

Goss	Longley	Saxton
Graham	Lucas	Scarborough
Greenwood	Manzullo	Schaefer
Gunderson	Martini	Seastrand
Gutknecht	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Hancock	McCreery	Shadegg
Hansen	McDade	Shaw
Hastert	McHugh	Shays
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Shuster
Hayworth	McIntosh	Skeen
Hefley	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Heineman	Metcalf	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Hillery	Mica	Smith (WA)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Solomon
Hoekstra	Molinari	Souder
Hoke	Moorhead	Spence
Horn	Morella	Spratt
Hostettler	Myers	Stearns
Houghton	Myrick	Stocksman
Hunter	Nethercutt	Stump
Hutchinson	Neumann	Talent
Hyde	Ney	Tate
Inglis	Norwood	Tauzin
Istook	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Jacobs	Oxley	Thomas
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Parker	Tiahrt
Jones	Paxon	Torkildsen
Kasich	Petri	Trafficant
Kelly	Pombo	Upton
Kim	Porter	Vucanovich
King	Portman	Waldholtz
Kingston	Pryce	Walker
Klug	Quillen	Walsh
Knollenberg	Quinn	Wamp
Kolbe	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
LaHood	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Largent	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Latham	Riggs	Weller
LaTourette	Roberts	Whitfield
Lazio	Rogers	Wicker
Leach	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Lewis (KY)	Roth	Young (FL)
Lightfoot	Roukema	Zeliff
Linder	Royce	Zimmer
Livingston	Salmon	
LoBiondo	Sanford	

Richardson	Stark	Vento
Rivers	Stenholm	Visclosky
Roemer	Stokes	Volkmer
Rose	Studds	Ward
Roybal-Allard	Stupak	Watt (NC)
Rush	Tanner	Waxman
Sabo	Taylor (MS)	Williams
Sanders	Tejeda	Wilson
Sawyer	Thompson	Wise
Schroeder	Thornton	Woolsey
Scott	Thurman	Wyden
Sisisky	Torricelli	Wynn
Skaggs	Towns	Yates
Skelton	Tucker	
Slaughter	Velazquez	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Kennedy (MA)	Schumer
Browder	Laughlin	Serrano
Chapman	Moakley	Torres
Dornan	Mollohan	Waters
Harman	Schiff	White

□ 1214

Mr. METCALF changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1854.

□ 1217

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 21, 1995, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 104-146 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] had been disposed of.

DE NOVO VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the Chair will now put the question de novo.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as amended.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] be allowed to speak out of order for 2 minutes in order to underscore and explain the amendment that is about to be voted on.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will only consent to this request if we are given equal time.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I would amend my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request now is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] will be given 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be given 2 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] will be recognized for 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, rather than exercising my right to speak for 2 minutes, maybe I can handle this through a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Am I right that this is a revote on the Fazio amendment, amended by me yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOUGHTON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

I would reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman has yielded it to me.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on this, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, under what authority would the gentleman have the right to close on a unanimous-consent request that was divided?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is the manager of the bill.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. But this is not on the bill. Under what authority would he have the right to close? This is a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. This is additional controlled debate, permitted by unanimous consent, on an amendment to the bill.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I know we have had a lot of discussion this morning about Members

NAYS—187

Abercrombie	Eshoo	Lipinski
Andrews	Evans	Lofgren
Baesler	Farr	Lowe
Baldacci	Fattah	Luther
Barcia	Fazio	Maloney
Barrett (WI)	Fields (LA)	Manton
Becerra	Filner	Markey
Beilenson	Flake	Martinez
Bentsen	Foglietta	Mascara
Berman	Ford	Matsui
Bevill	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Bishop	Frost	McDermott
Bonior	Furse	McHale
Borski	Gejdenson	McKinney
Boucher	Gephardt	McNulty
Brewster	Geren	Meehan
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	Meek
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Menendez
Brown (OH)	Gordon	Mfume
Bryant (TX)	Green	Miller (CA)
Cardin	Gutierrez	Mineta
Clay	Hall (OH)	Minge
Clayton	Hall (TX)	Mink
Clement	Hamilton	Montgomery
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Coleman	Hayes	Murtha
Collins (IL)	Hefner	Nadler
Collins (MI)	Hilliard	Neal
Condit	Hinche	Oberstar
Conyers	Holden	Obey
Costello	Hoyer	Olver
Coyne	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Cramer	Jefferson	Orton
Danner	Johnson (SD)	Owens
de la Garza	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
DeFazio	Johnston	Pastor
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
Dellums	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Dicks	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)
Dingell	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Dixon	Klecicka	Pickett
Doggett	Klink	Pomeroy
Dooley	LaFalce	Poshard
Doyle	Lantos	Rahall
Durbin	Levin	Rangel
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Reed
Engel	Lincoln	Reynolds

who are aggrieved by the circumstances that occurred when this was last voted yesterday, and I certainly relate to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA] and their concerns, but I think there is another individual Member who has been aggrieved as well, and I think that is the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] worked very hard to bring to the floor a compromise amendment which allowed for a reduction in OTA of some \$7 million, and yet under the aegis of the Library of Congress, kept this very important scientific advisory entity in existence. He worked his side of the aisle, and he found a majority; he found it once, and I believe he found it twice.

He brings the perspective of perhaps the most successful businessman in this institution to this issue. He has made clear that he believes cutting our research and evaluation capability is not the way to downsize an institution, even the Congress of the United States.

I hope when all Members choose their decision to vote now for the third time on this issue, they will affirm his position, they will vote to support his perspective and, I think, as well, will vote to confirm the fact that when you work the system right here in the Congress, no one, majority or minority, should be able to deprive you of having your day in court, the court of public opinion here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I ask for an "aye" vote on the Houghton-Fazio amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that will preserve OTA but transfer it to the Library of Congress.

The committee, in their bill, wants to allow the functions of OTA to be done at the Library of Congress or at other agencies that do scientific studies and reports that duplicate what now the OTA does, but the bill eliminates OTA.

This amendment will preserve OTA, but transfer it to the Library of Congress. We think that if we are going to streamline, downsize, and consolidate duplicating services, the committee bill already does that.

I must mention that the Speaker very strongly does not support this amendment and very strongly does not support gutting the Library of Congress. This amendment will take \$16.5 million out of the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress would have to discontinue many of its functions in terms of its basic and core functions, in terms of cataloging. It would prevent a full quarter of the cataloging necessary for its new holdings, and it would also take away some of the services to the public. It would cut the preservation program by 15 to 20 percent.

It would also cut the infrastructure support, the automation program, personnel, and procurement processes. It

would deeply hurt the Library of Congress.

I urge the Members to vote against this amendment and to defeat the amendment to preserve the OTA, and to support the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Chair will now put the question de novo.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—220

Abercrombie	Frost	Meek
Baesler	Furse	Menendez
Baldacci	Gejdenson	Mfume
Barcia	Gephardt	Miller (CA)
Barrett (WI)	Geren	Mineta
Becerra	Gibbons	Minge
Beilenson	Gilchrest	Mink
Bentsen	Gilman	Mollohan
Bereuter	Gonzalez	Montgomery
Berman	Goodling	Moran
Bevill	Gordon	Morella
Bishop	Green	Murtha
Boehlert	Gunderson	Nadler
Bonior	Gutierrez	Neal
Borski	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Obey
Browder	Hamilton	Olver
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Orton
Brown (OH)	Hefner	Owens
Bryant (TX)	Heineman	Oxley
Bunn	Hilliard	Pallone
Cardin	Hinchey	Pastor
Castle	Holden	Paxon
Clay	Houghton	Payne (NJ)
Clayton	Hoyer	Payne (VA)
Clement	Hyde	Pelosi
Clinger	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (FL)
Clyburn	Jacobs	Peterson (MN)
Coleman	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Collins (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Poshard
Collins (MI)	Johnson (SD)	Quinn
Condit	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Conyers	Johnston	Rangel
Costello	Kanjorski	Reed
Coyne	Kaptur	Reynolds
Cramer	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson
Danner	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
de la Garza	Kennelly	Roberts
DeFazio	Kildee	Roemer
DeLauro	King	Rose
Dellums	Kleczka	Roukema
Deutsch	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	LaFalce	Rush
Dingell	Lantos	Sabo
Dixon	Lazio	Sawyer
Doggett	Leach	Schiff
Dooley	Levin	Schroeder
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Durbin	Lincoln	Skaggs
Edwards	Lipinski	Skelton
Ehlers	Lofgren	Slaughter
Emerson	Lowey	Spratt
Engel	Maloney	Stark
Eshoo	Manton	Stenholm
Evans	Markey	Stokes
Farr	Martinez	Studds
Fattah	Martini	Stupak
Fazio	Mascara	Tanner
Fields (LA)	Matsui	Tauzin
Filner	McCarthy	Taylor (MS)
Flake	McDermott	Tejeda
Foglietta	McHale	Thompson
Ford	McKinney	Thornton
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Thurman
Franks (NJ)	Meehan	Torkildsen

Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky

Volkmer
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Williams

Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—204

Allard	Fowler	Myers
Andrews	Fox	Myrick
Archer	Franks (CT)	Nethercutt
Armey	Frelinghuysen	Neumann
Bachus	Frisa	Ney
Baker (CA)	Funderburk	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Galleghy	Nussle
Ballenger	Ganske	Packard
Barr	Gekas	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Pickett
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Pombo
Barton	Goss	Porter
Bass	Graham	Portman
Bateman	Greenwood	Pryce
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Quillen
Bilirakis	Hancock	Radanovich
Bliley	Hansen	Ramstad
Blute	Hastert	Regula
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Riggs
Bonilla	Hayworth	Rogers
Bono	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Brewster	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Hilleary	Roth
Bryant (TN)	Hobson	Royce
Bunning	Hoekstra	Salmon
Burr	Hoke	Sanders
Burton	Horn	Sanford
Buyer	Hostettler	Saxton
Callahan	Hunter	Scarborough
Calvert	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Camp	Inglis	Seastrand
Canady	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chambliss	Jones	Shaw
Chenoweth	Kasich	Shays
Christensen	Kelly	Shuster
Chrysler	Kim	Sisisky
Coble	Kingston	Skeen
Coburn	Klug	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cooley	LaHood	Smith (WA)
Cox	Largent	Souder
Crane	Latham	Spence
Crapo	LaTourette	Stearns
Creameans	Lewis (CA)	Stockman
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Cunningham	Lightfoot	Talent
Davis	Linder	Tate
Deal	Livingston	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	LoBiondo	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	Longley	Thornberry
Dickey	Lucas	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Luther	Vucanovich
Dornan	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Dreier	McCollum	Walker
Duncan	McCreery	Wamp
Dunn	McDade	Watts (OK)
Ehrlich	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
English	McInnis	Weller
Ensign	McIntosh	White
Everett	McKeon	Whitfield
Ewing	Metcalf	Wicker
Fawell	Meyers	Wolf
Fields (TX)	Mica	Young (AK)
Flanagan	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Foley	Molinari	Zeliff
Forbes	Moorhead	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	Moakley	Solomon
Chapman	Parker	Torres
Harman	Schumer	
Laughlin	Serrano	

□ 1241

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall 410

to restore funds to the Office of Technology Assessment. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLINGER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLINGER: Page 20, after line 10, insert the following:

In addition, for salaries and expenses of the Congressional Budget Office necessary to carry out the provisions of title I of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1965 (Pub. L. 104-4), as authorized by section 109 of such Act, \$1,100,000.

Page 26, beginning on line 12, strike "operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library;"

Page 26, line 19, after the first dollar figure, insert the following: "(less \$1,165,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment and would request the allocation of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I say that anybody who supported the unfunded mandates legislation which we passed earlier this year and which passed by an overwhelming vote, 390 Members in favor of that legislation, should indeed support this amendment. As I said at the time we debated the unfunded mandates legislation, this could be an effective way to reorder the Federal, State, and local relationship. It could also be an effective way to relieve the burdens which we imposed on State and local governments, but only if we were able to implement the law properly, and the CBO plays a vital role in the implementation of the unfunded mandates legislation. CBO must do the estimating as to whether or not the threshold of \$50 million nationwide impact is reached or not. If it is not reached, then there is not a point of order lies. If it is reached, then a point of order does lie. The whole credibility of the unfunded mandates legislation would be called into question if those estimates are not accurate. If, in fact, they can be challenged or questioned or found to be somehow ineffective, then I think we lose the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

What we have done is provide an offset of \$1,100,000. That is not really sufficient to do the job CBO is charged to

do under this legislation, but it will give them a good start on accomplishing that. We offset it from the Folklife Center in the Library of Congress. This is a program that is not authorized, it was not reauthorized. It is a program that receives a large amount of private sector funding, and we would encourage that to continue. It is also a program that frankly should go into the private sector for funding.

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

□ 1245

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is about the Folklife Center, which I know through personal experience to be a most useful entity and function of the Library of Congress. I visited with Chairman CLINGER and Chairman PACKARD about this issue, and they have assured me, and I would like to engage the gentleman from California in a brief colloquy, that this function will not be decimated, that it will simply be rearranged. Am I correct in that understanding?

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I think the American Folklife Center is important and ought to be retained. I cannot assure the gentleman from Missouri that it will be retained, because that will be a function of trying to work out this cut to the library appropriation. But certainly I would work toward that end.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I know his commitment to the Folklife Center, and would like, as the process moves forward, to continue to work with him, and also in the authorization process, to ensure that this most vital function is indeed retained.

I thank the gentleman for his generosity in yielding.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], a very valued member of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, why are we cutting the American Folklife Center? It is a great program, but I think the money can be raised from the private sector. It does not have to come from the governmental sector. More importantly, this money was deauthorized and is not authorized. This money is appropriated but does not have the proper authorization at this point.

Why reprogram dollars to the Congressional Budget Office? I think the answer is very simple. Without this amendment, the unfunded mandates legislation that we passed in a bipartisan manner, both Houses of Congress, signed by the President, will have no teeth, because the CBO, who does the

estimating on the costs of each mandate so that we will know what they will cost States and localities and the private sector, will not be able to do it. It will be gutted completely.

Let us not undo the unfunded mandates reform that a bipartisan Congress and the President passed this spring and the President signed into law. Without this amendment, that is exactly what we are doing. So I rise in support of the Clinger amendment.

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

I simply want to say at this point I am in a difficult position. I have been urging the chairman of this committee to provide additional funding to CBO. I do think they are going to need at least \$2.5 million to take on their new responsibilities. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS, I think just outlined, as Chairman CLINGER has, the responsibility that we have to give CBO the resources to do what we have just asked them to do in the first 100 days of this Congress.

But I do not want to do it on the back of the Folklife Center. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the House Committee on Oversight, tells us that they will take up the authorization of this entity in due time. But if this amendment is adopted, there is obviously insufficient support for it, and therefore he may not even take up the authorization.

I think people who believe that the Folklife Center has value, as I do, ought to vote against this amendment, and we ought to find additional 602(b) allocations to this subcommittee to help CBO when we get to conference. This is obviously a conferrable item with the Senate, a joint item we will both have to consider.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members of the House who do not know what the American Folklife Center is, I did not either, until I came on the House a couple years ago and we had an authorization bill under suspension, and I was told at the door that this was Lawrence Welk's homestead all over again. So like a hoard of other people, I voted no, only to get back to my office and have a phone call from a constituent, who happened to be chairman of the board of the American Folklife Center.

I learned out in a hurry what it was all about. I want to say now I am a believer. I have seen it. There are about 12 full-time equivalents there. Last year they served the needs of 9,000 researchers, a wonderful repository of American folklife and folklore.

One small example of what they do: Years ago, wax cylinders were made recording Indian chiefs and Indians of western tribes, recollections of their

tribe, native music and things of this kind. These were languishing somewhere in the Library of Congress. This organization brought them forth, perfected them, made them into digitized CD-ROM's, and now we have that resource preserved. We need some organization that is committed to this. For \$1.25 million, surely we can continue this kind of enterprise.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds merely to say last year the American Folklife Center raised \$330,000 in private funding. It obviously does attract a great deal of private support. The other point I would make is that under our amendment, we do in no way limit the Library of Congress in the ability to apply funds to that purpose, if they so choose.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I will take a short time just to say I am not going to actively oppose this amendment, but I do have some concerns about continually raiding the Library of Congress. The last amendment that passed was \$16.5 million. This is another \$1.165 million. That does give me some concerns. I hope we can find a way to protect and preserve the American Folklife Center.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the motives of the gentleman. He has to find money for the unfunded mandates. But clearly the American Folklife Center is not the place to cut, and would be a devastating cut. What we are basically doing is hurting the culture, the diverse culture, of this country.

This Library of Congress Folklife Center has 1.5 million manuscripts, sound recordings, photographs, films, and periodicals. It is unique in the world. It reveals our history through collections of conversations, arts, crafts, songs, traditions of everyday Americans, our cowboy history, our native American history, our Mexican-American history.

I have had many constituents call with great concerns about what this cut would do. This is not the right thing to do. We should not go after this center that is good, that is well-managed, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Clinger amendment because I believe there is nothing more sacred to the people of this country than our rich, diverse culture.

The American Folklife Center housed in the Library of Congress maintains 1.5 million manuscripts, sound recordings, photographs, films, and periodicals. It is unique in the world. It reveals our history through collections of conversations, arts, crafts, songs, and traditions of everyday Americans.

My State of New Mexico has a particularly diverse history. Ranchers rose every day of their lives to herd cattle and sing songs

around the campfire during cattle drives and the Folklife Center provides the only recordings and conversations we have of this folk cultures.

Mexican-Americans in New Mexico settled this country long before Columbus landed on Plymouth Rock. Their rich contributions to our culture should be and are chronicled in the John Donald Robb collection of Spanish-American folksongs and similar artifacts.

New Mexico is also blessed with a rich Native American culture. The American Folklife Center documents that culture with early recordings of Zuni songs and folklore, which date back to 1890. There are also recordings from the eight Pueblos in northern New Mexico, and materials from the Mescalero and Chiricahua Apache peoples.

As a nation, we have done more to destroy native American culture than to preserve it; recent appropriation bills would kill all funding for the National Museum of American Indian that would have been built here in Washington. Let's do the right thing and preserve the American Folklife Center collection of native American culture.

The American Folklife Center brings history to life like no other museum we have. It keeps pieces of our history alive for future generations to understand. When our children want to know what songs their relatives sang, or what native American language sounded like 100 years ago, the Folklife Center can provide that information.

The center has been part of the Library of Congress since 1928—it survived the Depression and post-World War II downsizing, surely we can preserve it now.

It is internationally renowned and heavily used. It's the sort of education that we must continue to cherish and fund.

The center's budget includes not just programs but collections. Its Archive of Folk Culture contains nearly 1.5 million sound recordings, photographs, manuscripts, and other unique materials representing American and (to a smaller extent) world folk music, folklore, and folklife traditions.

