingly, in correspondence dated April 22, 1994, Chairman ROSE and myself informed Speaker Foley that we jointly recommended five directives to reduce the House payroll by 387 full-time equivalents . Clearly, today's resolution is consistent with the policies advocated by the President and congressional Democratic leadership to streamline and realign all branches of the U.S. Government.

One issue I would like all members to take particular note of is the question of fairness to the minority party, whichever party that may be, in the allocation and control of resources.

As the new ranking minority member on this committee, I do want to acknowledge that this funding resolution, in the aggregate, allots to the minority an overall greater percentage of resources than have been historically apportioned. This is certainly true for the budget authority for this committee, as well as several others. In fact, the minority have been allocated 27 percent of aggregate committee staff slots. These improvements are welcome but still short of the overall one-third goal for which the Republicans have emphatically and consistently argued was the sine qua non of fairness and equity between majority and minority.

In preparation for this funding process, I have reviewed, among other things, the verbatim comments of those Republican members of this committee who served on the Accounts Subcommittee during the consideration of the primary expense resolution for the second session of the 103d Congress. In doing

so, it was our belief that we could determine—based on their prior statements what the present majority defined as a fair and just approach to this issue.

For example, during consideration of the funding resolution last Congress, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and others offered thoughtful, and instructive, amendments regarding the allocation of committee resources. Yes, I know, these amendments were defeated on a party line vote. However, with regard to providing the minority with a one-third allocation of all resources, Mr. ROBERTS said last year, ''if lightening strikes and the sun comes up in the West and Republicans take over the Congress, we are going to do that for you. If I am here, we are going to try it, make that recommendation; you will at least get one-third.''

With the Republicans now in the majority, I had intended to give them the opportunity to make good this pledge and consecrate their prior commitments with another affirmative vote on a motion to recommit identical to that offered by Mr. ROBERTS and others last year.

Instead, I would ask that a March 30, 1993 letter addressed to the co-chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and signed by Speaker GINGRICH, and virtually every Republican leader and committee chairman in the 104th Congress be entered to the record following my statement. This letter represents the ''Minority Rights'' policy articulated by the Republicans when they were in the minority. This ''Minority Rights'' policy is the benchmark against which all budget submissions in the future will be judged. In the interim, I will be monitoring the degree to which the minority is allowed to exercise autonomy over the direction and control of those committee resources allotted to each ranking minority member.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS, at my request, will convene a hearing at the beginning of the second session of this Congress to review with all the committees the progress of operating under biannual budget authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to cast an affirmative vote for House Resolution 107 to continue the bipartisan commitment to reducing the costs of operating the people's House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 30, 1993.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Co-Chairman
Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Co-Vice-Chairman
Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CO-CHAIRMAN AND MR. CO-VICE-CHAIRMAN: If congressional reform means anything, it means fairness to the Minority in allocation and control of resources. Reform without fairness is merely shuffling the cards in a marked deck.

There is no justification for the unfair disparity between Majority and Minority committee staff. Our colleagues in the Senate, under both Democratic and Republican majorities, have managed quite well with a staffing ratio of one-third/two-thirds. That, after all, is how we in the House apportion, by law, statutory staff.

The problem is that we do not so apportion investigative staff. We estimate that there are currently 947 investigative staff in the House, of which the Minority is allocated only 170, a mere 18 percent of the total. In past years, some have tried to justify that overwhelming disproportion by claiming the Minority could rely on the then-Republican Executive Branch to make up the difference. Whatever the accuracy of that argument then, it certainly no longer applies.

There are currently 175 Republicans serving in the House, more than 40 percent of total membership. Despite that, the Minority holds only 24 percent of total committee staff. Indeed, on several committees, the percentage is much lower than that. According to the Committee on House Administration, there are currently 1,131 Majority committee staff and 367 Minority counterparts, exclusive of the expiring select committees, the Committee on Budget and the Committee on Appropriations. The situation on those last two committees is equally flagrant: the Budget Committee boasts 50 Majority and 10 Minority staff while the Appropriations Committee has a professional staff ratio of 95 to 10 and an associate staff ratio of 74 to 46.

