think that would be a good investment of our dollars.

With regard to this amendment, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for his leadership on it and urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on the Frank amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 271, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 655]

AYES—154

Ackerman
Bachus
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunn
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Doggett
Duncan
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Riggs
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—271

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—9

Cardin
Coburn
Moakley
Mollohan
Reynolds
Schiff
Sisisky
Tucker
White

□ 1309

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. STOKES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 216, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1655, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 1655 the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes that will be necessary to correct such things as spelling, punctuation, cross-referencing, and section numbering.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 1655, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCKBOX ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 218 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 218

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1162) to establish a Deficit Reduction Trust Fund and provide for the downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits in appropriation bills. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1162, the Deficit Reduction Lockbox Act of 1995, an important budget tool to hold us accountable for making sure that spending cuts translate into savings for the American people. I am delighted that we are following through on the promise of considering the lockbox as a freestanding bill. As Members know, this House approved the lockbox as an amendment to the Labor–HHS spending bill in early August. If it were up to the clear majority of this House, lockbox would be the law of the land. But of course we know that ours is a bicameral legislature, and we must secure enactment of our good ideas by convincing our friends in the other body to concur. In sending them lockbox legislation as part of a spending bill and a freestanding bill, we are sending a clear signal that we are committed to lockbox and we want them to act.

Although there was much agreement on the Rules Committee proposal, we do expect several issues to be raised during the debate. The open amendment process will provide Members the chance to air any remaining concerns they have in a full and fair way. Once again the rule provides the option for priority recognition to those Members who have had their amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides an hour of general debate and makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules. The rule also provides that the amendment considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

On the advice of the Parliamentarian, this rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI against consideration of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The reason for this germaneness waiver is somewhat technical. The original bill as introduced by Mr. CRAPO in March proposed a lockbox mechanism called a trust fund to be maintained in the Treasury, while the Rules Committee has recommended a lockbox mechanism called an account to be maintained by the Congressional Budget Office.

The end result of this is the same: we want to ensure that a cut is really a cut; that when we say we are saving money by spending less in appropriations bills we follow through on that commitment. The change in terminology apparently raises some germaneness questions but the outcome is the same. Finally, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I would like to commend Mr. CRAPO, the entire bipartisan lockbox team, our Rules Committee Chairman, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Appropriations Committee for the enormous cooperative effort that went into the lockbox.

The lockbox team spirit could be a model for how this place can and should operate to do the Nation's business. This is a good rule, a good bill, and I'm proud to have played a part in getting us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD material from the Committee on Rules:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of September 12, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open[2]	46	44	45	74
Modified Closed[3]	49	47	14	23
Closed[4]	9	9	2	3
Totals:	104	100	61	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of September 12, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of September 12, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242–190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95)
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95)
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95)
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95)
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95)
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95)
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95)
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. But my support for this rule does not mean I wholeheartedly support the version of lockbox reported from the Committee on Rules.

While I will vote for passage of H.R. 1162, I believe there are significant improvements that should be made to this proposal but which, I fear, have little chance of passage on the floor. Those improvements would give this legislation real teeth and if enacted would take a significant bite out of discretionary spending for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Speaker, as of today, only one appropriations bill remains to be considered by the House. Short of the adoption of an amendment which will be offered by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the appropriation for the District of Columbia would be the only one of the 13 appropriations bills to be subjected to the lockbox process contained in this bill. Yet, the House clearly expressed its support for locking away savings from appropriations bills early this year when a lockbox amendment was added to the emergency supplemental by a vote of 421 to 1. That enactment provided that the net reduction of funds from the supplemental was to be used exclusively for deficit reduction.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in the months since the House considered the first supplemental, the lockbox has become more of a storage box. The version of the legislation originally introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentlelady from California [Ms. HARMAN], as well as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], no longer mandates net reductions from appropriations bills be dedicated exclusively to deficit reduction. Rather, this version has become more of an accounting tool.

Now, I would like to commend my colleague from Florida, Mr. GOSS, the chairman of the Legislative and Budget Process Subcommittee, for his work on this legislation. While Mr. BREWSTER and Ms. HARMAN appeared repeatedly before the Rules Committee in an attempt to offer their version of lockbox, the Rules Committee did make and follow through on a commitment to send some lockbox legislation to the floor. The committee recommendation may very well be the best version of the proposal we are going to get, but, as I said at the outset, this legislation can and should be improved to ensure that it will do what the original cosponsors of lockbox had intended to do.

First, it is my intention to offer an amendment which will make this bill retroactive so that the net reductions from each of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1996 will be subjected to the lockbox process. However, because I intend to take advantage of the family friendly atmosphere in the House and take my middle daughter to college, I may not be present to personally offer this amendment. It is my hope that the amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], and that the House will support this important improvement to this bill.

Second, the gentlelady from California [Ms. HARMAN] intends to offer an amendment which will capture savings in future years. As we all know, there are many Federal programs and projects with spendout rates which increase dramatically after the first or second year. Unfortunately, as the bill was reported from the Rules Committee, these savings can only be captured for the fiscal year in question and consequently savings in the outyears mighty well be reallocated to other programs. During the markup of this bill, the committee Democrats offered a version of Ms. HARMAN's amendment, but as matters turned out, the amendment was defeated by the Republican majority. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Ms. HARMAN's proposal makes a great deal of sense: Let's not allow savings to slip through the lock box only to be spent elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the fact that this rule provides a germaneness waiver for the committee substitute. It seems to me that the only reason this waiver is necessary is because the final product is so very different from what was originally introduced that it does not bear enough resemblance to be considered germane. While I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor, I think Members should understand what this waiver really means. I believe the fact that the committee substitute is a departure from the original intent only reinforces the need to adopt my amendment and that of Ms. HARMAN. Without those two additions to this bill, I am afraid we are merely playing a shell game with ourselves and with the American people.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start off by saying who gives a hoot who gets credit for what, as long as we pass this lockbox and we start getting credit for really reducing the deficit around here?

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and Rules Committee colleague from Florida for yielding me the time, and commend him as chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process for his outstanding efforts in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, today should be a proud moment in this House, not merely because today we will reform the budget process or even that we will create a mechanism to assist our efforts at deficit reduction. But because today we are debating a comprehensive piece of legislation that truly represents bipartisan compromise, ingenuity, and resourcefulness.

Indeed right from the beginning this issue has been one of a bipartisan thrust, begun through the efforts of our friends such as MIKE CRAPO of Idaho, Ms. HARMAN of California, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Mr. BREWSTER of Oklahoma, to mention just a few.

Despite their unsuccessful efforts during the last Congress, these Members along with many others from both sides of the aisle continued their full court press since the beginning of this Congress.

And Mr. Speaker, these efforts have paid off. Today we are considering the deficit reduction lockbox bill under an open process providing every Member of this body with an interest or even a concern with this legislation the opportunity to participate.

H.R. 1162 is responsible budget process reform that will continue to gear the entire system toward spending restraint rather than spending more.

While the lockbox is like the line-item veto and the balanced budget amendment in that it is only process reform, it will help to raise the accountability standard in this body, by forcing the tough choices, like those we made in the budget resolution earlier this year and those we will again make in the reconciliation process over the next few months.

This has been an open process from the very beginning and this open rule only continues the outstanding democratic process utilized during the development and consideration of this issue.

With that I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman very much for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in strong support of the rule and obviously want to commend the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], all of whom have been doing very hard work in bringing this important bill to the floor.

The concept of the lockbox is very simple. It makes basic common sense. In essence it provides that amendments to cut spending actually produce savings. I think I was as dismayed as many people to realize that when we often go through agony to get savings, those savings are not real; they in fact are then used for other purposes. Most taxpayers would agree and believe that when Congress agrees to eliminate $5 billion for the space station or $7 billion for the super collider, that the money remains in the Treasury.

□ 1330

Most would agree and believe that. But in fact under existing law or current law those tax dollars go back into the pot and can be reallocated or spent later in the same year. So I think everyone would have to agree that is an odd process at any time, and the practice frankly is just absolutely insupportable in an era of $200 billion deficits and $5 trillion national debt.

This bill, H.R. 1162, will change Federal spending law to ensure that a dollar saved is in fact a dollar saved, that when Congress votes to cut funding for a Federal program, the money will not be spent. The bill creates 13 separate savings accounts to match the 13 annual appropriations bills and requires that the average savings of each House- and Senate-passed spending bill be placed in that special savings account. The money would be used solely for deficit reduction and could not be made available for any future spending for any purpose whatever.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is an important step on the long road toward restoring Federal fiscal sanity and responsible congressional spending. It really for the first time permits lawmakers to choose savings over spending and allows us for the very first time to honestly tell our constituents that a dollar saved is a dollar saved.

So as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, which has jurisdiction on this matter, I would indicate that my belief that this is a good bill and long overdue. I would urge the adoption of the rule and a vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], who has been much discussed as the author of this and deserves a great deal of credit.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to say I appreciate the support that has been brought by both sides of the aisle and by so many Members to get us to this point today.

This is a very important day for the House of Representatives, not just because we are going in a few minutes to debate a very critical reform to the budget process but because it is a day when this institution is working the way that was intended by our Founding Fathers. It is working in a way that shows the kind of integrity and the kind of good work that can be done when the Members of Congress work together.

At a time in our history when so often there are negative stories in the media about how the Congress works, today we have a good strong example of how the system should work. Why do I say that? First of all, Mr. Speaker, we are here under an open rule. For so long we have been deprived in this Congress of having the opportunity to have open and free debate, where critical ideas are brought forward and debated and those who object to them can have the opportunity under an open rule to bring their objections and have those objections debated and voted on in an open recorded vote.

Second, it is an important day for this institution because this bill was brought forward to reform the system in a bipartisan fashion. I do not think we are going to see a lot of partisan bickering here today because it is a good idea that needs to be put into law. Although there may be some discussions about just what the fine tuning should be, we are going to see strong support for this legislation.