The Archive has been part of the Library since 1928, surviving the 1930's, the post-WWII downsizing, and other vicissitudes. It is internationally renowned and heavily used. Users include researchers, publishing and record companies from the private sector, and members of the communities documented in the collections. Its American Indian holdings alone are unparalleled in the world; its African-American holdings are unequalled. Every State, every region, and nearly every ethnic group are likewise represented.

The collections-based portion of the center's budget amounts to approximately three-fourths of the total budget; the other one-fourth covers programs and general operations overhead.

The center in 1994 raised or leveraged funds amounting to about \$350,000, or one-third again the appropriated budget. Fund-raising will continue to increase. But fund-raising for the basic collections support is difficult if not impossible. That base of public support, for the center and the Library as a whole, is what the public as well as donors expect the Congress to fund.

Some supporters of the idea of removing the center's budget cite the Western Folklife Center in Elko, NV, as an example of a folklife center succeeding on private funding. This is not true, as the artistic director of the Western

Folklife Center, Hal Cannon, testifies. First, that center has benefited greatly from tax-based support—Federal, State, and local. Second, the Western Folklife Center does not have the responsibility for a unique and heavily used national archive of 1.5 million items; the personnel to support such a collection adequately—acquisitions, processing, preservation, reference services—cannot be maintained by raising private funds.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], a very valuable member of the committee, a supporter of this legislation, and a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, in March the President signed the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act into law. We all debated that issue on the floor, and we are all well aware we needed to take action that would require us under the new law to come up with money to pay for the studies that CBO had to do.

That is basically what we are doing here today, is meeting our obligation to come up with some money. It is probably not enough money. We will have to do this again. It is unfortunate we have to take the money from the American Folklife Center. I understand that and am sympathetic to this. Somebody needs to speak on behalf of local government, county government, and State government on this issue. We have to do an assessment of the mandates so that we can get an actual cost. That is basically what we are doing today. We are doing it for local and State governments, and we need to be supportive of that amendment.

In addition to that, it has been mentioned, and I will reiterate for the Members on our side, this is an activity that has the support of the private citizens, and they can raise the money and it is a way for us to go. I am just saying we can move to the private sector and we can raise some money to help this American Folklife Center, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] mentioned that we might be able to conference this and work out another solution. If we can do that, that is great.

But we have to fulfill our commitment on the unfunded mandate. The President signed the law. We in Congress need to come up with this component to make it happen. So ask all Members to vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], an architect of the unfunded mandates legislation and a strong supporter of this amendment.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, by necessity. Let me say I think the Folklife Center can get a lot more in private funding. They did raise \$330,000 in 1994, three times what they raised in 1990. The one in the western region does it entirely by private funds. I think that offset can be handled.

If you voted for the unfunded mandate bill, you should vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate the importance of the Folklife Center. I think we all understand we ought to fulfill our responsibility to CBO to allow them to do the workload we have just given them, and I am certainly hopeful we will do that in conference. But I would not want Members to vote for this amendment, because if they do, they will end up doing in the Folklife Center at a time when it may be impossible to resurrect it and bring it back as an authorized entity.

The American Folklife Center has been an integral part of the Library of Congress since 1977, but really 1928 as the archives of folk culture. Its budget includes not just programs, but collections; 1.5 million sound recordings, photographs, manuscripts, films, videos, periodicals, and other unique materials representing American and to some smaller degree world folk music, folk lore and folk life traditions.

This is something we ought not to be doing in for \$1.5 million. This is an entity that ought to be preserved. They will be raising more and more private fund sector funds, as the library in general is, but if we do them in, they will not be in a position to do that. I urge Members defeat this amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we will be delaying votes until the end. Does the rule call for this vote to be a 15-minute vote?

The CHAIRMAN. This vote will be a 15-minute vote. Amendments 8 through 11 will then be debated and the votes held until the end.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 159, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—260

Allard	Bereuter	Bunn
Andrews	Bilbray	Bunning
Archer	Bilirakis	Burr
Army	Billey	Burton
Bachus	Blute	Buyer
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Calvert
Ballenger	Boehner	Camp
Barcia	Bono	Canady
Barr	Borski	Chabot
Bartlett	Brewster	Chambliss
Barton	Brown (CA)	Chenoweth
Bass	Brownback	Christensen
Bateman	Bryant (TN)	Chrysler

Clinger	Hoekstra	Porter
Coble	Hoke	Portman
Collins (GA)	Holden	Poshard
Combest	Horn	Pryce
Condit	Hoestettler	Quillen
Cooley	Houghton	Quinn
Costello	Hunter	Radanovich
Cox	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Crane	Hyde	Reed
Crapo	Inglis	Regula
Creameans	Istook	Riggs
Cubin	Jacobs	Roberts
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Danner	Jones	Rohrabacher
Davis	Kanjorski	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	Kasich	Roth
Deal	Kelly	Roukema
DeLay	Kennedy (RI)	Royce
Deutsch	Kim	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	King	Sanford
Dickey	Kingston	Saxton
Doggett	Kleczka	Scarborough
Doolittle	Klug	Schaefer
Dornan	Knollenberg	Schiff
Doyle	Kolbe	Seastrand
Dreier	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Largent	Shadegg
Dunn	Latham	Shaw
Ehrlich	LaTourrette	Shays
English	Leach	Shuster
Ensign	Lewis (CA)	Sisisky
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Skeen
Fawell	Lightfoot	Skelton
Fields (TX)	Lincoln	Smith (MI)
Flanagan	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Foley	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Fowler	Longley	Smith (WA)
Fox	Lucas	Solomon
Franks (CT)	Luther	Souder
Franks (NJ)	Manzullo	Spence
Frelinghuysen	Martini	Stearns
Frisa	McCarthy	Stenholm
Frost	McCollum	Stockman
Funderburk	McDade	Stump
Galleghy	McHale	Talent
Ganske	McHugh	Tanner
Gekas	McInnis	Tate
Geren	McIntosh	Tauzin
Gilchrist	McKeon	Taylor (MS)
Gillmor	McNulty	Thomas
Gilman	Metcalf	Thornberry
Gonzalez	Meyers	Thurman
Goodlatte	Mica	Tiahrt
Goodling	Miller (CA)	Torkildsen
Goss	Minge	Towns
Green	Molinari	Traficant
Greenwood	Montgomery	Upton
Gunderson	Moorhead	Volkmer
Gutierrez	Murtha	Waldholtz
Gutknecht	Myers	Walker
Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Wamp
Hamilton	Neumann	Watts (OK)
Hancock	Ney	Weldon (FL)
Hansen	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Harman	Nussle	Weller
Hastert	Orton	White
Hastings (WA)	Oxley	Whitfield
Hayes	Paxon	Wicker
Hayworth	Payne (VA)	Wyden
Hefley	Peterson (FL)	Young (AK)
Heineman	Peterson (MN)	Young (FL)
Herger	Petri	Zeliff
Hilleary	Pickett	Zimmer
Hobson	Pombo	

NOES—159

Abercrombie	Clement	Ewing
Baesler	Clyburn	Farr
Baker (LA)	Coburn	Fattah
Baldacci	Coleman	Fazio
Barrett (NE)	Collins (IL)	Fields (LA)
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Filner
Becerra	Conyers	Flake
Beilenson	Coyne	Foglietta
Bentsen	Cramer	Forbes
Berman	DeFazio	Frank (MA)
Bevill	DeLauro	Furse
Bishop	Dellums	Gejdenson
Bonilla	Dicks	Gephardt
Boniior	Dingell	Gibbons
Boucher	Dixon	Gordon
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Graham
Brown (OH)	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Bryant (TX)	Edwards	Hastings (FL)
Callahan	Ehlers	Hefner
Cardin	Emerson	Hilliard
Castle	Engel	Hinchey
Clay	Eshoo	Hoyer
Clayton	Evans	Jackson-Lee

Jefferson	Miller (FL)	Schroeder
Johnson (SD)	Mineta	Scott
Johnson, E. B.	Mink	Skaggs
Johnston	Mollohan	Slaughter
Kaptur	Moran	Spratt
Kennedy (MA)	Morella	Stark
Kennelly	Myrick	Studds
Kildee	Nadler	Stupak
Klink	Neal	Taylor (NC)
LaFalce	Oberstar	Tejeda
Lantos	Obey	Thompson
Levin	Olver	Thornton
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Torricelli
Linder	Owens	Tucker
Livingston	Packard	Velazquez
Lofgren	Pallone	Vento
Lowey	Pastor	Visclosky
Maloney	Payne (NJ)	Vucanovich
Manton	Pomeroy	Walsh
Markey	Rahall	Ward
Martinez	Rangel	Waters
Mascara	Reynolds	Watt (NC)
Matsui	Rivers	Waxman
McCrery	Roemer	Williams
McDermott	Rose	Wilson
McKinney	Roybal-Allard	Wise
Meehan	Rush	Wolf
Meek	Sabo	Woolsey
Menendez	Sanders	Wynn
Mfume	Sawyer	Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Laughlin	Richardson
Browder	Lazio	Schumer
Chapman	Moakley	Serrano
Ford	Parker	Stokes
Johnson (CT)	Pelosi	Torres

□ 1314

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Lazio of New York for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. BISHOP, EWING, POMEROY, and EDWARDS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, PORTER, and LIGHTFOOT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ORTON: Page 25, strike lines 14 through 20. Page 32, line 16, strike "\$16,312,000" and insert "\$23,312,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes. Who seeks time in opposition?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair will repeat, the request for recorded votes on the next four amendments will be postponed until completion of amendment No. 11, pursuant to House Resolution 169.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes and 45 seconds.

