Scott	Stupak	Vento
Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Shays	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Sherman	Thurman	Watt (NC)
Slaughter	Tierney	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Weiner
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Stark	Udall (NM)	Woolsey
Strickland	Velázquez	Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (TX)	Kolbe	Maloney (NY)
Buyer	Lantos	Rush
Hyde	Lofgren	

□ 1356

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. STUPAK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT CONCERNING EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF MONGOLIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 100–19)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 4, 1996, I determined and reported to the Congress that Mongolia was not in violation of the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. This action allowed for the continuation of normal trade relations status for Mongolia and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated report to the Congress concerning the emigration laws and policies of Mongolia. The report indicates continued Mongolian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1999.*

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 391, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 44 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 44

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 437) to provide for a Chief Financial Officer in the Executive Office of the President. 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 Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. 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 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. 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. 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.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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, House Resolution 44 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 437, the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999, a bill that will build on the success of the CFO, Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, by providing a CFO in the Executive Office of the President of the United States.

H. Res. 44 is an open rule, providing one hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform. The rule provides that the bill will be for consideration as read. Members who have preprinted their amendments in the record prior to their consideration will be given priority in recognition to offer their amendments if otherwise consistent with House rules.

The rule allows for the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15 minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation builds on the legislation the House passed just this week, the Mandates Information Act, by making the Federal Government more accountable. Additionally, it is one more example of a common theme in this Republican Congress, making the Federal Government accountable to the American people.

As an original cosponsor and advocate of the identical legislation, H.R. 1962, that passed the House 413 to 3 in the 105th Congress, I am pleased that the Presidential and Executive Financial Accountability Act is before us today. The other body was unable to take up this important legislation in the last Congress.

This legislation brings the agencies of the Executive Office of the President under the requirements of the Chief Financial Officers, or CFO, Act. The CFO Act was inspired by the realization that billions of dollars was lost through waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal Government each year.

As chairman of the Results Caucus, a bipartisan team of Members focused on ridding our Federal Government of its major management problems, I have seen report after report which has focused on insufficient and inefficient financial management systems that fail to produce consistent and reliable data.

In fact, the General Accounting Office in a report issued in January of this year gave details about the Department of Defense's accounting system. It reported that ''over $9 billion in known military operating materials and supplies were not reported.'' That same Defense Department did not have reliable information on important items of inventory, including ''the number and location of military equipment items, such as F–4 engines and service craft.''

The CFO Act was designed to improve financial management and to coordinate internal controls and financial accounting. Chief Financial Officers oversee all financial management activities in their agencies and report directly to the head of an agency on financial matters. It certainly is clear that such practices are needed in the White House.

This legislation fixes an oversight in the original CFO Act. Unfortunately, the original act never applied to the Executive Office of the President. H.R. 437, the Presidential and Executive Office Accountability Act of 1999, will do

so in a way that recognizes that unique circumstances of that office exist. It will establish a chief financial officer in the executive offices of the President, and will review and audit the White House's financial systems and its records. The CFO duties are to comply with those requirements set forth in the CFO Act, but is limited by discretion of the President.

When the annual fiscal report on the Federal Government was recently released, the government accounting office told us that ''significant financial system weaknesses, problems with fundamental record keeping, incomplete documentation and weak internal controls, including computer reports, prevent the government from accurately reporting a large portion of its assets, liabilities and costs.''

In other words, this administration cannot tell you how much money it receives, how much money it spends and what it spends its money on, what property it owns, where that property goes, or how much that property is worth. There is no evidence that the executive offices at the White House are any different from those reports that have been issued already.

Passage of this bill is another signal to the taxpayers that we will ferret out waste, fraud and abuse wherever it is found. Once again, the White House is not immune to this, and, thus, is no different than any other agency.

Mismanagement is found throughout the Executive Branch also. Investigation after investigation has turned over evidence of waste, fraud and abuse. The White House Travel Office, the White House Communications Agency, the FBI files matter, are all evidence that the White House needs its own watchdog. This legislation puts us on the right track.

I urge my colleagues to pass this fair, open rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 437, the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999, is identical to a bill passed by the House in the 105th Congress under suspension of the rules by a roll call vote of 413 to 3. The Senate failed to act on this legislation in the last Congress, and so the House is again considering this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 437 will be considered under an open rule, but, because there was no opposition to the bill when the Committee on Rules held its hearing Tuesday, it is unlikely there will be any substantive amendments offered to it.