For about 2 years now we have been working to make sure that this legislation moves forward and that this critical reform that is necessary is put into place. I can still remember, it has been a little bit more than 2 years ago now that I was sitting right here on this floor, and I heard two Members debating about a major proposal to cut one of our budgets. One of the Members said to the other: You know, even if we cut this budget, this spending will not be reduced and the deficit will not be reduced.

The other Member acknowledged that. That perked up my interest. I then started looking into it. Indeed, the budget system we have is one in which, even when Congress cuts a specific program or project, all that happens is that specific program or project is eliminated or reduced, and the spending simply becomes unallocated until the conference committee meets to reallocate it, often to projects that never saw the light of day in a hearing.

Today we will create a lockbox account in the House and send forward to the Senate an opportunity for us to pass into law a critical reform of our budget process that will help us to ensure that, when we make cuts, the cuts count.

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a hard process. It has taken us 2 years to get to this point in the House. We are going to have to fight it hard when it gets to the other body as well. But the American people deserve no less. We must past this rule, then pass this legislation and take one more important step in terms of reforming the budget process of this Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], who has also been one of the stalwarts of moving this legislation forward.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our government is running chronic $200 billion deficits at a time when we are $5 trillion in debt, with a devastating effect on our national savings rate, this reform for Government is critical.

This is essentially the same bill that was approved by the House on August 2, as an amendment to the Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations bill. It is similar to the House resolution I offered earlier this year. The lockbox provision in that Labor HHS bill was adopted by a vote of 373 to 52, better than 85 percent of this House.

Basically, the bill establishes a series of lockboxes in every appropriations measure considered by this House to ensure that savings made from amendments on this floor will go toward reducing the Federal deficit. As many of us have come to realize, unfortunately, this is not now the case, since savings realized from amendments to appropriations bills may be used for other funds or projects in that bill or other appropriations bills.

A good example of that was last year in this Congress when $100 million was eliminated by an amendment on this floor from the ASRM program, but we later found out that those funds wound up in other programs rather than going to deficit reduction.

I would just like to share that, as a cochairman of the porkbusters coalition in this Congress, I would hate to see something like that happen again. I would hate to see what happened last year happen again.

This bill will ensure that it does not. This bill will ensure that the average savings between the cuts that we make on the House floor and the cuts made over on the Senate floor will go in conference to a lockbox, to the Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction.

I will also share with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that this is an open rule worthy of everyone's support. I know that my constituents support this measure, as do the Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the Concord Coalition, and other taxpayer groups. It is an important and workable first step towards making this body more responsive and accountable to the people who elect them.

I urge an ''aye'' vote of every Member.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 218 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1162.

The Chair designates the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1339

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1162) to establish a Deficit Reduction Trust Fund and provide for the downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits in appropriations bills, with Mr. RIGGS, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring forward for the House's consideration H.R. 1162, the Deficit Reduction Lockbox Act of 1995. The concept behind the lockbox is deceptively simple: It says that when the House votes to cut spending we will not spend those savings elsewhere. It says that a cut is really a cut and savings are really savings that can and will be used to reduce the deficit. It says that we will no longer play the shell game of cutting money with big fanfare one day and quietly reprogramming it another. And it says that we are going to hold ourselves accountable for what we do.

I commend our colleague, MIKE CRAPO, and his bipartisan team of lockbox enforcers, who worked tirelessly to ensure that this day would come. Despite the simplicity of the concept, the practical application of lockbox proved more vexing than some might have thought. Working within the complexity of our current budget process was quite a challenge, but the lockbox team persevered through late night meetings and consultation with budget experts.

We wanted to make sure we had teeth in our proposal while retaining enough flexibility for the appropriators to do the very difficult job we ask of them. And I'm proud to say that we have achieved that balance. H.R. 1162 as reported by the Rules Committee closely tracks language that 373 Members of this House already enthusiastically supported in the form of an amendment to the Labor/HHS spending bill just last month.

Today's vote, which will hopefully be a reaffirmation of that commitment to lockbox, is designed to implement a two-track strategy in seeking to make lockbox the law of the land. We are, in effect, giving our friends in the other body two chances to do the right thing and adopt these lockbox provisions. H.R. 1162 as reported by our Rules Committee establishes lockbox balances to account for savings adopted through cutting amendments during floor consideration of spending bills. There will be a House lockbox balance and a Senate lockbox balance for each spending bill—and the appropriators will be bound to come up with savings splitting the difference between what the House and Senate have each proposed. The hammer to enforce this requirement—and ensure that money saved in one bill is not later spent in another—is a lowering of the overall spending total available to the appropriators. In this way we actually shrink the spending pie to reflect the lockbox.

No one argues that this procedural change alone will resolve our tremendous budgetary imbalance. In fact, just about everyone recognizes that discretionary spending, to which the lockbox pertains, is not the big bear in the woods when it comes to our spending problems. But we ought not ask Americans to consider changes in entitlement programs until we have demonstrated that we are serious about cutting low-priority, wasteful, or unnecessary programs. Lockbox really speaks to our credibility as we wage our battle for a balanced budget by the year 2002. Please support H.R. 1162.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the principle behind H.R. 1162, and, given

the fact that this is the only version of lockbox the House will be able to consider, I intend to support the bill. I do, however, encourage Members to support two amendments which will be offered to that bill. I believe those amendments will significantly improve the legislation recommended by the Rules Committee and are deserving of strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SOLOMON, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process for holding a markup on this bill. This year, as we went through the appropriations process, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentlelady from California [Ms. HARMAN] came to the Rules Committee seeking to offer lockbox amendments to each appropriation bill. While it was unfortunate that the Rules Committee majority did not see fit to allow the House to consider the request of these distinguished Members, our chairman did made a commitment to them that the committee would hold a markup on lockbox legislation. And, on July 20 the committee met and reported this bill.

Mr. Chairman, prior to the markup, the committee Democrats were gratified that the Republican majority accepted a number of suggestions we made that we felt improved the chairman's mark circulated among our Members. However, the committee majority did not accept three important amendments offered by the committee Democrats. The first amendment related to out year savings. Because it is the intention of the gentlelady from California [Ms. HARMAN] to offer such an amendment today, let it suffice to say that this amendment is not in the least just a technicality. In fact, reducing statutory caps for budget authority and outlays in the outyears has a great deal to do with our ability to curb and reduce discretionary spending. If we are really serious about reducing this part of Government spending, I would urge support for the Harman amendment.

Second, I will offer an amendment which would apply the provisions of the lockbox procedure to every appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, not just those passed after engrossment of H.R. 1162. I offered this amendment to the lockbox legislation attached to the Labor/HHS appropriation and my amendment was rejected. I also offered it to the chairman's mark, but again, the amendment was rejected. If we are going to claim savings, then those savings should apply to every appropriations bill, and not just to Labor/HHS, DOD, and DC.

Finally, we believe that the bill should have created a separate lockbox account into which savings resulting from spending cuts in individual appropriations bills would automatically be funneled. In that way, those funds could not be reallocated to other appropriations accounts and spent later. The committee bill, however, takes a fundamentally different approach, and while the committee did adopt an amendment which strengthens their original proposal by requiring OMB to reduce the discretionary caps for the fiscal year under consideration, we continue to believe that the creation of a separate lockbox account is an important part of proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support the Frost and Harman amendments in order that we can be sure that the tough choices we have had to and will continue to have to make will actually go to deficit reduction.

□ 1345

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, again, it is a privilege to be here debating this important measure here today. Before I get into the substance of my remarks, I want to give some thanks to some of the people who have really been there when it counts, particularly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] who is handling this measure for the Committee on Rules here today. They were there time and time again in the late night meetings and the negotiations that were necessary to help us move this legislation through the difficult political channels it had to be moved in order to get to the floor today.

It is not easy to change a system that has been put into place over years and years, and just take it and change it overnight. I appreciate their support, and that of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] who have been there in our bipartisan efforts for nearly 2 years now, working together to make this matter work. And that of so many of the other Members: the gentleman from California, ED ROYCE, who is sitting here beside me and ready to speak in a few moments, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ZIMMER; the freshman class who came in there this year and provided really the steam to move this reform forward, as we needed to have their strong support; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, and so many others. The list goes on.

The point I am trying to make is that this has been not only a strong effort by so many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who recognized that we need to reform our budget process, but that we have been able to put that effort together in the face of very strong political pressures.

I want to go back and give just a little history. As I said, it has been just about 2 years since this process started, a little over 2 years since I first became aware of the way the budget system worked, and did not allow our cuts to really count. At that time I introduced a bill that I called the ''make our cuts count'' legislation.

Shortly after that, I found that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and some others they were working with were also involved in trying to address the same issues. As we met together to put our efforts together and come together in a bipartisan effort, we changed the name of this to the lockbox concept, something that has stuck and has helped people across America to understand that we are really trying to balance the budget.

Not only did we develop a bipartisan commission here in Congress, we went out and found grassroots support across the country. I am proud to say today that this legislation is supported by the Concord Coalition, by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Citizens Against Government Waste, who I believe are going to make it a key vote, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, who I also believe are going to register this as a key vote, the National Taxpayers Union, the United We Stand organizations in different parts of the country, and others across this country who have recognized the need for this legislation, and have joined in our effort to develop the coalitions necessary at the grassroots level in this country to push this legislation forward.

I can remember when I was first interviewed on this legislation, and the interviewer said, ''What kind of a chance do you really think you have, trying to get something like this through this Congress?'' I said, ''To be honest with you, not much of a chance, but we are going to keep fighting and we are going to make this thing happen, no matter how long it takes.'' Little did I know that just 1 year later, about 1½ years later, we would be here on the floor, making sure that the legislation passed.