Before beginning, Mr. Chairman, since the House continues to waive its own rules prohibiting committees from meeting in voting session at the same time we are in voting session on the floor, I am currently missing recorded votes in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on a bill of which I am a cosponsor, to be here to present this amendment on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is deficit neutral. It is also simple. It shifts \$7 million of increased spending on the Botanic Garden to restore \$7 million of cuts in the Federal depository library program. Since 1985 the Federal depository library program has been a partnership between the Federal Government and 1,400 libraries around the Nation to provide the public with local access to Government information and documents.

There is widespread use of these libraries, Mr. Chairman. One hundred sixty-seven thousand Americans per week utilize these collections. The legislation before us would cut 50 percent of funding from these libraries. Overall, this bill cuts only 8 percent of legislative branch appropriations, and actually increases spending on the Botanic Garden by over 200 percent.

The Botanic Garden in the 1995 appropriation was \$3 million. In 1996 it is \$10 million. The \$7 million increase is the first of a 3-year \$21 million appropriation for construction on the Botanic Garden. The future of the garden is uncertain. It is listed for transfer from the Congress to the Department of Agriculture. The House is also considering proposals to privatize or move the garden.

Cutting spending is tough business. In doing so, we must set priorities. In this Member's opinion, funding 14,000 libraries is a higher priority than constructing improvements on a building with a very uncertain future. Even the Architect of the Capitol, in testifying before the committee, stated the construction improvements would be of low priority, and the Botanic Garden would be subject to consideration for privatization.

Mr. Chairman, I will refer to two letters which will be included, urging support for my amendment. One is from the American Library Association, and the other is a letter from both the American Association of Law Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a sensible, deficit-neutral approach that will restore \$7 million in critical funding to the Federal Depository Library Program—a true hallmark of our democratic society.

Since 1895, this community-based partnership between the public and private sectors has provided unfettered public access to Government information—access that is vital to effective citizen participation in the democratic process. The Federal Depository Library Pro-

gram is a partnership between 1,400 designated depository libraries and the Federal Government—the sole purpose of which is to disseminate Government information to the public, free of charge.

To give you an idea of the widespread use of the services provided by this program, the Public Printer testified earlier this year that more than 167,000 persons utilize Federal Depository library collections nationwide each week.

The GPO's 1996 request for the Depository Library Program was \$2 million less than the funding level for the previous year. The Public Printer testified that this request was sufficient to maintain program responsibilities, while also managing the transition to the appropriate use of electronic media.

But, now these facilities are being asked to accommodate a 50 percent increase in electronically formatted copies, while taking a 50 percent cut in their funding source. While overall, the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill only represents an 8 percent cut from last year's funding level.

The purpose of the committee's 50 percent reduction in funding is to hasten the transition to electronic publishing, by requiring that executive branch agencies reimburse the GPO for the costs of producing and distributing paper and microfiche documents to depository libraries. The reduction in funding is a disincentive for Government agencies to participate in the Federal Depository Library Program.

This will result in a drastic reduction in the number of printed documents produced by the agencies, and will ultimately hinder free public access to Government information. Also, these deep cuts will result in new costs to depository libraries, as more time and effort will have to be expended to locate and acquire Government agency information products.

The president of the American Library Association testified earlier in the year that additional equipment and support would have to be provided to the depository libraries in order to implement the overly aggressive electronic program proposed in this legislation. Furthermore, some of the smaller, rural, public libraries don't have the necessary resources or the technology that the larger, research libraries have.

But, the GPO and the depository libraries recognize the increasing need to move to an effective, electronically-based program, and they are making great strides in new technology. The GPO Access System was created to provide no-fee, online dissemination—via the Internet—of such publications as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Federal Register. Now, the public has free access to this service, either through on-site equipment at depository libraries or through off-site electronic gateways established in cooperation with the libraries.

As important as this transition to electronic dissemination of information is, one must realize that not all Government information can be distributed electronically. Since the informational needs of each community are different, it is important to maintain a variety of formats—including print and microfiche.

The distribution of electronic copies has been steadily increasing, with about 454,000 copies projected for fiscal year 1996—a 50-percent increase over fiscal year 1995.

If we are to expect our Federal depository libraries to provide free, convenient access to

Government information, we must allow for a more sufficient period of transition to an electronically-based program.

My amendment restores \$7 million to this vital program, asking our depository libraries to take a more reasonable cut of 22 percent from the GPO's request.

I would now like to discuss the source of this critical funding.

The fiscal year 1995 appropriation for the Botanic Garden was \$3.23 million. This legislation provides an appropriation of \$10.053 million for fiscal year 1996; that represents a 200-percent increase at a time when other agencies and operations are being asked to take their share of cuts.

The \$7 million increase over last year has been provided for a renovation of the Botanic Garden's conservatory. This is one of three, annual \$7 million expenditures to carry out this renovation. It would be nice to find the funding for this renovation, but we must set priorities for our limited resources.

During hearings before the legislative branch appropriations subcommittee, the question was raised as to whether this renovation expenditure should be reconsidered in light of suggestions to privatize the Botanic Garden. Questions were also raised as to the primary function of the Botanic Garden.

The Architect of the Capitol agreed that the Botanic Garden's function is limited, and that the only reason for housing the facility in its current place is for historical reasons.

One of the members of the subcommittee suggested that the Botanic Garden might be able to serve its function better if it were privately funded. It was also suggested that services could be obtained from local landscape and nursery contractors.

Finally, the Architect was asked the following question: "If the committee asked the Architect's office to reduce their budget by 10, 15, 20, or 25 percent for the next budget year, would this (Botanic Garden) be a low-priority item that you would recommend spinning off to privatize?"

The Architect's response: "It would."

One must ask the question: Should we be spending valuable resources on renovating a facility whose ultimate fate has not been determined?

We are faced here with a question of priorities—increased funding for a limited facility in Washington, DC, or a much needed investment in the 1,400 depository libraries throughout the country.

Let us ease the transition of our depository libraries to electronic dissemination of information, and assist these facilities in carrying out their primary objective—which is to provide vital Government information to the public.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the information I referred to.

The information referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF LAW LIBRARIES,
Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM ORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ORTON: On behalf of the American Association of Law Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries, we would like to express our gratitude to you for offering an amendment to H.R. 1854 to restore \$7 million to the Government Printing Office's Salaries and Expenses (S&E) appropriations. As you know, this

fund supports the Depository Library Program which provides government information in all formats to over 1,400 Congressionally designated depository libraries.

We are very concerned that the proposed fifty percent reduction in funding for S&E, shifting the cost burden to agencies as an unfunded mandate, will drastically reduce the number of documents disseminated to the American public through depository libraries. Further, we believe that the need for a well-studied transition period must be recognized as the government converts to an effective electronically-based environment.

Thank you again for offering this amendment to restore funding for the Depository Library Program. We are very appreciative of your efforts and grateful for your support.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. OAKLEY,
Washington Affairs Representative.
PRUDENCE S. ADLER,
Association of Research Libraries,
Assistant Executive Director.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM ORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ORTON: On behalf of the American Library Association, I write to tell you of our support for your amendment to restore \$7,000,000 to the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses Appropriation as the House of Representatives considers H.R. 1854, the Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY96. The House Appropriations Committee cut this appropriation by 50 percent from the FY95 funding level, a cut far in excess of the overall 8 percent reduction in the bill for the Legislative Branch. Additionally, H.R. 1854 amends the statute governing the Depository Library Program, a procedure not appropriate on an appropriations bill.

The SuDocs Salaries and Expenses appropriation funds the Depository Library Program which provides government publications in print, microfiche and electronic formats to constituents through the nearly 1,400 Congressionally designated depository libraries. This drastic cut does not provide for the orderly transition that the government must follow to assure that its statutory requirements are fulfilled to disseminate government information to the public under Title 44, United States Code.

While intended to encourage agencies to publish electronically, this slash in the appropriation will more likely result in a great reduction in the number of printed documents made available to the public. Agencies have not budgeted in FY96 for depository copies. Agencies may well shirk their responsibilities to disseminate agency information and the number of fugitive documents—those that escape the program—may increase enormously.

Additionally, the deep cuts in appropriations for the Depository Library Program will result in an unfunded mandate for the state and local governments that support depositories, and result in additional costs to participating libraries as more time and effort will be invested to locate and acquire publications. Many libraries will not have the money to buy the equipment and paper needed to provide on-demand print service to the public.

A 1992 survey of depository libraries confirmed that participating libraries make significant contributions in personnel, equipment, facilities, and resources (including resources beyond those provided by the Government Printing Office) to carry out their part of the partnership with the government to ensure that the American people have eq-

uitable and ready access to federal information.

The likely result of the change in funding and the shift to an electronic Depository Library Program is a loss of information to the American public as the government undergoes a transition from a print-based to an electronic environment. In 1994, GPO acquired, cataloged, and distributed approximately 21 million copies of 65,000 documents to depository libraries for about \$1 a copy. Of these titles, only 306 were in electronic format.

In addition, the GPO Access System now provides 24-hour no-fee public access through depository libraries and gateways to the Congressional Record, Federal Register, text of all published versions of bills introduced in Congress, the History of Bills, the U.S. Code, and Public Laws of the 104th Congress. GPO plans a gateway in every state. But that development is in jeopardy because Congress required GPO Access to be funded by cost savings from the GPO's distribution of publications. With the reduction you are being asked to vote on today, GPO will no longer be able to support and expand the resources of GPO Access.