A ratio of one-third/two-thirds for all committee staff, investigative as well as statutory, is a *sine qua non* for bridging the institutional animosities that now poison our policy debates. We therefore urge the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to recommend, in your final report, this more equitable allocation of resources.

We would welcome the opportunity, as a group, to present and expand upon these views in a public hearing of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Robert H. Michel, Minority Leader; Dick Armey, Conference Chairman; Duncan Hunter, Research Committee Chairman; Tom DeLay, Conference Secretary; Gerald B.H. Solomon, Ranking Republican, Committee on Rules; Joseph M. McDade, Ranking Republican, Committee on Appropriations; Newt Gingrich, Minority Whip; Henry J. Hyde, Policy Committee Chairman; Bill McCollum, Conference Vice-Chairman; Bill Paxon, NRCC Chairman; Bill Archer, Ranking Republican, Committee on Ways and Means; John R. Kasich, Ranking Republican, Committee on the Budget.

Pat Roberts, Ranking Republican, Committee on Agriculture; Jim Leach, Ranking Republican, Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; William F. Goodling, Ranking Republican, Committee on Education and Labor; Benjamin A. Gilman, Ranking Republican, Committee on Foreign Affairs Operations; William M. Thomas, Ranking Republican, Committee on House Administration; Hamilton Fish, Jr., Ranking Republican, Committee on the Judiciary; Floyd Spence, Ranking Republican, Committee on Armed Services; Thomas J. Bliley, Ranking Republican, Committee on the District of Columbia; Carlos J. Moorhead, Ranking Republican, Committee on Energy and Commerce; William F. Clinger, Jr., Ranking Republican, Committee on Government; Don Young, Ranking Republican, Committee on Natural Resources; Jack Fields, Ranking Republican, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

John T. Myers, Ranking Republican, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; Robert S. Walker, Ranking Republican, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology; Fred Grandy, Ranking Republican, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; Bud Shuster, Ranking Republican, Committee on Public Works and Transportation; Jan Meyers, Ranking Republican, Committee on Small Business; Bob Stump, Ranking Republican, Committee on Veterans' Affairs; Larry Combest, Ranking Republican, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

□ 1115

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR] for the kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], a valued member of the committee and chairman of the Republican caucus.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] for allowing me to speak on this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day here in the U.S. House of Representatives because today we are going to reduce spending on committee staff by 30 percent, saving $67 million over the next 2 years on behalf of our constituents and the taxpayers around this country.

Over the last 4 years, Mr. Speaker, many of us have come to the floor during the debate on this resolution in past Congresses calling for smaller committee staffs, calling for smaller committee budgets, and in most cases we were rebuffed, and last summer, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans decided that we would include in our Contract With America the fact that we would reduce committee staff by one-third, and on January 4 we kept our promise. We reduced the staff by one-third. In 1994, Mr. Speaker, the average number of employees working for committees was 1,854. The 1995 ceiling for employees for committees in this House will be 1,233, a reduction of just slightly over one-third.

In order to really bring home the savings, Mr. Speaker, the committee in a bipartisan way worked with our committees to come up with a 30-percent reduction in terms of the cost of running those committees because most of the costs of the committees is staff. We, in fact, were able to achieve the 30-percent reduction which is going to result in a $67 million savings on behalf of the American taxpayers.

As my colleagues know, the American people sent a very loud and clear message on November 8 that they wanted a smaller, less costly, less intrusive Government. I think they also said that they wanted a more open, more accountable, more responsible Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the effort here today is a bipartisan effort because there has been a great deal of help from Members on both sides of the aisle in order to come up with these savings. But Congress is more accountable, it is more responsible, it is more open to the American people, and that is important if we in this Congress are to deliver on our much longer term vision of downsizing and reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government.

We are beginning to change the way this Federal Government works, but these efforts would not happen unless

Congress continues to change. But these are needed and necessary reforms in this Congress. They have been done in a bipartisan way, as has almost everything in the Contract With America thus far this year. It has virtually all passed in broad bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], I want to congratulate our committee chairmen, the ranking members on all the committees, and certainly I want to thank my colleagues on the Committee on House Oversight for their help in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 107, the committee funding resolution. As a new Democrat, first-term Member of this body, I can tell my colleagues that the people of my district in Minnesota are very pleased that we are starting the budget cutting process right here in our own operations by saving $67 million over 2 years.