Some may ask, why are we doing it again after we already did it on August 2? On August 2 we passed legislation attaching this to an appropriations bill. It has now become evident that that appropriations bill may be vetoed, so we are going on a separate track to have a dual approach to making sure this legislation passes by putting forth this independent legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is a critical reform to our budget process. We must do it so Americans can count on this Congress, so the integrity of this institution is upheld, and when we say we are cutting the budget, those cuts go to deficit reduction. The American people can ask for no less. I am confident that today, this House will deliver them that kind of reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

FROST], my colleague and friend, for yielding so much time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard work that many of our colleagues have done to bring this legislation to the point where it is today, and I would particularly like to commend our chairman, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. GOSS for their efforts in producing a measure that satisfies most of the concerns of both the lockbox proponents, and the members of the Appropriations Committee who, under this bill, will have to operate under a more difficult system for achieving final agreement on appropriations bills.

However, I do not think that this deserves our support. I know from the previous vote we had on this measure last month, when it was offered as an amendment to an appropriations bill, that I am among a small minority of Members here who feel that way. But I am speaking out on this matter because I think it is important for us to consider the drawbacks of this measure.

On the face of it, the lockbox proposal is an appealing idea—as its proponents describe it, it is a way to ensure that the savings produced by spending-cut amendments to appropriations bills are used to reduce the deficit, not to increase spending for other purposes.

However, the only way to show that such savings are being used to reduce the deficit, is to reduce the amount available to the Appropriations Committee by the amount saved by the spending-cut amendments. Thus, at its core, what the lockbox proposal is all about is reducing discretionary spending beyond the limit set in the budget resolution. In other words, it is a procedure designed to force total discretionary spending below the level that Congress has already decided, through its budget resolution and through statutory caps, is the appropriate level for the coming fiscal year.

The question we should be considering is: do we want a procedure that will lead to deeper cuts in discretionary spending than we are already on the path toward achieving?

This year's budget resolution sets spending limits for the next 7 years at levels that will force Congress to cut domestic discretionary spending by $473 billion over that period, or by one third, in real terms, over this year's level.

For those of us who value the Federal Government's contribution to education and job training, transportation, housing, science and health research, environmental protection, national parks, crime control, and many of the other functions that comprise the discretionary spending category; for those of us who are alarmed at the severity of the cuts we are witnessing in so many essential programs, such as the one-third cut in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, it makes little sense to endorse a procedure that will likely lead to further cuts—or fewer opportunities to restore funds—to these programs.

Even Members who do wish to cut discretionary spending further, however, cannot dispute the fact that we already have an extremely effective process in place for controlling this type of spending. Under our existing procedures, Congress approves a total amount of spending for discretionary spending, and then enforces that amount by subjecting individual spending measures to Budget Act points of order—which has been in effect since 1974—and to the threat of across-the-board cuts, or sequestration—which has been in effect since 1990.

These controls have enabled Congress to restrain the growth of discretionary spending to such an extent that its share of gross domestic product [GDP] has declined from 10.5 percent in 1980 to 8.2 percent in 1994. If Congress complies with the current discretionary spending caps, as we have every reason to believe it will, such spending will decline to just 6.8 percent in 1998. Domestic discretionary spending will have declined from 5.1 percent of GDP in 1980, to 3.7 percent in 1994, to 3.1 percent in 1998.

Fortunately, it is unlikely that this new procedure will bring about significantly larger reductions in discretionary spending than those we will already be required to achieve. Most cutting amendments offered on the House floor traditionally have involved relatively small amounts. And, because House savings from spending-cut amendments will be averaged with Senate savings, the final amount by which discretionary spending will be lowered is likely to be relatively minor. Moreover, I suspect that as discretionary spending levels are reduced further, increasing numbers of floor amendments to appropriations bills will involve transfers of funds, rather than simple cuts.

For what may well be insignificant reduction in the deficit, one result of this new procedure is likely to be protracted conflict between the Senate and the House, and between Congress and the President, toward the end of each year's appropriations season when new, reduced allocations of spending are parceled out to the appropriations subcommittees to accommodate whatever lockbox savings are finally achieved.

Mr. Chairman, if our goal is to establish procedures that will help us reduce the deficit, this measure aims at the wrong target. Like procedures Congress has considered in recent years—such as expedited rescission, line-item veto, separation of emergency and nonemergency appropriations—to apply further controls to discretionary spending, the lockbox proposal addresses the one part of the budget that is already under the strictest control. If our budget process is inadequate in any way, it is that it provides comparatively little control for the mandatory spending—entitlement programs—that is driving the growth of the Federal budget.

In contrast to the decline in discretionary spending that has been occurring, and will continue to occur, mandatory spending has grown from 9.3 percent of GDP in 1980 to 10.7 percent in 1994, and will equal 12.6 percent of GDP in 1998.

If the plan to balance the budget by 2002 is to succeed, Congress must change its focus with respect to budget process matters. Rather than devoting our time and effort to devising ways to apply more controls to the part of the budget that is already under the strictest control, we must devote that same kind of effort to addressing other parts of the budget that are under less effective control. That includes not only entitlement programs, but also tax expenditures which, like entitlement programs, are not reauthorized on an annual basis.

Popular as the lockbox proposal is, I urge Members to consider carefully whether we really want a new procedure that increases the complexity of the budget process and the difficulty of reaching final agreement on appropriations bills, and that focuses our deficit-reduction efforts on an area of the budget that is already contributing more than its fair share to the cause.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, when I came here 17 years ago, 2 years before my hero, Ronald Reagan, it was for the purposes of putting an end to the deterioration of our U.S. military, making it as difficult as possible for this Congress to spend money, to raise taxes and place regulatory burdens on the American people. So needless to say, I stand here today very much excited about what has been happening for the last 8 months, and particularly what is happening on this bill.

I also just want to thank the leadership for their continual efforts to bring a bill to this floor that represents what I say is workable legislation, with a compromise language but a steadfastness in principle. Indeed, this document before us today is the product of consultation with, listen to this, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Congressional Budget Office, the Congressional Research Service, and even the Office of Management and Budget. That is all the people that have been involved in trying to bring this workable piece of legislation to the floor.

While this bill may not have reached the floor as soon as some of us might have desired, it is here today in a form that guarantees that when Members come to this floor to cut discretionary spending programs and reduce the deficit, spending will go down. That is what this is all about.

This bill is in a form that ensures that the Committee on Appropriations maintains flexibility to reach a consensus in conference, and that is very important, because that is what this legislative process is all about, all the while, spending less of the taxpayers' money. This bill is in a form that encourages spending, encourages spending cut amendments, because Members will know that when a spending cut is adopted, spending will be less at the end of the day. That is what this legislation is all about.

□ 1400

Finally, this bill is in a form that, while procedurally arcane, it truly works. Let us look at the process, because we need to establish legislative intent here today.

First, the deficit reduction lockbox account would be established in the Congressional Budget Office to monitor savings made in appropriations bills by House and Senate amendments adopted on the respective floor of those bodies, and to lock in average savings of the two houses by lowering congressional and statutory spending caps.

This lockbox account would consist of 13 subaccounts, matching the 13 appropriations subcommittees, and each subaccount would consist of a House lockbox balance, a Senate lockbox balance, and a joint House-Senate lockbox balance.

Upon the passage of each appropriation bill by each of the houses, the Director of the CBO would enter a balance for the appropriate subaccount of that house based on savings resulting from amendments adopted by that house from the spending level of the reported bill. During the consideration of each appropriation bill, a running tally would be established reflecting the increases and decreases in budgetary authority from the reported bill's total resulting from the adoption of each amendment.

Once an appropriation bill is passed in the Senate, the average of the House and the Senate savings for that bill would be entered in the joint House-Senate balance and the overall allocation, that is, the 602(a) spending limit for the appropriations committees would be reduced by that amount.

That means it cannot ever be spent again. Whenever an overall spending limit is adjusted downward, the chairmen of the appropriations committees would submit to their houses the revised suballocation for that subcommittee to reflect the reductions in the overall limits.

Furthermore, to ensure actual spending reduction, the bill states that upon the enactment of all appropriations bills for a particular fiscal year, the Director of OMB make reductions in the statutory spending ceilings to reflect the total cumulative savings in the joint House-Senate lockbox balance.

This process will apply the provisions of the bill retroactively to fiscal year 1996 for any appropriation bill passed by the House after the date of House passage of the deficit reduction lockbox bill.

Mr. Chairman, while this process may seem complicated, it is only as complicated as is necessary to ensure efficiency, reality and spending cuts in the budgetary process. I believe this new element of our process is necessary, and I believe that this bill provides the balanced yet reasonable process reform to assist our efforts toward a balanced budget.

That is complicated, but, ladies and gentlemen, it is going to work. It means when Members come on this floor and vote to cut a program, that program is going to stay cut and the money is going toward the deficit, not going to be spent on some other program. That is what this is all about. That is why Members need to come over here and vote for this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very popular measure, this lockbox proposal. It enjoys wide bipartisan sponsorship and even broader support here in the House, and perhaps that is equally true in the other house as well. But I think it is important that at least a few iconoclastic voices be raised in opposition to this measure so that we might more adequately and more deeply reflect on what we are doing and the consequences of those actions.

We have a basic responsibility here in the House of Representatives, even more so than the other house, to manage the economy, to make sure that we have a system of economic growth and prosperity, that we are creating jobs and creating economic opportunity for all Americans.

I know that the Members of this House take that responsibility very seriously. Unfortunately, however, we are focusing our attention only on one aspect of our economy, and we have been doing that for far too long now. That is this deficit, the budget deficit.

Focusing our attention on the budget deficit regrettably takes our attention away from two other deficits that are at least equally important and perhaps even more so: One is the trade deficit. I will not talk much about that.

The other is the investment deficit. We have a substantial deficit in the investment in the future of this country. It has been estimated that that deficit ranges as high as $1 trillion a year.

In other words, we may need as much as $1 trillion of public investment in order to create the kind of adequate growth in the economy that is necessary to create the kind of jobs and economic opportunity that is essential for a strong, sound, healthy economy. Other countries in the industrialized world are doing much more than we are.

We unfortunately are focusing our attention on the budget deficit to the detriment of our other responsibilities in this House. In so doing, this House has already tied its hands substantially with regard to its ability to manage fiscal policy, so much so that the entire, or most at least of the management of this economy has been handed over to the Federal Reserve, which has the ability to regulate monetary policy, and it is through monetary policy that our economy is seeing the ups and downs it has experienced in recent years as a result primarily of changes in interest rates.