The American Library Association is also very concerned about the Appropriations Committee's decision to publish only on CD-ROM the Serial Set and the bound Congressional Record. Everyone does not have access yet to a computer for their information needs. The elimination of the print format of these very important titles will create information have-nots. Further, these two publications are at the core of Congressional information and serve as the official record of the daily activities of Congress. The longevity and durability of the CD-ROM format remain untested. In addition, the paper format has always served as the permanent and official record.

Congress should hold hearings and study the cost effectiveness and impact of these policy changes on public access to government information.

The American Library Association deeply appreciates your willingness to offer an amendment to restore funds to the appropriations for the Depository Library Program. ALA is a nonprofit educational organization of 57,000 librarians, library trustees, and friends of libraries.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR CURLEY,
President, American Library Association.

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

Mr. Chairman, let us make it clear to the Members of the House, we are not going to cut in this bill our commitment to the depository libraries. What we are doing in this bill is requesting that the agencies of Government, including the administration agencies in the executive branch, as they provide documents printing for depository libraries, they will have to pay for their own print on paper rather than having the GPO pay for it out of their own funds. Therefore, the work will still be done. It is just that we are transferring the costs to those that require the printing to be done.

In reference to the conservatory, this is a historic building. We all see it. It is the glass building right here close to Capitol Hill. It is falling apart. We simply have to preserve and protect it, as well as to repair it, or else it will simply not be able to be visited by people who want to visit the exhibits, because of safety reasons.

We have worked out a program where we have cut them back in their request for construction money from \$28 million to \$21 million. If we take this \$7 million away, then we may lose the private funds that are being raised and contributed for the purpose of the National Garden, but we also undercut the entire process of renovation. We think that would be a very sad mistake.

Mr. Chairman, it is only right that the agencies that request the printing to be done pay for their own requests. That is all our bill does. This would frustrate that process. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Owens].

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Orton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot promote the general welfare unless the citizens are informed. Our people cannot fruitfully engage in the pursuit of happiness in this complicated information age unless they are informed. For the past 100 years Congress has paid for Government publications to be sent to depository libraries located in each of our districts across the country. The depository library program ensures that ordinary citizens can have access to Government information, but H.R. 1854 reverses 100 years of precedent by having executive branch agencies reimburse the Government Printing Office for their publications. I assure the Members, no executive branch agency will have it as a priority. They will not do it.

H.R. 1854 also mandates a massive shift from print to electronic dissemination of information. However, in promoting a "cyber government", the bill ignores the fact that we cannot electronically reach most of our constituents through these libraries. They are not wired. They do not have the ability to receive electronic information.

Mr. Chairman, information must be produced not only in electronic formats, but also in traditional print formats, in order to accommodate the wide range of the majority of our people's needs and abilities. Many citizens are not yet ready to use Government information in an electronic format. Most libraries do not have the capacity to receive it that way.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1854 also eliminates the availability of free copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we send to our public schools, hospitals, and nonprofit libraries, not to mention free copies of bills, reports, and other documents that we supply. These proposed changes do not take us anywhere. I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill number is H.R. 1854. The concept driving this amendment is truly circa 1854. No one is talking about cutting off depository libraries from getting information. In fact, we want to promote it. What we do not want to encourage is a central paper printing process which then produces a bulk paper product, which is then shipped across country, and then made available at a depository library. That is what we are trying to change.

More than 90 percent of the libraries transmit, send, and receive electronic data today. What we are trying to do is tell the executive branch agencies we are not going to fund them. I have no quarrel with where the money comes from, the Botanic Garden, that is a secondary issue. It is up to those people to decide what they are going to do.

I object strenuously, that they are taking money from congressional sources and funding an executive branch agency when they do not want to spend the money themselves. We should not be forced to pay the money for the executive branch to pay for perpetuating an 1854 paper world. What we want to do is get up to speed in sending that same data electronically, and by CD ROM. If taxpayers want a hard copy at the depository library, the library will produce it there. Taxpayers do not pay for shipping wood, printed on wood, across country. That is what they did in the 19th century.

What we are trying to do is stop that. This amendment perpetuates it. It is wrong. It may be revenue neutral, but the concept is wrong. Unfortunately, I am going to ask Members to vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Utah.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has 1¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman, I would say we do need to gear up the electronic highway, we do need to transmit information electronically. Hopefully, this will save us costs. However, the reality is costs and transition time to shift to an electronic-based program, while placing an additional burden on the libraries in the immediate future.

Demand for electronic copies is projected to increase by 50 percent in just 1 year. A 50-percent cut in funding right now will make it impossible to meet this demand.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the informational needs of each community are different. Not every community in America has an off ramp from the elec-

tronic highway. Not all Government information can be distributed electronically. It is critical to provide documents and Federal information by print, microfiche, and CD ROM. The result of a 50 percent budget cut would be significant reduction of services and elimination of some Federal depository libraries.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues postpone the \$7 million capital construction to the building of uncertain future, and let us continue to fund the Federal depository libraries. I urge support for my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee removed from the conservatory construction funds \$7 million in this year 1995 rescission bill. We have already cut them back \$7 million. To cut them back an additional \$7 million would be simply gutting the renovation process.

Let me speak very briefly to the idea of access to the electronic equipment and information, Mr. Chairman. Virtually all, over 90 percent of the depository libraries, have access to electronic information through Internet and other electronic access equipment. To say that they cannot access it is simply not true. Furthermore, we ought to push them toward access. We ought to nudge them toward putting in the equipment that would give them access to electronic information and facilitate that process.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, if we move this process to the electronic age, we will save more than the \$7 million that we are trying to save in paperwork that is now being printed. We will save it with the electronic age.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 34, line 24, strike out "3,900" and insert in lieu thereof "3,550".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the fine work the Committee on Appropriations has done to this point in trying to execute one of the key platforms of the Republican agenda, now that we have taken control of the House, and that is a trend toward privatization.

This appropriations bill we have in front of us today does it when it comes to the beauty shop and barber shop here in the House, the elimination of the folding room, and we all hope the eventual sale of a powerplant that the U.S. Congress actually owns and operates.

I have to tell the Members that I think this amendment is far too timid when it comes to the matter of the Government Printing Office. Mr. Chairman, the Government Printing Office has 4,000 employees in it, which essentially serve at the will of Congress itself to print documents connected to our business here. I think we have to ask ourselves why it is in 1995 that we run a printing plant.

There are 115,000 private printers in the United States. Assuredly one of them is capable of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at much more reduced costs than what we presently pay the Government Printing Office on a regular basis. Since 1991 the GPO has lost money every year. For my colleagues here in 1994, they may remember the bizarre situation where GPO lost business and suddenly decided it had to raise rates in order to make up for the shortfall. What business in America, if they lose business, would suddenly increase their costs?

□ 1330

This amendment we have in front of us, Mr. Chairman, will reduce the Government Printing Office staffing levels. The Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations has already reduced it from 4,200 to 3,900. This amendment will reduce it by another 350 slots. In the long run, what we hope we will accomplish is a glide path to force the Government Printing Office to essentially become a procurement agency in the next several years and to close down the printing function altogether. In fact, the committee report itself directs the Public Printer to study the outsourcing of both security personnel and custodial care which account for 144 of the 350 positions that we are discussing today.

I think this amendment is absolutely crucial if we are going to be serious about privatization in this House.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talks about a printing plant. I hope the gentleman has visited that plant. In point of fact, it is in the Internet, it is on the World Net. It, in fact, has the state of the art technology in terms of information transfer available to it. Individuals anywhere in this country can get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other Government documents in their home and can print it, presuming that they have the proper facilities, as we get it ourselves.

The fact of the matter is, in addition, 80 percent of the GPO's workload is contracted out right now to the private sector. The fact of the matter is there are certain things; namely the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other documents that we need inhouse for security reasons or other reasons.

The gentleman talks about a glide path. Approximately 5,000 employees 3 years ago, down to 4,104. This bill brings them down to 3,900. They are on a glide path, they are reinventing, they are downsizing.

This will cost 20 million additional dollars. The reason being, because it will require RIF's, 554 to be exact if they come down that fast, and there will be a tremendous cost, not a cost savings.

This is a bad amendment, it is not timely, and it will undermine the ability to get the information that this Congress needs in a timely fashion.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], who has been an absolute tireless champion on reform of the Government Printing Office and has been a mentor on this issue since I first got here in 1990.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Wisconsin.

As the ranking Republican Member on the House-Senate Joint Committee on Printing, I have been alarmed with the dramatic losses being incurred by the GPO. The gentleman from Maryland asked if anybody has been down to the GPO. I have, many, many times.

This year the GPO estimates its losses to be nearly \$10 million. The Joint Committee has requested four different studies over the last several years to be conducted by the GAO, and Arthur Andersen, and the Public Printer's GPO 2000 study, to determine the cause and options to reduce these losses. This is \$10 million.

I think it is far more sensitive to employees to really gradually try to reduce the work force, if we can, than at a future date to be forced to totally eliminate the entire agency.

The gentleman from Maryland has indicated that the argument that we are going to have RIF's here and it is going to cost money—that is false and shortsighted. We do not have to go to RIF's. The GPO can do it. It is not required to utilize RIF's. Even if the GPO chooses to do so, the amendment will still save taxpayers over \$6 million.

We are talking about 350 positions. This has been a glidepath but, again, this agency has lost over \$10 million. They are under orders from the Joint Committee to quit losing money, and it is not the fault of the employees. It is that the GPO is the victim of a technological revolution in regard to printing.

The gentleman's amendment is in good standing. It is the continued way to go to save money. We will await the studies and see if we can make further savings. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Klug-Roberts amendment. The Government Printing Office has served our country for 100 years and they still have a vital role.