I ran for Congress to change the way Washington operates. Now that I am here, I have learned that over 50 percent of our Members have been here less than 5 years, and, like me, many Members are committed to reforming Congress and focusing on the need to make the tough decisions necessary to balance our Nation's budget.

Fighting for change is not a partisan issue, and this committee funding resolution is an excellent example of that. This $67 million cut is a very good beginning, and it represents a 30-percent reduction from the funding levels in the 103d Congress.

It is critical, as we make tough decisions about cutting spending, that the American people be assured that we are looking at our own operations first. The public deserves to have a Congress that keeps pace with the changes taking place in America, a Congress that is not wasteful or inefficient. Enacting this committee resolution and tightening our belts before we ask the rest of the American people to tighten theirs is a good step toward building confidence with the American people.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY].

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by the committee funding resolution before the House today. First and foremost, it demonstrates once again that, when Democrats and Republicans work together, the American public benefits. This bill is important because it demonstrates bipartisan fiscal responsibility. Adoption of this resolution will mark the first installment of a promise many of us made to reduce the size of the Federal Government and make it more efficient. By eliminating 3 standing committees and cutting funding for all committees by 30 percent, we are assuring the people back home that reforming Government begins right here in this body.

As we begin the budget and appropriations process, I would like to reaffirm that the healthy debate we are having today on this funding resolution should act as a model of how we should proceed on future budget and appropriations bills. While we may not share similar view points on our Nation's spending priorities, I hope we share the desire to have all those view points heard on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Democrat, I commend the committee on its work and the model of bipartisan cooperation it has provided.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], a long and valued member of the committee in its various ramifications in previous Congresses, not the least of which was as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Accounts that used to do this work first for us. It is exciting as a chairman to yield to a member of the committee as valuable as this gentleman is.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered today by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS]. Most of it has been said before by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], and my other colleagues, but it bears repeating because it is such good news. It is progress. It is something that has been done that we can all be proud of, and I want to thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their participation and their cooperation, but especially the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], our chairman, and also the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] on the minority side, but more especially, BILL.

□ 1130

The chairman of the committee has persevered time after time after time. We have been present during the process of the Subcommittee on Accounts and tried to institute reform and real cuts and bring sunshine into the process. The chairman has approached it in a professional manner, and lo and behold, this year we have been able to achieve true bipartisan reform.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has also illustrated the same school of thought and leadership all throughout our hearings.

We have a resolution before us that, as I said, represents real progress. Since the opening day of the 104th Congress, the House has been really working to fulfill our pledge that we made to the American people. We have cut the committee staff by one-third. For the first time we are consolidating the committee spending or the funding into a single 2-year funding resolution. That is reform. This new process includes both statutory and investigatory funds, as well as below-the-line costs, the hidden costs, the costs that were always hidden before. I am talking about office supplies and long-distance telephone charges that have never before been included in the committee budgets.

This resolution represents a total of a 30-percent cut in committee funding. That is a real cut. That is compared to the 103d Congress, from $223 million down to $156.3 million. That is a real cut.

In previous years the committees were funded on a yearly basis, 1 year, not 2, and they received funds from two sources—as I said before, statutory and investigative. I know that is an inside-the-Beltway term, and it is an inside-the-House Administration Committee term, but the statutory budgets, which total over 50 percent of the committee costs, what we are spending on committees, were allocated through a nonpublic process. It was behind closed doors. It was administered by the Finance Office. The investigative sources, which total only 45 percent of the total, were the only funds authorized through a public process, and that is where Chairman THOMAS, when he was the ranking minority member, and Yours Truly labored so long trying to institute the reforms. It included hearings, as I have indicated, before the previous House Administration Committee.

In addition, the committees received funding from other sources for such things as legislative office supplies, long-distance phone calls, and franked mail. These cost a total of 4.1 percent, but they were not available. The new majority in the Congress has finally shed the light of public disclosure on this process. House rules adopted at the beginning of the 104th Congress state that the Congress must, for the first time ever, publicly state all committee spending every 2 years and fund all staff salaries out of a single unified account.