We have taken from ourselves the ability to manage fiscal policy, which means the ability to regulate the amount of growth that we need through spending and saving policies which are primarily the responsibility of this house. Now we are taking one further additional step down into that deep cellar by the passage, and I am sure it will pass, of this lockbox proposal, because once again it restricts our ability to manage fiscal policy in a responsible way by taking away from the House that which it needs, which is flexibility with regard to our spending and saving practices.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that although this seems like a good idea and although many people support it, I think that we ought to reflect more adequately on what we are doing and begin to understand the consequences of our actions in restricting our ability to manage the fiscal house, that responsibility which we have been charged to manage, our fiscal obligations and fiscal policy for this country.

In passing this measure we are restricting our ability to do that. We will be restricting our ability to stimulate growth and to create jobs and economic opportunity. By so doing, we are making, I believe, a serious mistake. Nevertheless, it is something that we will probably do, and we will have to correct it at some point in the future.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Deficit Reduction Lock-box Act which is an idea whose time has arrived. The bipartisan support for this legislation is very well known. We are going to be able to hold the line on waste and return savings to reduce the deficit. This is a bipartisan milestone legislative item that I think all of those who have been involved over the number of years before this Congress deserve a great deal of credit for bringing about and I think that the leadership of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] today on this particularly should be highlighted. I thank him for his efforts.

The legislation before us, Mr. Chairman, will create a series of lockboxes to capture savings from the floor amendments and give appropriators maximum flexibility in allocating such savings. The process is one jointly with three lockboxes from both the House

and the Senate and a joint House-Senate account that will lock in the savings.

After a bill is passed, the Congressional Budget Office will enter the final amount saved into the House lockbox. The Senate will follow a similar procedure and then average the two figures.

At this point the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, will reduce the overall allocations for the House and Senate appropriations committees by the amount in the shared lockbox.

As Members can see, the American people, Mr. Chairman, have been saying for a long time, ''We want the lockbox. We want to make sure that the savings you actually have in committee and on the floor result in real savings.

I think we will be hearing later from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] about his particular example which is so poignant. But for our taxpayers' protection the lockbox is essential to ensure that spending cuts that are made on the floor actually go toward reducing the deficit instead of funding tax cuts or other expenditures.

This session of the legislature, Mr. Chairman, has seen the line-item veto, the balanced budget amendment, the prohibition of unfunded mandates, and regulatory reform. The final item in protecting taxpayers will be the adoption of this lockbox legislation. It is consistent with the other reforms. I must say it also has been considered after careful deliberation of all those parties involved. I congratulate the sponsors and look forward to its passage.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is very important and long overdue legislation. I want to commend all of those who worked so hard on it on both the majority and minority side.

I would like to thank my cosponsors and sponsors on this side, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER]. I would like to thank all the folks on the other side who worked so hard on this, including the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] who when we were in the majority carried the lead on this proposal. And I would like to thank the majority leadership, because this bill is coming to the floor and frankly it should have come to the floor when we were in charge and it did not.

Let me say, this is a very simple concept. That is, that when you go to the floor and make a cut, and that cut succeeds, that that money goes to where it should go, which is to deficit reduction, rather than having the Committee on Appropriations go spend it on something else that no one has ever voted on.

Time and time again this body over the last decade has voted for cuts and then the money is spent on something else. That has not been the will of the House. That has not been what should have happened. Now for the first time when Members get up and if they had voted on, say, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and there was a 3-percent cut or voted on anything else and there was a cut, automatically the overall numbers would decrease and the money would go to deficit reduction. This is the kind of rational change that will actually bring our deficit down and yet at the same time not require us to make such draconian and across-the-board cuts that so many good programs pay because so many other programs which mainly are pork programs and would never succeed standing on their own or in the light of day, are sort of the jackals of the hard work of Members who go up and ask for cuts and they feed on these cuts and are used for these other kinds of programs.

This is very, very simple. It says the lockbox, and I would like to thank the people on my staff who came up with this idea originally 3, 4 years ago and actually named it the lockbox, says very simply, where you put the money, you make a cut, it goes into a lockbox and its stays there.

I would like to say that when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and I talked at a Democratic issues conference 3 years ago about doing this, we did not know that we could actually get it done.

Today is a very good day. I hope that both of us on both sides of the aisle will make sure that the Senate goes along and that this lockbox becomes law, because it will reduce pork, it will reduce deficits, and it will make sure that the will of this body is actually achieved.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hopes of the gentleman from New York are indeed realized because they are the same hopes we have.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], the commander in chief of the Republican theme team.

Mr. HOKE. I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to speak on this today in favor of it. I think that the reason that this came about is the same reason that it was first brought to our attention, and when I say ''our,'' I mean my colleague and classmate the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] and my attention and everybody else, the other Members of the 103d freshman class.

□ 1415

In about the summer of 1993, after we had all been elected and we had come here idealistically, blithely thinking that we were going to make cuts in the budget and we were going to do the fiscally responsible thing and do what is right by the American people, the taxpayers that had voted us here, and we found out about halfway through that first year that a cut is not a cut at all, and we tried to do something about it.

Lo and behold, one of the things we found out is that we were also in the minority. Then along came the 104th Congress, and 72-some new freshmen Republicans were ushered in by the American people, and they found out the same thing in the summer of 1994. They found out, to great frustration, and not a little bit of anger, that, in fact, just because we vote for a cut in an appropriations bill on the floor, it does not necessarily mean anything.

So, Mr. Chairman, with some bipartisan support as well, on both sides, we have had a critical mass of frustration and anger that said, ''Look, this flies in the face of common sense. If we are going to do what we were elected to do, if we are going to bring the fiscally responsible actions to the floor, then why does it not actually hold? Why does it not obtain?''

It is amazing, because it completely flies in the face of common sense what we do with these appropriations bill. Thank goodness for the Republican freshmen of the 104th Congress, because now we are going to pass this bill and it means that if we actually have a spending cut on the floor, that it will mean something.

Mr. Chairman, that has very important impact, because one of the things it does is it takes some of the power away from the Committee on Appropriations and it puts more power in the Congress, generally, which means that the will of the Congress can actually be worked out on the floor. That is very important.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of one other thing that is happening now, a similar thing, and it will seem equally confusing to the public that watches this. That is that Members all have office accounts. We were under the impression, as many Members were, I am sure, in the 104th Congress freshman class, that when we cut our office account and did not spend all the money, where does that balance of the money go? Members would think it goes back to the Federal Treasury. Wrong. It goes back to a fund that is an overall programmatic fund and it gets reprogrammed some place else.

That is completely unlike everything in America. Thank goodness we are in the right direction here. We are going to do the same thing with the office accounts and we are going to bring a little more common sense and fiscal sanity and responsibility to the way that we run things here in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to stand here in enthusiastic support for the lockbox bill. A bit later, I will be offering an amendment to make it even better. But meanwhile, as the self-styled mother of lockbox, who has now moved into being the grandmother of lockbox, I would like to share with our colleagues some of the history here.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] was correct when he said that a number of us introduced this bill almost 3 years ago on the Democratic side. Similarly, a Republican, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], offered it as a Republican bill. We joined together, and, over time, our bipartisan efforts became the genesis of the bill we are voting on today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to everyone that prior to signing the budget bill in August 1993, President Clinton signed an Executive Order which enacted a lockbox into which all of the savings generated and the revenues raised under the 1993 budget bill would go.

That lockbox concept has yielded hundreds of millions of dollars for deficit reduction, so we know that the concept worked. This bill, as my colleagues have heard, has passed in several forms in this Congress. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] first offered it as an amendment to the emergency supplemental bill earlier this spring and it passed overwhelmingly, 418 to 5.

We offered it last month as an amendment to the Labor–HHS appropriations bill and it again passed overwhelmingly. Mr. Chairman, here we are again with an independent, stand alone bill, which I think reflects enormous bipartisan support, the very hard work of Republican freshmen and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], and the Committee on Rules. It is also the product of some very hard work by many on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I offer my enthusiastic support and I hope that a few minutes from now we will make this bill even better with the adoption of the amendment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and I will offer.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], my colleague who is the chairman of the Republican effort in this matter and has done a magnificent job.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, we came to Congress, and the freshman class has been mentioned many times on the floor. Much to my chagrin, one of the programs that I cut out of the budget, a wasteful program, $25 million, I excitedly ran out of the room and I said, ''I have had a victory. I saved the taxpayers $25 million,'' only to find out the next day that an amendment was offered to take the entire savings and move it to another governmental program.

Lo and behold, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] came up to me and said,

Mark, I have just the fix for this dilemma that we are facing in the U.S. Congress. It is a savings account. It is like a Christmas Club account that the families save toward to provide for funds for much-needed projects.

Mr. Chairman, the lockbox account is a historic effort to make Government accountable for its spending and to put money aside and bring down the deficit. Some suggested today that we are unnecessarily focusing on the deficit of this Nation. It is our No. 1 problem.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending more than we have. We are charging money to a charge account that the banks have canceled. We are in debt up to our ears and that debt is costing us 15 percent of our national budget just to pay interest alone on the debt.

Let me put it in plain, simple terms. The lockbox will reduce the deficit. It will reduce the cost of interest to the consumer. One example: A 1-percent reduction in the interest rate on a $75,000 loan on a single family home, a 1-percent reduction will provide $750 a year in saving, $65 a month.

The Deficit Reduction Lock-box Act will allow us, over time, to reduce the Federal Government's appetite for debt and bring about fiscal sanity in this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude and thank the Democratic side of the aisle for their help on this issue, and particularly the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and the Committee on Rules, for their leadership in bringing this to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, this is a historic day and I urge every colleague to support this viable initiative.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the lockbox bill is a security key for our children. It is a security key for our grandchildren. With the passage of the lockbox bill, and its signing into law I hope sometime this year, we are going to be saying to our children and grandchildren this Congress is going to be more fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I think the consequence of this bill is that it will result in the reduction of the deficit. If we do not deal with that serious problem, we will put a load on our children and grandchildren out from under which they cannot climb.