Just to clarify for the American people, to give them a sense of what this agency does on a daily basis, they produce 20,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 32,000 copies of the Federal Register, 26,000 copies of Commerce Business Daily and process nearly 2,000 orders from the American people. All of this is being done despite a 50-percent decrease in staff since 1975.

I would submit that in fact the committee considered this issue very thoroughly. They made reductions to the tune of 200 positions that are being reduced. This amendment would add to that 350, and rest assured, you cannot do 550 positions without some additional cost. You cannot do it all through attrition. There will in fact be some cost as a result of RIF's.

But the final point I would like to make is this: They do it efficiently. They produce the overnight service, the 24-hour turnaround that is required to meet our needs. There is no plant, no facility on the east coast, in the mid-Atlantic area that has shown the capacity to deliver this work product in a timely, efficient, and most importantly consistent manner as the Government Printing Office.

I believe I would have to return to the old adage: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I assume I have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], a member of the committee, has the right to close.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me respond to a couple of points, if I can, Mr. Chairman. First of all the argument that nobody on the east coast is capable of doing this work.

Somewhere in India or Bangkok today a reporter from the Wall Street Journal will file a story, it will be edited in New York, sent up on a satellite dish, and the Wall Street Journal will end up on my doorstep the next morning in Madison, WI. Assuredly

somebody is capable on the east coast of publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD overnight.

In terms of the cost of RIF's, let's make it very clear on the arithmetic for everybody who is in this Chamber today. On the average it costs us \$55,000 an employee at the Government Printing Office. The one-time cost if we have to end up paying those people a RIF is \$25,000. That means at a minimum we save \$30,000 a year on each single employee. It does not cost us money. It saves us \$6 million.

In the long run if what we are interested in is attempting to save money and to move toward privatization, then it is clear we have got to be very aggressive on privatizing services in the Government Printing Office, and RIF'ing, and eliminating another 350 positions is exactly the way to do it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], a former chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I would love to let the Wall Street Journal print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if we could sell ads, but that is another day.

The point is clear: In my opinion, as for 4 years I was chairman of the House Administration Committee and either chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Government Printing Office is on a glide path as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] so well put. It will cost money. It will cost money if we have to reduce under this amendment as quickly as this amendment says we should.

I am in sympathy with the objects that the gentleman who authored this amendment had. But let me tell you a little story. The other night, the White House wanted something printed in color and they were a little afraid to work it through the Government Printing Office, so they went to Kinko's to get 30—however many copies they needed—Kinko's in Washington. Kinko's could not handle it as quickly as they wanted it, so they farmed it out all over town.

It wound up costing \$30,000. It would have cost \$5,000 if it had been procured, and that is what GPO basically is today, is a procurement shop. It would have been \$5,000 if it had been procured through GPO, in color. It would have been \$3,000 if it had been done in black and white. The quick turnaround time necessary for printing the documents that we use in this institution is what keeps this work force alive and in necessary for us.

My colleagues, I beg you, let's don't speed up the glide path that the Government Printing Office is on now. You are going to pull a nose dive off that is

going to have a crash and is going to cost us a lot more than if the normal path that has already been set up for many years now is followed.

The Government Printing Office is basically a procurement shop. I do not want the Defense Department being able to go out and choose whatever printer it wants to print its business. I want the Government Printing Office to be competitively bidding those jobs out in the private sector as it has been for years. I hope that will continue. I respectfully ask my colleagues, please don't vote for this amendment.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHRISTENSEN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTENSEN: Page 49, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the salaries or expenses of any elevator operator in the House of Representatives office buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for Members of Congress to start pushing their own buttons. Yes, that grievous, arduous task of pushing your own elevator button. No, my amendment does not propose to eliminate elevators, nor does my amendment require the Members to take the steps from here out. All my amendment requires is that we begin pushing our own elevator button.

Last week a young woman who had been visiting my office commented to my staff that she was shocked to see that we still had elevator operators in the House office buildings. She re-

marked, "I thought you guys got rid of those the first week."

Well, if we the Members of this body have heard that comment once, we have heard it too many times. My amendment very simply would eliminate funding for the 10 elevator operators in the House office buildings, not the Capitol, just the House office buildings.

Each and every day this body convenes in committees and task forces all over the Capitol to make tough choices about changing the way our Government does business. We were elected to change the way our Government does business because it is no longer acceptable to Americans for us to mortgage the future of our Nation and our children.

My amendment is not going to bring the deficit down a whole lot. It is not going to work on the debt, but it is going to save the taxpayers \$263,000 this year in salary and benefits.

I understand some very well-intentioned Members may suggest that we should commission a study on this issue. A study. How anyone could suggest a study to examine how to eliminate 10 elevator operators and keep a straight face while saying it is beyond me. With a \$5 trillion debt, the last thing we need is another study.

In our economy, when businesses are forced to downsize, it is the perks that go first: company cars, expense accounts, and corporate country club memberships, all cut back in the name of the bottom line. By what justification can any of us say that we must downsize Government but keep House elevator operators?

I will be the first to admit that many of the people who run the automatic elevators are good, decent people. However, we must remember that any time a company is forced to downsize, many kind and friendly people may lose their jobs as well.

It might be argued here today that the purpose of the operators is to assist Members in arriving at the floor in time for votes. But I submit that my amendment has no bearing whatsoever on the elevator operators in the Capitol Building. It only affects those in the House office buildings.

I also remind Members that there are already elevators set aside for Members only to use, the speed of which remains the same no matter who pushes the button.

In closing, I will again remind all assembled here that our Federal Government is broke. We are nearly \$5 trillion in debt. At a time when we are asking Americans to tighten the belt and make do with less, surely this body can make do without elevator operators.

My colleagues, the time has come for us to begin pushing our own buttons.

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend yielding, and I know he is into sacrifice.

Am I correct that the gentleman's office is on the first floor of the Longworth?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. The gentleman is correct. I am on 1020 Longworth.

Mr. HOYER. Am I correct that the gentleman does not need an elevator, therefore, because he is at street level? He just walks right out?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Reclaiming my time from my friend from Maryland, it is correct that I am on 1020 Longworth, but the issue is not whether I am on the first floor or the seventh floor or in Rayburn or in Cannon.

Mr. HOYER. You want to give it up for the rest of us.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. The issue is that it is time for us to push our own automatic elevator buttons.

Mr. HOYER. I understand.

□ 1345

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Virtually every Member that does work in the Longworth Building would not want to have the elevators made more inconvenient. There has never been a time on the floor of this House when the whole issue of being able to get here to vote on time is more graphic than it was yesterday and today.

And to even consider making it more difficult for our Members to meet the time frame of getting here to vote by virtue of eliminating elevator operators, that only operate for Members at least during the time that we have a vote call, this would not be the right time.

We have not asked for a study. We have simply asked the chief administrative officer of the entire House of Representatives, to review the process of elevators and elevator operators and give us a recommendation as to how it can be improved. That is not going to be a long study and expensive study. We expect that to come back to us. We will readdress this issue at the appropriate time in the future.

Mr. PACKARD. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed in the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]. We have already cut the elevator operators from 150 a few years ago down to 22. The gentleman is not giving us any credit for that.

And I might say for the elevator operators, these are good people. They have families. They are working. And what are we doing in the U.S. Congress? I thought we were going to put our emphasis on finding ways to build self-esteem and self-worth. We cannot all be chiefs; we need a lot of Indians. And we all do different things to get the job done and accomplish the mission.

Let us give our elevator operators a break. I do not see the gentleman from Texas putting a cap on these people

making \$10 million or more, yet we want to single out the elevator operators who give information, they give advice, they give directions, and they are trying to make a difference.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new issue. It is an issue that is easy to make fun of. The American public hears you have got push-button elevators. What do you need an operator for? Like all the elevators around the country, they are run by computers and the computers cannot tell, they are not as sophisticated as human beings still.

And human beings, as the chairman has pointed out, can make a difference, can make judgments, can make sure that people get up and down the 7 floors of the Longworth Building or the 6 floors or the 5 floors of the Cannon and Rayburn Buildings so that Members can get to the floor on time.

We have just had a substantial incident where a number of Members were late getting to the floor. We had a big confrontation about that and the Speaker told us, voting in a timely fashion is important. We want to limit it to 17 minutes. This facilitates that at a relatively small cost. Why? Because the computers cannot tell as well as human beings can how to accommodate the 15-minute voting patterns.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have, with all due respect, seen a lot of bonehead amendments in the years that I have been here, but this one ranks up at top.

The elevator operators on the House side work very hard. They are scared to death about this. They are scared to death about losing their jobs. And, frankly, we need them. Those of us who are in the Longworth Building, many times we run down the steps because the elevators are so difficult to get in that building. Without the elevator operators, we would probably miss half the votes.

So, I can think of nothing more that is so silly. The savings is next to nothing. All it is doing is making a lot of loyal government employees, who work hard and are not paid much, frightened to death and making it impossible for Members to vote in a timely fashion.

If there was ever a vote that did not make sense on the merits, this is it. It does not make sense from a monetary point of view. It saves us nothing. It does not make sense from an efficiency point of view.

