Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—27

Bishop
Brown (FL)
Deal
Fattah
Foley
Geren
Green
Harman
Lincoln
Maloney
McDade
McKinney
Mfume
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Oberstar
Ortiz
Reynolds
Riggs
Sanford
Serrano
Sisisky
Smith (NJ)
Tucker
Waldholtz
Wilson

□ 1731

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MANTON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I, reluctantly voted for the previous question in spite of my desire to support the Senate gift ban. I personally have implemented the Senate gift ban in my office. While the golf and tennis trips worth thousands of dollars to Members usually benefit charity as well as the Members, there is no question in my mind that these primarily recreational trips should be eliminated as a Member's perk. The American people are demanding that we reform this system of expensive dinners, gifts, and trips. The question is not whether or not people believe the other party. They don't trust them either. Citizens are fed up with both parties because they believe we work too closely with those who give us financial benefits—personal and political. Our large freshman Republican class was elected largely on Government reform. We are not likely to remain if we don't progress on real reform—of Congress itself, or PACS, of gifts, of term limits. I will continue to sponsor legislation on these issues, as well as voluntarily implement them in my office. While ultimately this is a question of integrity and character, I sincerely hope that our leadership will begin voting on these issues soon because previous Congresses have spent the public's full measure of trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LIMITING DEBATE ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1854 be limited to 10 minutes each, equally divided between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the conference report to H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 206, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 1995, at page H7964.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] each will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasure to present the conference report on the 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. This is the first 1996 appropriations bill to come out of conference, but there are a number close behind us.

The conference report presents a bill that will greatly reduce the size of our own branch of Government.

To summarize, the conference agreement provides budget authority of $2.18 billion. This is $433 million below the President's budget request, a 16.5 percent reduction. It is $205.7 million below fiscal year 1995; that's an 8.6 percent reduction in funding below the current year. This agreement reduces legislative branch jobs [FTE's] by 2,614 under fiscal year 1995, Senate staffing excluded; that's a 9.5 percent reduction in jobs. Finally, the conference agreement is $114.7 million below our 602(b) budget resolution target.

The House and Senate concluded a successful conference.

There were 55 amendments to the House bill, all were resolved by the conferees.

I will include a table showing details and a list of the highlights of the conference agreement.

We have compared the conference agreement to the House bill.

The bill we sent to the Senate did not have funds for Senate operations.

Excluding the Senate items, the conference agreement is $9,518,000 below the House-passed bill. The reductions to the House bill consist of: $18,458,000 further reduction to GAO; $4,511,000 further reduction in congressional printing; $903,000 reduced from the Joint Committee on Taxation; $1,060,000 further reduction in the power plant; $14,999,000 reduced from Congressional Research Service in order to restore Library of Congress funding; $7,000,000 from the Botanic Garden Conservatory renovation which eliminates the funds to begin that project.

There were several additions to the House bill, including: $2,500,000 for a joint Office of Compliance; $3,615,000 for an orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment; $50,000 for Capitol buildings maintenance; $17,753,000 was restored to the funding of the Library of Congress; and $13,995,000 was added back for the depository library program under the Superintendent of Documents.

There were several provisions included, primarily to facilitate the operations of the House and Senate. The conference report (House Report 104–212) has been available for several weeks and explains these provisions.

One of these provisions is contained in amendment No. 10 which provides $6,115,000 for the orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment and includes provisions for severance pay and disposal of property.

Amendment No. 55 includes some House housekeeping provisions added by the managers and a provision that establishes an awards and settlement fund required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

In addition to the overall reductions I have already enumerated, a few of the highlights include:

House of Representatives—has been cut $57.2 million—$57,174,000—below 1995. Included in this reduction, committee staff have been cut 33 percent; committee budgets have been reduced by $39.8 million—$39,762,000—House administrative offices have been cut by $11.9 million below 1995—$11,934,000—