This bill will have the advantage of cutting pork-barrel spending. What has happened on so many occasions is that Democrats and Republicans come to the floor of this House in the light of day and cast a tough vote to cut spending programs, and then late at night, behind some closed door in a Committee on Appropriations hearing somewhere with very few people watching, the appropriators in the House or the Senate might add the same amount of spending back into the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, that is a poor way to do the public's business. This lockbox bill will not only result in more fiscally sound decisions; it will result in those decisions being made in the light of day.

I want to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and others on the majority side. This is a true example of this Congress working in bipartisan fashion to come up with a bill that makes common sense and a bill that is fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay special tribute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] who worked on this bill over the last several years, at a time when very few people were paying attention to it, when others wanted to put it on the shelf. She never gave up and the gentlewoman from California deserves credit from both sides of the aisle for her effort on this. I hope we can apply the concept of this legislation to spending in outyears as well.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I hope the American people will find out about this commonsense measure being passed today. The fact that we are not having a bipartisan fight on the floor will probably cause many people, our friends in the press, not to pay attention to this bill. This is a very significant piece of legislation. I hope the American people will find out about it and I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the bipartisan effort.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman both for yielding and for being the manager of this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] who worked so very hard on this. They have done an extraordinary job.

Mr. Chairman, budgeting in the U.S. Government is the most complex procedure I have ever dealt with in my life. With a family budget, we sit down and look at our checkbook. With a corporate budget, generally there is a committee that does it. And in State, city, or country government, there is one committee that does the appropriations and sets the basic budget tone and then it is reviewed and signed or not signed.

Here in Washington, we deal with budget resolutions done by one committee, appropriations bills done by 13 subcommittees, appropriations bills, reconciliations, raising the debt ceiling of the United States of America, maybe a continuing resolution. It has taken me the 2½ years that I have been here just to begin to comprehend what it is we are doing with it.

Mr. Chairman, how is it for the public? All they know is that we have a $4.95 trillion debt, that we have a deficit every year, and they keep saying to me, and all of us, I am sure, ''Why can't you all balance the budget?''

I think we are honestly making an effort. We have, in the last 2½ years in this House, passed a balanced budget amendment; we have passed a line-item veto, so that the President can get involved in the process on a line-item basis; we have eliminated the baseline budgeting, so that we look at the budget from the year before and calculate our budgets from that; and now, we have the lockbox concept.

Mr. Chairman, it is complicated and sort of a complicated name, but it is so doggone simple in what it does. That is, when you cut something from an appropriations bill on this floor from now on, it is going to stay cut and will not be added some place else, either in that appropriation or some other appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is pretty straightforward when it comes right down to it. For that reason, I rise in strong support of this legislation as part of the overall package, which I believe we need to make our procedures simpler, to make them plainer, so that we as Members know exactly what we are doing and so the public can recognize what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can all support this legislation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], my friends and colleague, one of the well-known deficit hawks of this institution.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I fully endorse the concept of a lockbox and believe this is a good first step toward fulfilling our pledge to the American people. We made a promise that we will spare future generations from being asked to bear the brunt of paying for our follies.

When I heard the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] talk, and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] talk, I thought to myself, they would be interested to know that even Thomas Jefferson supported the lockbox. So I went back into his writings and I have a quote for my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, it says,

> I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of offices and salaries merely to make partisans, that is, just pass something to get votes, and for increasing by every device the public debt on the principle of it being a public blessing.

In effect, when he was talking about ridding the national debt by taking possible savings, he was actually talking about a lockbox. My colleagues probably did not know that, but I thought I would share that with them.

Mr. Chairman, obviously I am in favor of this concept, and if we are truly committed to turning our Nation's economy around, we must not falter in this regard. I am a cosponsor of this bill and proud to speak in its behalf.

Mr. Chairman, let us heed the words of Thomas Jefferson and vote to protect the public interest and make the lockbox permanent.

□ 1430

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Members of this body that if this bill had been law last year, we would have saved $659 million that would have gone to deficit reduction. That is the sum that we actually passed in cuts, and yet later we found that those cuts, those savings, were reallocated for additional spending programs in this House.

When I think about the fact, and I have spoken about the $200 billion chronic deficits that we are running in this Government, when I think about the fact that last year we had $100 million in the ASRM program that we thought we had cut on this floor, and yet we found out subsequently that that money was reallocated for additional spending, when I think about the fact that it is really the will of the majority of this House, when the majority votes on this floor, to cut spending, and then to see that will of the majority overturned, overturned by having that money reallocated, I say let us let the will of the majority be done. Let us let the cuts be carried out.

I am excited about the reform movement in this Congress. I think people have told us, ''No more politics as usual.'' I think that people have made the point to us that this change, these changes that we are implementing in public policy really represent for us a keeping faith with the expectations of the American people, that we are going to keep out commitments. We are going to basically keep our credibility with that public and that we are going to say to that public, when we say we are cutting spending, we mean we are cutting spending; we mean that we are actually going to implement that and make certain those cuts go right to the bottom line.

Last, I will share with you my final thought on this subject, and that is that the most important thing we to do here is deficit reduction, and this reform, this governmental reform that we are implementing today, will allow us to better implement our policy to reduce that Federal budget deficit, and that is the final reason we should vote for this reform.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have one further speaker who will close for our side.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional speakers on our side.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time, 3½ minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I have said for a long time that we need structural reforms if we are ever going to balance this budget. This bill does that.

As people around the country watch on C–SPAN, and they probably writhe and cheer when this body has the guts to make some cuts along the way, what they forget along those lines is that when that bill goes to the other body months later, if we have been successful in making those cuts, the other body just sort of backfills.

I am going to give you an example. Last week we had the vote on the B–2 bomber on the appropriation spending bill for defense. I voted against it. I voted against it because I did not think that we could afford it, and had we been successful, we were not, but had we been successful, I would have wanted that money, and the reason I voted ''no'' in the first place was to lower our deficit so that the other body would not have been able to take that money and use it for something else.

I am a fiscal conservative, and whether it is the line item veto or changing the budget process to work, we have got to make this institution aware that when we cut spending here, we cannot allow the other body to simply raise it, and when they cut spending there, they should not be in the same shoes on this side to take the money that they might cut and add it to something else.

This idea, the lockbox, with strong bipartisan support, and it has been that way from the very onset, does exactly what we say we are going to do. When we cut spending, the money goes to reduce the deficit. It does not go for something else, and that is the reason that I rise and join so many of my colleagues here this afternoon in support of this legislation. This is real reform. It is structural reform. It is going to work, and it is about time that we passed it here and get the other body to do the same.

I just would encourage my colleagues, all of them, to support this legislation because it really does something about spending cuts, and that is what it is all about.

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

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

As I mentioned previously, I support the legislation. I do. There are several amendments that will be offered shortly. I intend to offer one. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] intends to offer one. We will be discussing those very soon.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan deficit lockbox legislation, H.R. 1162.

However, it is unfortunate that H.R. 1162 was not brought before the House of Representatives prior to consideration of this year's spending bills. Regrettably, this means that many of the cuts I voted for this year are not guaranteed to help reduce the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1162 is all about the truth. When Members vote to cut an unworthy project and do not redirect those scarce resources elsewhere, our constituents expect that money to go toward reducing the deficit.

Unfortunately, that is not the way the system works now, but with the passage of H.R. 1162 that will change. Now when the project

is cut, those savings will lower the total sum of funds available and the deficit should be reduced by a commensurate amount.

I am pleased to support this truth in budgeting legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for H.R. 1162. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1162, the Deficit Reduction Lock-Box Act. I am an original cosponsor of this legislation and I have appreciated working with the bipartisan group bringing the bill to the floor today.

It should be recognized that we really started getting serious about deficit reduction with the 1993 budget agreement. Early that year, the President asked Members of Congress to the White House to brainstorm on just how we should approach our fiscal challenges. I met with the President on February 15, 1993, and at that time suggested to him the idea of a deficit reduction trust fund, which would help account for the money being saved through the budget process.

I told the President that the American people are willing to make the hard choices on taxes, program cuts and budget priorities if they know that the ultimate result is deficit reduction. What makes people unhappy is when they pay their fair share, services are reduced, non-priority items are funded and the deficit continues to rise.

This is a meaningful response to the concern. The lock-box helps us make sure a cut is a cut and that a zero is a zero. I am pleased to see the House taking this step toward fiscal responsibility and thank the Members of both sides of the aisle who helped make it happen.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All the time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1162

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Deficit Reduction Lockbox Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX ACCOUNT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX ACCOUNT

''SEC. 314. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Congressional Budget Office an account to be known as the 'Deficit Reduction Lock-box Account'. The Account shall be divided into subaccounts corresponding to the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations. Each subaccount shall consist of three entries: the 'House Lock-box Balance'; the 'Senate Lock-box Balance'; and the 'Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance'.

''(b) CONTENTS OF ACCOUNT.—Each entry in a subaccount shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (c). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

''(c) CREDIT OF AMOUNTS TO ACCOUNT.—(1) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Director') shall, upon the engrossment of any appropriation bill by the House of Representatives and upon the engrossment of that bill by the Senate, credit to the applicable subaccount balance of that House amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by that House to that bill.

''(2) The Director shall, upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill, credit to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance the amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to—

''(A) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of new budget authority in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of new budget authority in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that bill; and

''(B) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of outlays in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of outlays in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that bill,

under section 314(c), as calculated by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

''(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'appropriation bill' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 313 the following new item:

''Sec. 314. Deficit reduction lock-box account.''

SEC. 3. TALLY DURING HOUSE CONSIDERATION.

There shall be available to Members in the House of Representatives during consideration of any appropriations bill by the House a running tally of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill as reported.

SEC. 4. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF 602(a) ALLOCATIONS AND SECTION 602(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.