I very, very strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat this amendment. It may play great with the folks back home, saying we have cut out fat. This is not fat. This is necessary. I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may

consume. For any Member to suggest that they are going to miss votes because they cannot push their own button, but they need an elevator operator to push the button, is ludicrous. What is this country coming to when you cannot push your own automatic elevator button?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has 1 minute remaining and has the right to close.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would urge support of my amendment and I guess it would just be the fact that it is not about the families, because they are good people. They are very good people. But when you downsize, you have to make some cutbacks and some people have to find other work. So, I would urge support of my amendment.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is mistaken. This is not a tough vote at all. It is not tough to cut out jobs; to inconvenience the Members when we have only 17-minutes to get to a vote. It is a cheap-shot vote. It is a bad vote. It is not a tough vote.

The elevator operators here control the traffic and the flow of the crowd during the times of votes. It is very important that they do that. I would urge the Members to vote down this amendment.

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

In writing this bill we have not approached it to save jobs, per se. We have tried to streamline and improve the operation of Government. And the time will come when we will reevaluate the operators after we have upgraded the elevators and made them work better for the Members. But for the time being, this is not the time to make it more difficult for the Members and to eliminate the elevator operators in this amendment. I urge a strong no vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. ZIMMER: Page 49, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 312. Any amount appropriated in this Act for "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances" shall be available only for fiscal year 1996. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, together with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], I am proposing an amendment that addresses an issue that has caused great confusion, consternation, and rancor in this House.

Many of us have gone to great lengths not to spend the money that is available for our office expenses because we believe that frugality begins at home. We believe that we cannot credibly ask for major cuts in programs that affect our constituents unless we cut programs that affect us and reduce spending in our own offices.

I have saved more than \$500,000 in my 4 years in Congress, and many of my colleagues have save more. But there has been persistent uncertainty about what happens to the money that we do not spend.

This amendment ends that uncertainty by explicitly dedicating the money we save to deficit reduction. Simply put, this amendment gives Members a real incentive to do the right thing.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak not so much in opposition as to explain the circumstances. In my opinion, this amendment simply does not do anything that is now not being done through the normal process.

There has been the mistaken idea, and I had that mistaken idea for many years when I first came here, and I think many of my colleagues had the

idea, that there was a slush fund out there that all the extra money that we did not spend in our official expense or our other office expense allowances, clerk hire and so forth, if there were surpluses at end of the year, that money would be turned back to the slush fund that the Speaker or somebody else in the House would control.

That is simply not true. The fact is that when I do not spend money out of my official accounts, it is never withdrawn from the Treasury. It is never spent from the Treasury.

Members need to know that what we do not spend, what is surplus at end of the fiscal year out of our official moneys, and that is for all three accounts, never comes out of the Treasury. That includes the mail account, that includes the official expense account, and that also includes the clerk hire account. What is not spent, there is nothing written out of the Treasury. So there is nothing to return to the Treasury as this amendment would request.

We cannot return to the Treasury money that has never been withdrawn from the Treasury. So in my judgment, this amendment has absolutely no meaning in terms of changing existing policy. It will still remain the same.

With that explanation, I oppose the amendment because I think it simply adds a layer of redundancy.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

I am proud to join in cosponsoring the amendment with Mr. ZIMMER. I introduced this bill as H.R. 26 on the first day of Congress. It has 121 cosponsors, Democrats and Republicans. The idea has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Concord Coalition, because it does address the deficit.

We should vote for this for two reasons, and I strongly disagree with the analysis of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD]. One is because we should lead on deficit reduction. We should take the first step. If American families are tightening their belts, Congress certainly can do the same thing. And voluntarily return money. I voluntarily returned \$677,000 over the last 4 years.

Second, in response to the gentleman from California, [Mr. PACKARD], this is a truth-in-budgeting amendment. It is outrageous that somebody could say we need to appropriate less money in the appropriations process and count on the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] to return money to pay for these other people spending more.

I thank the chairman and the sponsor of the amendment and join proudly in a bipartisan way to urge passage.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I, too, at one time introduced a bill to do exactly what the gentleman from Indiana has done, but I was wrong. I simply misunderstood the process, and I now know what the process is. The money never goes out of the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I too, do not rise in opposition or in support of this particular amendment. I would tell the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] he does not return money to the Treasury.

First of all, no money is appropriated for individual offices. There is no appropriation for the 21st District of California, for example. There is no appropriation for Members' offices. There is an appropriation to the House in support of our official duties.

Members draw down on that account. If they do not use all of the money, it means they did not draw down all of their call on that account. They do not return money to the Treasury. Having said that, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] knows that I have been working with our lawyers and others to try to figure out a way to make this happen. We are talking about even fundamentally changing the way in which we appropriate so that Members who do not draw down their account to the maximum amount available under law, can go back home and say: that amount I did not draw down is designated to go to deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is a positive. That is an incentive and it is probably a better goal than just going back into the Treasury to be churned for other expenditures.

□ 1400

So that is why I am not opposing this measure, but you have got to have an understanding, folks. Your concept of the way this place works in flat-out wrong.

What we need to do is to make sure that what you are talking about, in fact, becomes reality, and I pledge my support to continue to work on this.

And the reason I am not opposing the gentleman from New Jersey is because if, in fact, it is possible, within the context of this appropriations bill, to make some determinations without having to go to statute, at least, he says, it is to go to deficit reduction instead of the general treasury. That is a modest step forward, if we can make it happen.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

I join him in urging support of this amendment, as well as the gentleman from Indiana.

I agree with much of what the gentleman from California said. He is correct in that these funds are not office- or district-specific. However, the fact is if all of the offices collectively do not use the appropriated amount, these funds can be reprogrammed.

In the past, I would submit that that has occurred in this House, and what this amendment would do is it would change that procedure so those leftover funds are not reprogrammed.

In the beginning of this session, during the debate on the rules package, I came to the floor and requested that we have an independent audit of House operations to include an examination of where these funds go, because it has been blurred and made difficult for us to find this out.

So I would urge support of the amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the sponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], and also the author of H.R. 26, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], for allowing me to speak on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Zimmer amendment.

As a new Member of Congress, I have discovered there are few clear choices when it comes to balancing the Federal budget. This amendment is a simple, commonsense proposition for Members of the House to claim they support this goal. Each year many Representatives have money left over in their office budgets. This money goes back to the general House fund for use on other projects.

The Zimmer amendment would require Representatives to apply all excess funds from their office budgets each year to the Federal debt. In essence, Members of Congress would be making their contribution to the ultimate goal of balancing the budget, a goal which many of us support.

I ask Members who came to Congress as a result of the 1994 elections to carefully consider this amendment. The American people sent us here to reduce the deficit and change the way Congress does its business. The Zimmer amendment accomplishes both goals.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, this is a familiar fight for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and other people in my class because we actually began it back in 1990.

I understand the point of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], that it is certainly not the intention, his intention, nor the intention of his colleagues to turn around and reprogram money.

It seems to me if there is a question or if there is essentially some sense of indecision about whether or not this is binding, then we should clearly err on the side of deficit reduction. Let us remove any sense of temptation that presently exists for the Committee on Appropriations to reprogram any of this money. Let us settle it once and for all.

Like my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], I have worked very hard in my office to hold down expenses and have had the lingering suspicion over the last 4 years much of the money I saved somehow gets spent someplace else.

Let us say to the Members of Congress, if you are careful enough to hold down travel and careful enough to hold down salaries of your staff and careful enough to watch the kind of monies spent throughout your House operations, then at the very least all the incentives should be in place to save money rather than spend it.

I strongly support the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, and Members, I, too, join in the opposition to this amendment. I really think, after listening to the dialogue here, that the problem could be corrected by allowing Members to put out a press release saying that they returned money to the Treasury.

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

Mr. Chairman, in my concluding remarks, I want to simply remind Members that we went to special efforts to give Members credit for not spending all of their funds. The report provides that there will be a letter that would indicate that they have not spent all of their funds; they can use it for whatever purpose that they wish.

Any amount left in the appropriations account, in this account, remains in the treasury. It is never spent out of the treasury and thus it is available for deficit reduction.

The absolute intent of this amendment is being realized in the existing process.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 8, offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr.

ORTON]; amendment No. 9, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]; amendment No. 10, offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]; and amendment No. 11, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. Those in support of the demand for a recorded vote will rise and be counted. The Chair will count all Members standing in support of the request for a recorded vote.

This is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, can the Chair advise us as to how the vote turned out on the voice vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said in the reading of the announcement that the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has not yet been ordered.