Our committees must also include all the below-the-line costs, the hidden costs, in their budgets. The House Oversight Committee has taken further steps by establishing the franked mail allocations for each committee. Last year the House overspent the franked mail appropriations by over $2 million. Let me repeat that. They overspent the franked mail allowance by more than $2 million. The separate franked allocations included in this resolution will control the overspending and keep a lid on the excess mailings.

One of the biggest accomplishments has come in the area of minority resources. According to the House rules, the majority has the responsibility of determining the funding level of the minority. In the past many committees were denied a fair share of the resources. In the 103d Congress the minority was allowed only about 21½ percent of the investigative resources.

Under the resolution we are considering today all committees will be treated fairly. All committee chairmen will treat the minority the same or better than the minority was treated in the past allocation of resources. In fact, 13 committee chairmen are increasing the allocations of staff or resources to the minority. In the last Congress only 4 of 21 committees were actually provided a figure at or above the 33-percent goal. Nine Republican chairmen will allot one-third of the committee staff and of the resources to the minority.

So I am calling this the BILL THOMAS 15–year Great Leap Forward. It is a reform. Progress is being made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time last year I estimated, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], with the progress we were making as we were calling forth the incremental reforms—and it was a slow call—that by the year 2010 we would reach our long-held committee funding goals. Well, we did it in 1995. That is 15 years ahead of time. As I have indicated, it is the Chairman THOMAS 15-year Great Leap Forward.

The resolution we are considering today has really been created in an open public process. It includes all funding. It takes into account every dollar that will be spent by the committees. It is more fair than any funding resolution ever considered on this floor. It represents a savings of $67 million to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to rise in strong support of this resolution. I truly appreciate having had the opportunity to work with my colleagues on this bipartisan resolution. Hey, it is progress. Vote for it. It is time.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, as a Democratic freshman I rise today in strong support of this resolution. On the first day of the 104th Congress, I voted for congressional accountability. This bill replaces rhetoric with action.

It cuts House committee funding by more than $67 million, and eliminates 620 committee staff positions, a 30-percent reduction. It also institutes a 2-year budget cycle for committee funding. This will help to ensure long-term planning and force committees to spend wisely. Finally, the legislation provides for greater oversight and disclosure of committee spending. All committee spending will be fully and completely disclosed so that the public can be assured that its tax dollars are being well spent.

This move to cut spending and streamline the process obviously is not going to balance the budget by itself, but it takes an important step in the right direction. We must begin to restore the trust and faith of the American people in their Government, and we must make sacrifices if we are to get our fiscal house in order.

Our single most important effort in this congress will be that to cut Government spending and reduce the deficit. We must do this in a careful, considered manner, not by taking a ''slash and burn'' approach or extreme approach.

This legislation is just one of many steps that the Congress, working together with the President, must take if we are to continue to move in the right direction to control spending and reduce the deficit. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Democrat I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 107, which is a bold first step in making this institution and Government as a whole more efficient, more effective, and in fact more truly representative of the people.

We as an institution cannot request families and businesses to make sacrifices and hard choices unless we are also willing to make those sacrifices. I am proud to support this resolution to cut funding for committees by over $67 million, a 30-percent reduction from the last Congress.

Under this resolution committee staffs will be cut by more than 620 staffers, which also represents a 30-percent reduction from the last Congress.

My support of this resolution is a natural extension of my support for the Congressional Accountability Act, which will force Congress to comply with the same laws it imposes on the rest of the Nation. We had a House rules package which I supported which reduced the number of House committees from 21 to 18. This resolution has broad bipartisan support and will set an example of how both sides of the aisle can come together. I believe that this resolution is an example of the bold, decisive measures which must be enacted in order to restore the faith of the American people in this great legislative body and put people's trust back in Government and in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

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

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Democrat who ran unchallenged and supported the package of reforms which began this 104th Congress, I am pleased to rise in support of this bill.

One of our primary tasks in this Congress will be to rebuild the trust of the American people in this body. I believe that this proposal is a good first step. The American people want us to work smarter, work more effectively, and work more economically. I believe this bill, which reduces committee funding by over a third, which reduces staff by over 620, which consolidates 3 separate committees, which requires a 2-year budget cycle in long-term planning, and which ensures that 100 percent of committee spending is justified and approved by Members of the House, is just the sort of reform we need.