(a) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) Upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill (as defined in section 314(d)) for a fiscal year, the amounts allocated under paragraph (1) or (2) to the Committee on Appropriations of each House upon the adoption of the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year shall be adjusted downward by the amounts credited to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lockbox Balance under section 314(c)(2), as calculated by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the revised levels of budget authority and outlays shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.''.

(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.—Section 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Whenever an adjustment is made under subsection (a)(5) to an allocation under that subsection, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make downward adjustments in the most recent suballocations of new budget authority and outlays under subparagraph (A) to the appropriate subcommittees of that committee in the total amounts of those adjustments under section 314(c)(2). The revised suballocations shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.''.

SEC. 5. PERIODIC REPORTING OF ACCOUNT STATEMENTS.

Section 308(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Such reports shall also include an up-to-date tabulation of the amounts contained in the account and each subaccount established by section 314(a).''.

SEC. 6. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The discretionary spending limit for new budget authority for any fiscal year set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be reduced by the amount of the adjustment to the section 602(a) allocations made under section 602(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The adjusted discretionary spending limit for outlays for that fiscal year, as set forth in such section 601(a)(2), shall be reduced as a result of the reduction of such budget authority, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget based upon programmatic and other assumptions set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the conference report on that bill. Reductions (if any) shall occur upon the enactment of all regular appropriation bills for a fiscal year or a resolution making continuing appropriations through the end of that fiscal year. This adjustment shall be reflected in reports under sections 254(g) and 254(h) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall apply to all appropriation bills making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 or any subsequent fiscal year.

(b) FY96 APPLICATION.—In the case of any appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996 engrossed by the House of Representatives after the date this bill was engrossed by the House of Representatives after the date this bill was engrossed by the House of Representatives and before the date of enactment of this bill, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall, within 10 calendar days after that date of enactment of this Act, carry out the duties required by this Act and amendments made by it that occur after the date this Act was engrossed by the House of Representatives.

(c) FY96 ALLOCATIONS.—The duties of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Committees on Budget and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives pursuant to this Act and the amendments made by it regarding appropriation bills for fiscal year 1996 shall be based upon the revised section 602(a) allocations in effect on the date this Act was engrossed by the House of Representatives.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to establish procedures to provide for a deficit reduction lock-box and related downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits.''.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: Page 2, line 6, strike ''ACCOUNT'' and insert ''LEDGER''.

Page 2, line 7, strike ''ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT'' and insert ''LEDGER''.

Page 2, line 10, strike ''ACCOUNT'' and insert ''LEDGER''.

Page 2, line 11, strike ''ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT'' and insert ''LEDGER''.

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike ''There'' and all that follows through ''Account,'' on line 13, and insert the following: ''The Director of the Congressional Budget Office (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Director') shall maintain a ledger to be known as the 'Deficit Reduction Lock-box Ledger'.''.

Page 2, line 14, strike ''Account'' and insert ''Ledger'' and strike ''subaccounts'' and insert ''entries''.

Page 2, line 16, strike ''subaccount'' and insert ''entry'' and strike ''entries'' and insert ''parts''.

Page 3, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

''(b) COMPONENTS OF LEDGER.—Each component in an entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (c). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

Page 3, line 4, strike ''ACCOUNT'' and insert ''LEDGER''.

Page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike ''of the Congressional Budget Office (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Director')''.

Page 3, line 9, strike ''subaccount'' and insert ''entry''.

Page 4, line 2, strike the comma and insert a period and strike lines 3 and 4.

Page 4, before line 5, add the following new paragraph:

''(3) CALCULATION OF LOCK-BOX SAVINGS IN SENATE.—For purposes of calculating under this section the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by the Senate on an appropriation bill, the amendments reported to the Senate by its Committee on Appropriations shall be considered to be part of the original text of the bill.

Page 4, between lines 13 and 14, strike ''account'' and insert ''ledger''.

Page 5, lines 9 and 10, strike '', as calculated by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and'' and insert a period, and on line 11 strike ''the'' and insert ''The''.

Page 5, line 19, strike ''Director of the Congressional Budget Office'' and insert ''chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of each House''.

Page 6, line 3, strike ''ACCOUNT'' and insert ''LEDGER''.

Page 6, line 7, strike ''account'' and insert ''ledger'', and on line 8, strike ''subaccount'' and insert ''entry''.

Page 6, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 7, line 7, and insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The discretionary spending limits for new budget authority and outlays for any fiscal year set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be reduced by the amounts set forth in the final regular appropriation bill for that fiscal year or joint resolution making continuing appropriations through the end of that fiscal year. Those amounts shall be the sums of the Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balances for that fiscal year, as calculated under section 602(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. That bill or joint resolution shall contain the following statement of law: ''As required by section 6 of the Deficit Reduction Lock-box Act of 1995, for fiscal year [insert appropriate fiscal year], the adjusted discretionary spending limit for new budget authority shall be reduced by $ [insert appropriate amount of reduction] and the adjusted discretionary limit for outlays shall be reduced by $ [insert appropriate amount of reduction].'' Notwithstanding section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 306 of that Act as it applies to this statement shall be waived. This adjustment shall be reflected in reports under sections 254(g) and 254(h) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Page 7, lines 14 and 15, strike ''the date this bill was engrossed by the House of Representatives'' and insert ''August 4, 1995''.

Page 8, lines 5 and 6, strike ''the date this bill was engrossed by the House of Representatives'' and insert ''August 4, 1995''.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I will briefly explain this amendment, which is somewhat technical. It is primarily a managers' amendment. I know there is some concern about time on the other side to get on with some of the amendments which we need to do.

Mr. Chairman, this is a manager's amendment primarily a series of technical changes to the bill reflecting dozens of hours of careful consultation with budget process experts, the various committees with interest and jurisdiction, and lockbox advocates. In making these technical changes we are clarifying the effect of lockbox, ensuring that we are in conformity with the Budget Act, addressing a potential vagueness in the language vis-a-vis the other body and fixing a potential constitutional problem with the requirement for lowering the statutory spending caps. Among the modifications we are making, is a change of the language of lockbox from ''accounts'' and ''subaccounts'' to ''ledger'' and ''entries.'' The reason for this is to be as clear as possible about the accounting or scorekeeping function assigned to CBO in this process. We have also made sure that all the various tasks assigned in this bill are properly assigned to reflect the requirements of the Budget Act. In addition, we have added language to make clear that when we refer to ''Senate amendments'' to appropriations bills we mean amendments adopted on the floor of the other body. In addition, some legal experts raised a concern about whether the language in this bill might have constitutional problems in the sense that it keys the statutory lowering of the discretionary caps by OMB to a provision that is not yet in law. In order to make absolutely sure that we do not run afoul of the constitution, this amendment would modify that section of the bill to require that the final appropriations bill—or CR—for a given fiscal year must include a statement telling OMB to reduce the caps by the amount of the total of all the joint House-Senate lockboxes through that budget cycle. Finally, this amendment ensures that the House is held accountable for lockbox to the date on which we first adopted it—when we passed the fiscal year 1996 Labor/HHS Appropriations bill on August 4, 1995, in which we included a Crapo lockbox amendment. I would like to thank the Budget Committee and the Appropriations CMTE for help in crafting this technical manager's amendment and I urge its passage.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FROST TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FROST to the amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: Amend the instruction relating to page 7, line 14, to read as follows:

Page 7, beginning on line 14, strike ''after the date this bill was engrossed by the House of Representatives and''.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, many of us have supported lockbox because we want to make real cuts that will really reduce the deficit and assist our efforts to reach a balanced budget. However, as reported, this bill will not be applicable to 12 of the 13 fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills.

I understand that my colleague from Florida, in the amendment that he has just discussed, is offering an amendment which will make this bill applicable to the labor-HHS and Department of Defense appropriations, but I think we should go all the way and cover every one of the 13 bills in this exercise. The DOD appropriation was reduced by $121 million, and those savings will be counted toward deficit reduction. If we can count those savings, why can we not count others?

Mr. Chairman, let me give you a few specific examples of savings that have been made in the other 10 bills. We cut $20 million from the global environmental fund and $14 million from OPIC when we considered the foreign operations appropriation. We cut $65.8 million from the Treasury, Postal appropriation by reducing the funds for offices of the Food and Drug Administration. The energy and water appropriation was reduced $20 million by cutting the gas turbine modular helium reactor. Interior was reduced $5 million when we agreed to cut fossil energy research. In total, Mr. Chairman, the House has agreed to reduce discretionary spending by over $240 million,

which, in anyone's calculation, amounts to real money.

Mr. Chairman, the question has arisen about what happens if money saved from one bill has subsequently been spent in another. I know the Committee on Appropriations believes this amendment will hamper its ability to negotiate with their Senate counterparts. I know Members will say funds have already been reallocated to programs that really matter to their districts. But is it the answer really that we have had to make hard choices? We have made them, and in order to get credit for them, they have to be real.

Mr. Chairman, if we apply lockbox retroactively, then maybe some of these cuts we have made will be real. That is what this Member intends when voting to cut, and I am sure that intention is shared by every other Member of this body.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman I think that the subject of retroactivity has been greatly debated in the process by all the players, and I recognize the sentiment that their distinguished gentleman from Texas in laying out. It is one that we all had when we started this process. It is something we hoped we could achieve.

The reality of the circumstances is, as we got into this thing and worked it all out, and it was complicated, as we see it, is that we had to draw a starting line somewhere, and we felt that the fair way to do it was to pick the day when the House spoke on it, and that is, in effect, what the managers' amendment, the underlying amendment to which this amendment applies, tries to do, and that date is August 4.

In terms of retroactivity, that would mean presumably that the lockbox might affect for fiscal year 1996 Labor-HHS, Defense, and D.C., by my calculations and that is, I use the word ''might'' advisedly, but I believe that is true.

The problem with trying to go back before that is we were operating very much under different rules and there was no notice to the appropriators, and I think that is a question of fair play, a question certainly we did not want to take away unnecessarily flexibility from the appropriators, but a practical reality that money has been reprogrammed and put into the process.

