

1991. The 1996 election featured the world's largest voter turnout, practically free of violence. The 1997 election featured the victory of Prime Minister I.K. Gujral, who is of Punjabi descent, the very region that Mr. BURTON claims human rights violations are taking place.

On the subject of the State of Punjab, the Sikh minority dominated the ruling party in open democratic elections. Voter turnout was 65 percent.

Prime Minister Gujral, in his first month of leadership, engaged in direct talks with newly elected Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan. A hotline phone system was established in a commitment to bring peace to the two nations.

So let us as Members of Congress not view the Government of India as being callous to these alleged human rights violations. India has made great strides in their battle to bring together the States of Kashmir, Jammu, Nagaland, and Punjab.

Recent reports by the U.S. State Department declare that India has "made further progress in resolving human rights problems."

It would be false and misdirected to say that India is not our friend. U.S. business in India has grown at an astonishing rate of nearly 50 percent a year since 1991, with the United States becoming India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

As India prepares to celebrate its 50th anniversary of democratic self rule, let us not sever the ties that we have so diligently strived to assemble. Vote "no" on the Burton amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, 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. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER LIMITATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2159, no further amendments shall be in order in the Committee of the Whole except the amendment Number 1 in House Report 105-184, and the amendment to that amendment, under the terms of the order of the House of July 24, 1997, and the pending amendment, Number 38, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and the amendment, Number 40, offered by Mr. BURTON.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that under the two Burton amendments there is no limitation on the time? We will be under the 5-minute rule?

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to double check amendments 38 and 40. Now 38 is the one that we are on?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the one we are on now, and 40 is the one the gentleman from Indiana indicated he wanted to introduce.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

VACATING REQUEST FOR RECORDED VOTE ON BEREUTER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the request for a recorded vote on the Bereuter amendment, Number 53, on H.R. 2159.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] prevails by voice vote.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2209, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SERRANO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2209, be instructed to agree to the position in Senate amendment numbered 1 with respect to the account "Joint Committee on Taxation" providing not more than a 4.64 percent increase for the Joint Committee on Taxation compared to an 8 percent increase in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and the other gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] will each control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my motion would simply direct the House conferees to do the fiscally responsible thing when we take up the funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation and agree to the Senate position. The Senate bill would give the Joint Committee on Taxation a tidy 4.6-percent increase over last year. We think that it is more than fair.

The House bill, in my view, was overly generous in providing an 8-percent increase for this office. In comparison, in the name of fiscal discipline, both bills provide increases of only 3.6 percent for the operation of the House and less than 2 percent for such vital agencies as a Congressional Budget Office and the Government Printing Office [GPO]. The House bill actually cuts funding for the General Accounting Office by \$8 million below last year.

In light of these funding levels, it is inappropriate and inconsistent to turn around and reward one office with an 8-percent increase. Moreover, the justification for this increase does not stand up to any reasonable level of scrutiny. I think the American people could question why we would increase the staff of this office the year after work is completed on a major tax bill, especially when at the same time we are cutting GAO whose main purpose is to look for wasteful Federal spending and save taxpayers money. If the existing staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation could operate effectively this year when they worked on what we are told over and over again was a major historic tax bill, one would think they could manage the work load during a more routine year without all this extra staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are simply calling on the House to be more consistent in imposing fiscal austerity within the legislative branch. We should treat all offices the same, not give special treatment to a favored few.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion.

The intent of the motion is to eliminate the five additional full-time