I pledge to work with my constituents and the staff of my office to do the people's business in a more frugal manner. I believe this bill is a concrete first step to that end, and I am proud to be a part of it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], a member of the committee who has been of invaluable aid in making these adjustments in committee funding.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me to offer support for this resolution and to make a couple of brief points.

This bill is another small example of the historic positive changes the 104th Congress is making to this great institution. It is another example of how the new majority in this House is keeping its promises, and I am especially pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see how the minority side is giving support to this initiative that we have begun.

It is important to point out that in bringing this resolution to the floor, Chairman THOMAS has done a great service on behalf of the American voters. Congress is being told to reduce the deficit and to cut spending.

Mr. Speaker, that is a very popular theme around this place these days. This bill offers proof to the taxpayer that we are starting out by saving them money and cleaning up our own house. During our opening-day reforms we voted to reduce committee staff by one-third. This bill acts as a companion piece to that measure. It makes an additional reduction in committee funding for staff and expenses by over $67 million, a 30-percent reduction from last year's provision.

This resolution reflects true reform, Mr. Speaker, in the entire legislative budget process by which committees ask for and receive funding. Prior to this Congress hundreds of millions of dollars in funding for salaries and below-the-line costs, an amount that made up over one-half of the total committee costs, was something that we did not even see. It escaped the scrutiny of the public hearing process.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this resolution sets a good, solid precedent for allocating a third of the resources to the minority. I have served for the last 2 years on this committee as a minority member and was vocal in insisting on fair treatment of the minority. I am still insistent on that fair treatment, and, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to

see that the number of chairmen allocating at least one-third of their committees' resources to the minority has increased by over 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes accountability and sunshine in the committee funding process. I commend Chairman THOMAS for his hard work and for his leadership, and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I also am a freshman Democrat, and I rise in strong support of House Resolution 107.

Some of us came here with the contract for America, and some of us came here with just straight talk and common business sense about how we should approach the business of the House. During the first days of the Congress we began reducing the size of Government, and we started from within by cutting congressional staffs. We eliminated three committees and reduced committee staff by a third, for a total cut of 620 positions.

House Resolution 107 will cut congressional expenditures by more than $67 million. It proves to the American people that we mean business.

I intend to go further to demonstrate to my constituents a commitment to a smaller, more efficient Government by cutting my own personal staff, as I said during my campaign, long before there was any discussion of the contract for that matter.

□ 1145

Coming from the private sector, I learned that you cut expenditures and you try and create efficiencies when you run a deficit, or you do not stay in business very long. This is a simple, commonsense business approach to government. We must be more efficient and must be more responsive to the people, and our budget cutting must begin at home.

We must create a bond with the American people if we are going to be serious about addressing the budget. We can all talk about less government, but today we can vote for less government. I further encourage my colleagues to join me in putting their money where their mouth is by downsizing their own offices and returning the unused funds in their clerk hire to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to bring up after we pass this bill, H.R. 26, introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], to prove to the American people that we really are serious about deficit reduction.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his hard work and leadership, along with Chairman THOMAS and Ranking Member FAZZIO.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we in the U.S. Congress announced to the American people that this Congress is ready to tighten our very own belts. We are prepared to do no less than what we have asked the small businesses around this Nation to do, and I am proud to join in in support of this resolution to emphasize that this Congress stands for sound fiscal policies and that we understand that as we move toward the 21st century in this budgeting process, we too have to look inside and establish guidelines to make sure that this Congress works well and works efficiently.

I am very proud of this resolution because it was a bipartisan effort, and I am glad to have joined in support of this resolution, like I supported the congressional resolution that dealt with congressional responsibility.

The important aspects of this particular resolution, I think, will sound like music to the ears of businesses across this Nation. One, there will be a 2-year budget cycle to ensure long-term planning. No guesswork in this Congress.

Two, it ensures that 100 percent of committee spending is justified and approved by the Members. The buck stops here. We understand what is going out, we understand the needs, we have to take the responsibility for improving it and approving it. We will have to have the responsibility for sound fiscal policies.