We as Members of this House have voted on that process during the movement of those other appropriations bills that happened before August 4. So I think it is extremely impractical, no matter how we feel about the general principle which the gentleman from Texas has espoused, it is impractical to get there.

So I am afraid I have to urge opposition to the amendment. I do not know how we can go back and capture what is not there, especially when we put everybody on notice on a certain date and we said that after this date we will operate under these new rules, and that is what my managers' amendment does. It says we are simply going to do that, and we are doing that, and I think that is living up to our word, our commitment. It is clearly what we put Members on notice on, and while I wish that we could do better, I do not think it is practical that we can, and I think it would deviate a little bit from what we promised the Members of this House if we passed the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I do not wish to do that.

I urge, therefore, that we oppose it and defeat it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], he is a very valuable Member of the so-called opposition party, the loyal opposition, on the Committee on Rules, and I have great respect for him.

But his amendment, I would have preferred to pass this lockbox right out of the starting gate the first of the year and had it affect everything from then and into the future.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the same argument with my good friend, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], when she offers an amendment on the out years, but, as my colleagues know, this is a controversial issue. My colleagues heard my next-door colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY], stand up and say we are spending a trillion dollars too little in this Congress and that we have got to build all these roads, and bridges, and infrastructure. Well, the truth of the matter is, my colleagues, we have a serious problem in this country. It is called a deficit that is ruining us in this country. It is turning us into a debtor nation, and there is nothing more uncompassionate than taking away the future of our children and grandchildren.

Now I take a back seat to nobody on deficit reduction. Here is a bill I introduced back on June 22, 1995. It contains $890 billion, and that is not million, that is billion dollars, in cuts. It cuts just about everything. But it balances the budget in 5 years. That is how important it is.

But I would just say to the gentleman that, as the gentleman knows, Ronald Reagan, and I mentioned his name earlier, taught me something a long time ago. And that is, we cannot always have it our own way, we have to compromise. It is always a two-way street, and that is what we have done with this legislation. We had many of the appropriators dead set against this legislation, the same thing over in the other body, because they do not want to be hamstrung in spending, spending, spending.

Well, this is a compromise. It is a good compromise. It is a compromise that is going to get, I think, the overwhelming majority in this vote. That is why I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and any other amendments to this bill, because it is a consensus that has been worked out with both the Democrats and Republicans, the liberals and conservatives. it is a bill that is acceptable, and that is why my colleagues should vote against my good friend's amendment and vote for this bill on final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 221, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 656]

AYES—204

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chabot
Chapman
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Horn
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
LaHood
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Montgomery
Moran
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weller
Williams
Wise
Wyden
Wynn
Zimmer

NOES—221

Abercrombie
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Pelosi
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Sabo
Salmon
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Tate
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Moakley
Mollohan
Reynolds
Sisisky
Thornton
Tucker
Volkmer
Wilson
Zeliff

□ 1508

Messrs. NEUMANN, FRANK of Massachusetts, FARR, RIGGS, and RAHALL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CREMEANS, TOWNS, SHADEGG, and ROYCE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HARMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. GOSS:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment as a new section 6, in the third sentence—

(1) insert ''and each outyear'' after ''[insert appropriate fiscal year]''; and

(2) insert ''for the budget year and each outyear'' after ''insert appropriate amount of reduction'' the second place it appears.

Ms. HARMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am standing here as close as I possibly can to the center aisle to signify the point that there is bipartisan support for the legislation that we are considering.

Mr. Chairman, just a moment ago we saw here in the well of the House, Elizabeth Waldholtz, our newest daughter. I would like to say, as a mother of four, how happy I am that a new life has just joined us.

I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for his leadership on the lockbox legislation and for his help in bringing the bill to the floor as a freestanding bill, as well as an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. The gentleman from Florida and I both believe that the lockbox approach is a critical step in that long and winding road to a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, we can do even better. This amendment pairs the mother of lockbox with the father of the balanced budget constitutional amendment. Our amendment will improve the current bill and allow us to capture outyear savings that result from successful floor amendments cutting appropriations. True deficit hawks should support this amendment, as do the National Taxpayers Union and the Concord Coalition. Let me repeat. The National Taxpayers Union and the Concord Coalition support this amendment. Indeed, earlier in the debate, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] made the point that Thomas Jefferson supports this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Harman-Stenholm amendment is very simple. It ensures that spending cuts in a multiyear program result in a reduction in outyear discretionary spending caps, as well as the present year caps.

□ 1515

Let me remind my colleagues that H.R. 1162 as originally introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] and myself, and now cosponsored by 80 of our colleagues, contained provisions capturing outyear spending, exactly what this amendment would do. The Harman-Stenholm amendment restores the original Crapo-Harman language.

Why do we need it? Well, here is the answer: If we are cutting personnel funds, 95 percent of those funds are spent in the first year. So we do not need this amendment for personnel cuts. But we need this amendment when we are cutting construction funds, military construction funds, for example, or multiyear procurement programs, which spend out slowly. Only a portion of the funds for those types of programs are spent in the first year.

For example, if we voted on a $100 million military construction program, it could be that only $6 million, or 6 percent, is spent in the first year. So if we cut that program, or cut a courthouse that would be valued at $100 million, we are really only applying $6 million to the deficit unless we adopt the Harman-Stenholm bipartisan amendment.

Similarly, with major weapons procurement programs, the first year's spendout is very small and the balloon comes later. So if we are serious about deficit reduction, and I think we are, certainly those of us who supported the balanced budget amendment in its various forms are, we need to adopt this amendment so that not only is a cut a cut, but a cut is a full cut.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, as I did before, that the original Crapo-Harman bill as introduced contained this language. The Brewster amendment to the emergency supplemental bill which was passed earlier this year by 418 votes to 5, contained this language. The more recent version of lockbox that we passed as an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill did not contain this language, but that was necessary as a concession at that time.

Now we have a freestanding bill. Now we have the opportunity to restore the original language that 80 cosponsors of the Crapo bill support, that the Concord Coalition supports, that the Taxpayers Union support. Every single serious deficit hawk on both sides of the aisle ought to support this amendment in order to achieve the glidepath we all want to a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Harman-Stenholm bipartisan amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from California knows, I admire her persistence and her wisdom and her leadership in trying to make the best possible piece of legislation we can out of the lockbox, and she certainly deserves a great deal of credit for getting it this far down the track.

We have been wrestling with this problem of the outyears, trying to find a way to make it work. We want to do it. We have not been able to find the exact language. We find there are serious problems when we are talking with

programs as opposed to dollars. Of course, we are reminded of the fact that we do our appropriations annually, at least at this point. So we have felt that we had the opportunity to come in and do what the gentlewoman has proposed in a way that would work and is agreed upon by all the players.

I would very much like to accommodate the amendment, and we tried, as I said. My view is we should certainly not oppose what you are proposing, and I would be very happy to immediately say that I embrace it. Wonderfully, it is a great addition and welcome addition if I felt we had the language worked out.

So I am put in the position of trying to figure out can we get this thing sorted out and in conference and accepted, as I would like to do, or do I point out there are procedural problems with this, which means it is not a good idea at this time, until we get the problems all sorted out. Frankly, I am not sure we are going to ever get them entirely sorted out, because they are of such a nature, when you get into talking about trying to deal with outyear implications for dollars rather than for programs, I do not know how you do that. Nobody does.

So the other question we have to measure is the sentiment of the body. In my view, the sentiment of the body is we should try and go on ahead and try to work this thing out in conference. Therefore, I am going to accept the proposed amendment to my amendment, with the understanding that we are going to have to work some things out in conference because we have not got the language yet.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the constructive comments that the gentleman has just made.

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the gentleman's accepting this amendment, if I heard correctly. This, indeed, has been tricky to work out. Many of us have spent a lot of time on this amendment, on this concept. I would like to declare myself in addition to mother of lockbox, a de facto member of the Committee on Rules, since I have spent hours and hours over there. But I also want to commend the gentleman from Florida, Mr. GOSS, and to commend the gentleman from New York, Chairman SOLOMON, for really going the extra mile to make this work. I think that if we can get this perfected and if it can apply to the out years, we are doing more by this act to balance the budget than anything else we have done in this Congress.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I concur with the feelings of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]. There are some procedural problems, as I discussed with the gentlewoman earlier. I think that there may be a way to work it out, and if there is, certainly we would look forward to it. If I am one of the conferees, we will do what we can to try to work with you between now and the time we do go to conference to see if there is some way to perfect this language that will truly make it work.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate that. I pledge to work with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to conclude, as I am very close to this center aisle, that when we work in bipartisan fashion on some of these very complicated but very important budget reforms, we make more progress. So I feel this has been a very excellent debate on the House floor. I know it is not over. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], is waiting to speak. But I congratulate both gentleman for the enormous effort made, and also the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], who is sitting quietly in the back there, for his leadership and his friendship.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to thank Members for the bipartisan spirit in this. This is a complicated issue, as we have said. We are trying to do the right thing. I hope this is the right way to proceed. With the assurances we have from the gentleman that we will continue to work in a bipartisan effort, we will accept this and see how we can get it sorted out, at least as a placeholder in conference, to get the best we can.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I learned a long time ago when you have your amendment passed, you do not talk too much, so I will take all the persuasive arguments that I was going to use with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and insert them into the RECORD, and accept this in the spirit of bipartisan, something we have not seen nearly as much of over the last several months. But I hope this is a sign of better things to come.

This is an idea that I have no doubts whatever can be worked out. All of the technical points that the gentleman from Florida has mentioned are very real, but they can be worked out in the spirit of cooperation that has been indicated today.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time and insert the persuasive arguments that are no longer necessary into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Rules Committee both for bringing H.R. 1162 to the floor with an open rule and for the committee's substantive, legislative activity on the bill.