The pending business before the committee is a request for a recorded vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I understand this is not necessarily a parliamentary inquiry. Was it the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON]?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

EXPRESSING CONCERN ON VOTING PROCEDURE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. The concern I have, I would say to the acting ranking member and the chairman, is that if one of our colleagues requested a vote and expected that vote to occur and is now off the floor, I think it would be somewhat unfair of us not to—here is the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. I know my colleagues were glad to hear from me.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member may make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on my amendment. Pending that, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order and demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 321, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—104

Abercrombie	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Andrews	Holden	Pickett
Bachus	Houghton	Pomeroy
Baesler	Hoyer	Rahall
Baldacci	Jacobs	Reed
Barrett (WI)	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Becerra	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Bishop	Kanjorski	Sabo
Borski	Kasich	Sawyer
Brewster	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Browder	Kildee	Shays
Brown (FL)	Klecza	Sisisky
Cardin	Klink	Skelton
Clyburn	LaFalce	Slaughter
Condit	Lewis (GA)	Stenholm
Coyne	Lincoln	Tanner
Cramer	Lofgren	Tauzin
Danner	Luther	Taylor (MS)
Deal	Maloney	Thornton
DeFazio	Markey	Thurman
DeLauro	Mascara	Towns
Doyle	McHale	Vento
Duncan	McKinney	Visclosky
Engel	McNulty	Volkmer
Eshoo	Meehan	Waldholtz
Farr	Mfume	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Minge	Watts (OK)
Fields (LA)	Montgomery	Waxman
Foglietta	Nadler	Weller
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Williams
Furse	Orton	Wyden
Geren	Owens	Wynn
Gordon	Pastor	Yates
Hayes	Payne (VA)	Zimmer
Hefner	Pelosi	

NOES—321

Allard	Bunn	Cubin
Archer	Bunning	Cunningham
Armey	Burr	Davis
Baker (CA)	Burton	de la Garza
Baker (LA)	Buyer	DeLay
Ballenger	Callahan	Dellums
Barcia	Calvert	Deutsch
Barr	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Barrett (NE)	Canady	Dickey
Bartlett	Castle	Dicks
Barton	Chabot	Dingell
Bass	Chambliss	Dixon
Bateman	Chapman	Doggett
Beilenson	Chenoweth	Dooley
Bentsen	Christensen	Doolittle
Bereuter	Chrysler	Dornan
Berman	Clay	Dreier
Bevill	Clement	Dunn
Bilbray	Clinger	Durbin
Bilirakis	Coble	Edwards
Bliley	Coburn	Ehlers
Blute	Coleman	Ehrlich
Boehlert	Collins (GA)	Emerson
Boehner	Collins (IL)	English
Bonilla	Collins (MI)	Ensign
Bonior	Combest	Evans
Bono	Conyers	Everett
Boucher	Cooley	Ewing
Brown (CA)	Costello	Fawell
Brown (OH)	Cox	Fazio
Brownback	Crane	Fields (TX)
Bryant (TN)	Crapo	Filner
Bryant (TX)	Cremeans	Flake

Flanagan	Largent	Reynolds
Foley	Latham	Riggs
Forbes	LaTourette	Rivers
Ford	Lazio	Roberts
Fowler	Leach	Roemer
Fox	Levin	Rogers
Franks (CT)	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Frelinghuysen	Lightfoot	Roth
Frisa	Linder	Roukema
Frost	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Funderburk	Livingston	Royce
Galleghy	LoBiondo	Rush
Ganske	Longley	Salmon
Gejdenson	Lowe	Sanders
Gekas	Lucas	Sanford
Gephardt	Manton	Saxton
Gibbons	Manzullo	Schaefer
Gilchrest	Martinez	Schiff
Gillmor	Martini	Scott
Gilman	Matsui	Seastrand
Gonzalez	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCollum	Shadegg
Goodling	McCrery	Shaw
Goss	McDade	Shuster
Graham	McDermott	Skaggs
Green	McHugh	Skeen
Greenwood	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Gunderson	McIntosh	Smith (NJ)
Gutierrez	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gutknecht	Meek	Smith (WA)
Hall (OH)	Menendez	Solomon
Hall (TX)	Metcalf	Souder
Hamilton	Meyers	Spence
Hancock	Mica	Spratt
Hansen	Miller (CA)	Stark
Harman	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hastert	Mineta	Stockman
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Stokes
Hastings (WA)	Molinari	Studds
Hayworth	Mollohan	Stump
Hefley	Moorhead	Stupak
Heineman	Moran	Talent
Herger	Morella	Tate
Hilleary	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
Hinche	Myers	Tejeda
Hobson	Myrick	Thomas
Hoekstra	Neal	Thompson
Hoke	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Horn	Neumann	Tiahrt
Hostettler	Ney	Torkildsen
Hunter	Norwood	Torricelli
Hutchinson	Nussle	Traficant
Hyde	Obey	Tucker
Inglis	Olver	Upton
Istook	Ortiz	Velazquez
Jackson-Lee	Oxley	Vucanovich
Jefferson	Packard	Walker
Johnson (CT)	Pallone	Walsh
Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Wamp
Johnston	Payne (NJ)	Ward
Jones	Peterson (FL)	Waters
Kaptur	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Kelly	Pombo	Weldon (PA)
Kennedy (MA)	Porter	White
Kennelly	Portman	Whitfield
Kim	Poshard	Wicker
King	Pryce	Wilson
Kingston	Quillen	Wise
Klug	Quinn	Wolf
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Woolsey
Kolbe	Ramstad	Young (AK)
LaHood	Rangel	Young (FL)
Lantos	Regula	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman	Moakley	Schumer
Clayton	Parker	Serrano
Laughlin	Scarborough	Torres

□ 1430

Mr. WISE and Mr. MARTINEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."
 Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. PAYNE of Virginia, BAESLER, FARR, NADLER, LEWIS of Georgia, MFUME, FOGLETTA, CRAMER, TAYLOR of Mississippi, OBERSTAR, KLECZKA, MAS-CARA, SHAYS, and TOWNS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Messrs. BORSKI, TAUZIN, BACHUS, GORDON, MARKEY, SKELTON, RICHARDSON, and LUTHER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 412. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 293, noes 129, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—293

Allard	Cox	Gordon
Andrews	Cramer	Goss
Archer	Crane	Graham
Armey	Crapo	Greenwood
Bachus	Creameans	Gunderson
Baker (CA)	Cubin	Gutknecht
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Danner	Hamilton
Balinger	de la Garza	Hancock
Barcia	Deal	Hansen
Barr	DeFazio	Harman
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Hastert
Barrett (WI)	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Barton	Dickey	Hayworth
Bass	Doggett	Hefley
Bentsen	Dooley	Heineman
Bereuter	Doolittle	Herger
Bevill	Doyle	Hilleary
Billbray	Dreier	Hobson
Billirakis	Duncan	Hoekstra
Bliley	Dunn	Hoke
Blute	Durbin	Horn
Boehlert	Edwards	Hostettler
Boehner	Ehlers	Houghton
Bonilla	Ehrlich	Hunter
Bono	Emerson	Hutchinson
Brewster	English	Hyde
Browder	Ensign	Inglis
Brown (CA)	Eshoo	Istook
Brownback	Everett	Jacobs
Bryant (TN)	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Bunn	Fawell	Johnson, Sam
Bunning	Fields (TX)	Jones
Burr	Flanagan	Kaptur
Burton	Foley	Kasich
Buyer	Forbes	Kelly
Callahan	Ford	Kim
Calvert	Fowler	King
Camp	Fox	Kingston
Canady	Frank (MA)	Klug
Castle	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Chabot	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Chapman	Frisa	Largent
Chenoweth	Funderburk	Latham
Christensen	Furse	LaTourette
Chrysler	Galleghy	Lazio
Clement	Ganske	Leach
Clinger	Gekas	Levin
Coble	Geren	Lewis (CA)
Coburn	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Collins (GA)	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Combest	Gilman	Lincoln
Cooley	Goodlatte	Linder
Costello	Goodling	Lipinski

Livingston	Payne (VA)	Smith (MI)
LoBiondo	Peterson (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Smith (TX)
Longley	Petri	Smith (WA)
Lucas	Pickett	Solomon
Luther	Pombo	Souder
Maloney	Pomeroy	Spence
Manzullo	Porter	Stearns
Markey	Portman	Stenholm
Martini	Poshard	Stockman
Mascara	Pryce	Stump
McCarthy	Quinn	Stupak
McCollum	Radanovich	Talent
McCrery	Ramstad	Tanner
McHugh	Reed	Tauzin
McInnis	Regula	Taylor (MS)
McIntosh	Richardson	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Riggs	Thomas
McNulty	Rivers	Thornberry
Meehan	Roberts	Tiahrt
Menendez	Roemer	Torkildsen
Metcalf	Rogers	Upton
Meyers	Rohrabacher	Volkmer
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Vucanovich
Miller (CA)	Roukema	Waldholtz
Miller (FL)	Royce	Walker
Minge	Salmon	Walsh
Molinari	Sanford	Wamp
Montgomery	Saxton	Ward
Moorhead	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Myrick	Schaefer	Weldon (FL)
Neal	Schiff	Weldon (PA)
Nethercutt	Schroeder	Weller
Neumann	Seastrand	White
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Norwood	Shadegg	Wicker
Nussle	Shaw	Williams
Orton	Shays	Wyden
Oxley	Shuster	Young (FL)
Packard	Sisisky	Zeliff
Pastor	Skeen	Zimmer
Paxon	Skelton	

NOES—129

Abercrombie	Hall (OH)	Owens
Baessler	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bateman	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hilliard	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hinche	Quillen
Berman	Holden	Rahall
Bishop	Hoyer	Rangel
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds
Borski	Jefferson	Rose
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Roth
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Rush
Bryant (TX)	Kanjorski	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kennelly	Scott
Coleman	Kildee	Skaggs
Collins (IL)	Klecza	Slaughter
Collins (MI)	Klink	Spratt
Conyers	LaFalce	Stark
Coyne	Lantos	Stokes
Davis	Lewis (GA)	Studds
DeLauro	Lowe	Tejeda
Dellums	Manton	Thompson
Dicks	Martinez	Thornton
Dingell	Matsui	Thurman
Dixon	McDermott	Torricelli
Engel	McHale	Towns
Evans	McKinney	Traficant
Farr	Meek	Tucker
Fattah	Mfume	Velazquez
Fazio	Mineta	Vento
Fields (LA)	Mink	Visclosky
Filner	Mollohan	Waters
Flake	Moran	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Morella	Waxman
Frost	Murtha	Wilson
Gejdenson	Myers	Wise
Gephardt	Nadler	Wolf
Gibbons	Oberstar	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Obey	Wynn
Green	Olver	Yates
Gutierrez	Ortiz	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman	Laughlin	Schumer
Clayton	McDade	Serrano
Condit	Moakley	Tate
Dornan	Parker	Torres

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Moakley against.