Then, No. 3, we ensure that 100 percent of committee spending is fully and completely disclosed. No less than what has to be done by the American people in running their businesses.

This is the way this Congress should operate. I am proud to be a part of it. I salute the focus we are taking, and I say to the American people, this resolution clearly states we are tightening our belts, we are looking to support sound fiscal policies.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will take only a minute in introducing the next gentleman, because frankly, the committee budgets could not have been cut without the full cooperation, understanding, appreciation, and hard work of the committee chairmen and the ranking members. This was an extremely difficult thing to do, and it was done in such style and willingness that, as chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, I have to congratulate all of the chairmen in the way in which they went about this difficult task.

Mr. Speaker, no one personifies it more than the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP]. I yield to him such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time and for those kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 107.

Our committee has cut its staff by one-third—this contributes to the overall 30-percent cut in committee funding from last Congress.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, Mr. BILL THOMAS, for his assistance and leadership in marshaling all of the committees through a difficult process.

I also appreciate Mr. THOMAS' attention to the special needs of smaller committees as well as all of the help and assistance provided by the Oversight Committee's staff to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this process.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Speaker, there will be precious little bipartisan agreement in the House today as we begin the upcoming rescission debate, so it is very appropriate we recognize our bipartisan moments as we find them. The proposal before us to reduce committee staffs by one-third clearly represents one such moment. We in the 104th Congress must show that when it comes to reducing Government spending, the cuts start here.

Last session, as a freshman in this body, I fought for reductions in the legislative branch appropriations. While some headway was made, frankly I did not feel the cuts went far enough.

Today, in a new Congress, I am happy to be part of an effort to make meaningful reductions in the amount Congress spends on itself. I particularly want to commend my friend, Chairman BILL THOMAS, and the majority caucus, for their support and leadership on making these reductions. Quite clearly, we could not have done it without you.

I also commend Ranking Member VIC FAZIO and my colleagues in the minority caucus for supporting these reductions. It is time to make these cuts. I urge all Members to join me in supporting these cuts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Speaker, when we got here, in fact way back in November right after the election, we talked about the part of the contract that said we were really going to clean house and really reduce spending for this Congress. I started hearing some whining and started

hearing some people say, ''But we cannot do that,'' from both sides of the aisle eventually.

Standing here today to see that we really can do it, the money is gone, and you add that to the fact that we reduced our own franking, I am now convinced, as well as the American people should be convinced, that this Congress is serious about cleaning house.

We are going to go into a budget cycle that is going to be hard, because we are going to have to make a lot of hard decisions, and every patriotic American is going to sacrifice something as we work to reduce a nearly $200 billion overspending problem a year. But, first of all, we stood and we did it ourself.

I think this is a good faith effort, but a very deep cut to this body, that the American people will appreciate us taking, and I want to commend the Chair and the bipartisanship of this group, because we really did it, and it shows again that you can trust this Congress to do what we promised. We keep our promises.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan resolution. It is very important that we cut where we can, and we should start cutting here where we work.

I think it is great that we have this resolution, but I want to ask the American public to look at some other cuts that are coming later today. The Republican majority is bringing us some cuts, and I want to look at those and say I do not know that they are such a good idea.

A cut of 180,000 jobs for our youth this summer. I ask you, what are we going to do? What do we plan for them to do this summer? Join gangs perhaps? And what about the cuts in senior housing we are going to see later, $2.7 billion in assistance. Where will those seniors live if we cut this assistance?

What about veterans? We are cutting $206 million on veterans. Do you know, that is a contract we made with the men and women who joined the armed services. Then there is one that is very close to my heart, the Coast Guard, $28 million. They protect our fishermen on the Oregon coast, and they do all that hard work in drug interdiction. Mr. Speaker, they also want to make a very tough cut, $47 million from student loans.

But do you know what? There is not one cut, not $1 dollar, from the pentagon in this rescission bill. Not $1 dollar. And I know, because I offered that as an amendment.

I support cuts in this resolution, but I ask the American people, were we sent here to cut the money from seniors, from students, from youth in our summer jobs programs? Were we sent here to do those kinds of cuts? I do not think so, and I do not think those are the cuts we should be voting on on floor today.