Like so many others who have spoken on the floor today, this is an issue I have spent many hours over the past several years working towards and I am pleased to see this day finally come. My colleagues, MIKE CRAPO, JANE HARMAN, MIKE CASTLE, BILL BREWSTER, JOHN KASICH, CHET EDWARDS, and others have done a terrific job in leading this bipartisan effort and I want to thank them for that leadership.

I intend to vote in support of final passage of this bill, not because I think it is a perfect bill, or even as strong a bill as we have had proposed over the past several years. But I support it in a spirit of legislative compromise which has been noticeably lacking in recent months. Contrary to much of the rhetoric which has been circulating, not so much around this issue but around some of the currently relevant larger issues, I refuse to become part of the army which seems to think the political process can move forward without compromise.

I would like to see this bill come a little closer to provisions included in the Kasich-Stenholm-Penny common cents reform of last year. In my opinion, the ways in which this bill differs from that earlier proposal result in undesirable consequences for the budget deficit. But I accept that other people had other ideas and so I am willing to continue as a foot soldier to improve the status quo, even if it's not everything I would like. I hope others might get the hang of that concept as the next few months proceed.

I do intend to support final passage of this bill, but I also want to join in one more effort to improve what I believe is the most serious shortcoming of this bill before it leaves the House of Representatives. Therefore, I rise enthusiastically at this point to speak in behalf of the amendment by my colleague from California, my leader in this effort, JANE HARMAN. This amendment will ensure that the full effect of spending cuts on appropriations bills are locked into deficit reduction.

H.R. 1162 as it is before us currently affects only allocations of spending and discretionary caps for the fiscal year covered by the appropriations bill. Thus, the measure would not lock-in the outyear savings resulting from spending reduction amendments.

At first blush, one might assume this criticism is worthy of little more than nitpicking from a budget nerd. Nothing could be further from the truth. For anyone whose support of this legislation is driven by concern about deficit reduction, which I assume is virtually everyone supporting this bill, this outyear factor is no small matter. In fact, we're talking about this bill cutting in half the potential deficit reduction.

On average, 48 percent of funds appropriated in any year do not result in outlays until the second year or later. Therefore, in the rhetoric that has surrounded this concept from its beginning, this bill doesn't really guarantee that a cut is a cut. What it does is say that a cut is half a cut at best.

I say it is half a cut at best because there is a split-the-difference formula in the base bill which says that the amount placed in the lockbox should be equal to one-half the sum of the amounts in the House lockbox and the Senate lockbox. If we assume that current trends will continue and the House will typically cut more than the Senate, it means that the optimum deficit reduction will never be achieved.

Putting that formula aside, however, I believe that this outyear matter is of even greater

importance. The Harman amendment will capture all of the outyear savings for deficit reduction.

Because the Federal budget process is such a complicated one, I would like to give an example of what this outyear matter really means. Let's assume that this year the Congress appropriates $1 billion for a given highway project. Because building a highway takes some time, the Department of Transportation may obligate only $100 million of the money during the next year. That doesn't mean that the project loses the other $900 million; it just means that money will be obligated in subsequent years as the highway continues to be built. Eventually, that full $1 billion will be spent by the Federal Government on the highway.

Now, let's say that as part of an across-the-board cut, that highway appropriation was cut in the House by 5 percent. Does that mean that $50 million will be going to reduce the deficit? Absolutely not. It means that $5 million, or 5 percent of the first year's spending can go into the House's account. Of course even that amount might be reduced if the Senate cuts less, but we won't get into that here.

Clearly, if you are trying not only to maximize the deficit reduction but also are trying to accomplish what the average citizen assumes you have done, you need to capture the outyear savings. In today's environment, I would say that the trust/credibility aspect of following through on what we imply we are doing is just as important as the deficit reduction aspect of capturing the outyear savings.

I believe that Ms. HARMAN has focused on an absolutely critical element of the bill with her amendment. I believe that anyone who cares about getting the biggest bang for our deficit-reduction buck, as well as anyone who is concerned about rebuilding public confidence in Congress, should support this amendment. I urge passage of the Harman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. This is not the same amendment that I filed in yesterday's RECORD. I was advised by the House Parliamentarian that this new version of the amendment is in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MEEK of Florida: At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. 8. REQUIREMENT THAT SAVINGS ONLY BE USED TO REDUCE THE BUDGET DEFICIT.

Reductions in outlays and reductions in discretionary spending limits specified in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 resulting from the implementation of the Act shall be used only to reduce the budget deficit of the United States and shall not be used, directly or indirectly, to increase the budget deficit of the United States.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I would like to hear the full amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a clarifying, technical amendment to the bill. It should not be controversial.

My amendment would simply specify that all of the funds saved through lock-box spending reductions would be used for deficit reduction, and not for tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the goal of reducing the Federal deficit, although I strongly disagree with how the Republican majority is attempting to achieve this goal.

My amendment will insure that this bill actually does what it is advertised to do—cut the deficit.

The sponsors of this bill say that any cuts in a specific appropriations bill made on the floor of the House or the Senate should go only to deficit reduction.

But the actual text of the bill only says that the funds cut on the floor cannot be used for other appropriations bills. The reported bill does not actually say that the cuts must be used for deficit reduction.

Thus, the bill leaves open the possibility that the spending cuts could be used to pay for a tax cut.

My amendment corrects this ambiguity and makes it clear that the cuts cannot be used to pay for a tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, this House has strongly supported this approach in the past.

The effect of my amendment is identical to a provision of the Brewster lockbox amendment adopted by the House on March 15 of this year by a resounding vote of 418 to 5.

Some may argue that my amendment is unnecessary because existing law prohibits using cuts in appropriations to pay for tax cuts. But this argument is a technical, legal one. It misses the point.

This Congress is making many, many cuts in spending in the name of reducing the deficit. It is therefore important for Congress to clearly affirm its intent—in this bill—that cuts in appropriations cannot be used to pay for tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that those who have already cut programs like Head Start, housing for low-income people, job training and similar programs will try in the future to make additional cuts.

I have opposed these cuts in programs to help children, the poor, the sick, and the elderly, and I will continue to oppose them in the future.

But it would be rubbing salt in the wounds of the poor to have these cuts used to help pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Let us make it clear to everyone that spending cuts can only be used to reduce the deficit.

□ 1530

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of this debate I said when I came here 17 years ago I came here for the purpose of trying to stop the defense budget of this country from becoming totally inadequate and to do everything I could to make it more difficult to spend money, to raise taxes, and to place regulatory burdens on the American people.

I would say to the gentlewomen, as I read her amendment, this amendment says that from now on and in the future, if we want to cut taxes, we cannot pay for it out of discretionary spending cuts. That, to me, is the antithesis of what I came to this Congress for. We are here to cut taxes, and we are here to limit speeding. I would hope we would defeat the gentlewoman's amendment, as much as we happen to like her.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have not seen this amendment in this form until just a few minutes ago. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has characterized the concern we have over here about it.

As one reads it, it seems harmless enough, but when we think of the implications of it, it gets into a situation where we have many missions as we go through our budget work. One of them certainly is to try to cut taxes, where we can, to reduce the tax burden on the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid this is so broadly worded that it talks about steps that we might take with regard to the lockbox, which could be interpreted to prohibit us from tax cuts in the same year with regard to discretionary funds. I understand what my colleague from Florida, I think, is trying to accomplish; to make sure that we basically take the savings that come out of the appropriations process and use them to reduce the deficit. And that is what this is all about, that is what the lockbox is all about.

I am afraid this creates some uncertainties and goes beyond just a lockbox procedure and would tend to tie the hands of Members who would be interested in tax cuts in the same fiscal year.

That, I think, Mr. Chairman, is a serious, serious matter. So what I would

urge so that the record is very clear, the testimony at the time we passed the lockbox, the Crapo amendment to the Labor, HHS, the testimony in the Committee on Rules, the testimony here today is all very, very clear. It says that the purpose of the lockbox is to capture those savings, and we intend to capture those savings.

To go further than that and say we also will not cut taxes, I think, goes well beyond, frankly, the scope of what we are talking about and does cause some complication with regard to the original intent, which is the lockbox, which is to capture the savings.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I have to join in opposition to this amendment.

I certainly have the greatest of admiration for my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], but my concern is that, as we look at the issue of saving, and now to go, as my friend has just said, a step further and jeopardize the ability to reduce the incredible tax burden on working Americans, I believe, goes far beyond the purview of the intention of the lockbox.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, there are many of us, most everyone, concerned about the pattern of deficit spending we have seen over the past several decades. But we are also concerned about the fact that there are so many people out there who feel that the Federal Government imposes a tax level which is way too high, and it is our goal as we reduce the deficit to also reduce that burden of taxes on working Americans.

It is clear that the amendment offered by my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], would joepardize the opportunity to do that. For that reason I am compelled to join in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 144, noes 282, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 657]

AYES—144

Ackerman
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Montgomery
Moran
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—282

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

de la Garza
Moakley
Mollohan
Reynolds
Sisisky
Torricelli
Tucker
Wilson

□ 1556

Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. RICHARDSON, TEJEDA, and ORTIZ changed their vote from ''aye'' and ''no.''

Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida, BEVILL, METCALF, CRAMER, and CARDIN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. QUINN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1162) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1162) to establish a deficit reduction trust fund and provide for the downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits in appropriation bills, pursuant to House Resolution 218, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 364, noes 59, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 658]

AYES—364

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—59

Abercrombie
Baker (CA)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bonior
Clay
Clayton
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Dixon
Engel
Evans
Fattah
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Lewis (GA)
Livingston
McDermott
Meek
Mink
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Olver
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Serrano
Skaggs
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Bateman
de la Garza
Ensign
Frost
Moakley
Mollohan
Obey
Reynolds
Sisisky
Tucker
Wilson

□ 1617

Mr. OLVER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to establish procedures to provide for a deficit reduction lock-box and related downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits.''

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as cosponsor of H.R. 359.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 219 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 219

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1670) to revise and steamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government, to reorganize the mechanisms for resolving Federal procurement disputes, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) or 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. The first two sections and each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI or section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business: *Provided*, That the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the