So I support this resolution, but I do not support the cuts that are coming later today.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I commend Chairman THOMAS and ranking Member FAZIO for the fine work they have done, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. This was a new process for all of us, and, quite frankly, he made it much easier than it could have been. I also want to thank all of the Members of the committee who worked with us.

But remember, the Committee on House Oversight is new in this Congress. All of the Members on the majority side were appointed by the Speaker. The Committee on House Oversight works the will of the leadership, and the resolution before us here today reflects, more than any one individual, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. It was his guidance and leadership that focused on what could be done.

Frankly, as the gentlewoman from Washington indicated, a number of folks on both sides of the aisle did not think it could be done. We cut the staffs by one-third opening day, and we stand before you with a better than a 30-percent cut in resources, without a diminution in our ability to do the job.

I said earlier, and I will repeat it, without the committee chairmen and the ranking members' cooperation of each of the committees, it could not have been done. I want to take a moment and thank the staffs on both sides of the aisle, because in putting these numbers together, and they changed over time and, sometimes, very brief periods of time, they were taxed to the limit. They did an excellent job, and I want to thank them at this time for that.

Let me close with this: When I was a member of the minority, I did not think the minority was treated fairly. Now that we are in the majority, I want to pledge to the minority that, as soon as possible, they will have a full one-third of the resources, if I have anything to do about it. I have pledged to them and I will tell them again we will work together to make sure that both sides of the aisle have resources adequate and fairly distributed to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would ask all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is keeping a promise to the American people to cut Congress' work force. During last fall's election campaign, we told the voters that if we became the majority we would reform Congress and no longer exempt this institution from the belt tightening actions the rest of America is facing. The American people want accountability and they want more bang for their taxpayers' buck. That is what we are doing in this resolution. When compared to what was spent in the previous Congress, this funding proposal represents a 30-percent cut, and a reduction of $67,003,290.

The House Oversight Committee deserves credit for the way it went about making these cuts. It was done very carefully, with full recognition of the importance of sustaining every committee's ability to operate effectively. Moreover, it was done with sensitivity to the needs of the minority party. Indeed, a close scrutiny of this budget reveals that the Democrat minority is treated comparatively better than their Republican predecessors were in previous Congresses. Moreover, to bring this about the new majority, on a number of Committees, substantially reduced the size of their own staffs to help the minority.

The House Oversight Committee must also be commended for developing an entirely new accounting system in which all of the House Committees' operational expenses are consolidated in a single account. Such streamlining will make auditing expenditures much easier to track. Thus, the taxpayers will be able to determine quickly how their tax dollars are being spent.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this responsive and responsible Congressional cost-cutting measure deserves the support of everyone in this House. I urge its swift passage.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 6, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Barcia	Bevill
Ackerman	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Allard	Barrett (WI)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Bartlett	Bishop
Archer	Barton	Bliley
Armey	Bass	Blute
Bachus	Bateman	Boehlert
Baesler	Becerra	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Beilenson	Bonilla
Baker (LA)	Bentsen	Bonior
Baldacci	Bereuter	Bono
Ballenger	Berman	Borski

Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
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
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
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
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—6

Fattah
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Jacobs
Moran

NOT VOTING—7

Barr
Cubin
Dicks
Fazio
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Pelosi

□ 1216

Mr. ROTH and Mr. WAXMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, 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. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 236, adoption of the committee funding resolution. Had I been here, I would have voted ''aye.''

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on House Resolution 107, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 115 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 115

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. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution 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 for a period not to exceed ten hours and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 1158 modified as follows: on page 56, after line 12, add as new titles IV, V, and VI the respective texts of titles I, II, and III of the bill (H.R. 1159) making supplemental appropriations and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, except the text of section 306 of H.R. 1159. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order unless printed as an amendment to H.R. 1158 or H.R. 1159, as the case may be, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII before March 14, 1995. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. Points of order against such amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. It shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing to increase the net level of budget authority in the bill. It shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing to redistribute budget authority within the net level of budget authority in the bill except within a chapter of the bill or, in the case of a title of the bill not organized by chapters, within such title. Debate on each amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute and any amendments thereto shall be limited to thirty minutes. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all points of order against the amendments specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER: Page 3, line 15, insert before the period '', and any