The bill requires the President to appoint or designate a chief financial officer in the Executive Office of the President in order that financial management practices in the Office of the President might be brought into conformity with the practices in the 24 cabinet departments or major agencies that have been in place since the passage of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 and the Government Management Reform Act of 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this legislation or to this rule.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 437, the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), on this fair and open rule. I am pleased that Members have the opportunity to amend the bill at any point, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

As the Vice Chair of the Committee on Government Technology, I am committed to the sound management of our Nation's government. This year the subcommittee has an ambitious agenda of hearings and legislation designed to make government more efficient. As an original cosponsor of the Executive Office Financial Accountability Act, I am pleased that the House has affirmed the importance of the subcommittee's work and that it will consider this act as one of its first orders of business.

Mr. Speaker, every CEO in corporate America, every director of a large not-for profit institution, even the leaders of our Nation's churches and synagogues, rely on one key individual within their organization, the chief financial officer.

Why do all of these leaders rely upon the CFO? It is to protect the resources of their shareholders, their donors, their congregations. It is to guard against mismanagement and inefficiencies, waste, fraud and abuse. It is to ensure that there is in place the sound fiscal management and strict internal controls that allow their organizations to run smoothly and achieve their goals.

Nine years ago this body voted to give the CEOs of our major Executive Branch agencies the same important resource that America's CEOs have enjoyed and relied upon for decades, the chief financial officer. In the nine years since our agencies created these offices, billions of dollars in taxpayer dollars have been saved through more efficient management practices and the ferreting out of waste, fraud and abuse.

Yet, today, some of our Nation's most important government business is handled in offices that lack this key resource, the office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Office of Drug Control Policy, OMB, the White House Office, National Security Council and seven others.

Mr. Speaker, the nature of the work of these executive offices is no less deserving of these important financial safeguards and efficiencies than our other Executive Branch agencies. In fact, with a budget of more than $246 million this year, the Executive Office of the President would rank among the top 200 companies in the Chicago area.

Let us give to the CEO of our Nation's highest office, the President, the same important resource enjoyed by all the other CEOs in America. Let us ensure that taxpayer dollars are guarded from waste, mismanagement and inefficiencies in all areas, in all offices of government.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), which will extend the CFO act to the Office of the President. In addition, I hope all Members will support this open rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend congratulations to my friend from Dallas for the very, very hard work he has put into the product that we are seeing here. I say that not because of his work on the Committee on Rules, but because he formerly served as a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and has been very, very involved in many of these key issues which were designed to increase accountability and ensure that we streamline operations so that we can deal with the taxpayer dollar in the most effective way.

The prospect of establishing a chief financial officer to look at the litany of questions that are there is the right thing to do.

When I think of the beginning that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has launched here as a member of the Committee on Rules in managing his first rule on the floor, I know it is an indication of the fine work to come, because it has been evidenced in the work he has done on so many other committees in the past.

□ 1415

So I appreciate his fine leadership here, and I strongly support the rule, and I urge my colleagues to join in a bipartisan way in supporting both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, 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. SESSIONS). Pursuant to House Resolution 44 and rule XVIII, 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. 437.

□ 1418

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. 437) to provide for a Chief Financial Officer in the Executive Office of the President, with Mr. CALVERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate, I will be yielding myself and others particular time to speak on this issue, and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, during a speech in Ashland, Kentucky in March of 1829, the distinguished former Speaker of this House, Henry Clay said, ''Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees, and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people.'' If the government is created for the benefit of the people, as Clay so eloquently argued, the government must be accountable to the people.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes the need for accountability in its Federal Government. It is in the spirit of this concept that the framers of the Constitution formulated a three-branch, separation of powers form of government, instilled with a system of checks and balances. The nature of oversight, which is to monitor, review, supervise, or investigate executive activities, was implied in the Constitution rather than explicitly enumerated. In ''Congress Investigates: 1792–1794,'' historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., noted, ''expressed authority to conduct investigations and compel testimony was not considered necessary to make an explicit grant of authority, because the power to make the laws implied the power to see whether they were faithfully executed.''

Congress oversees the executive branch by reviewing, monitoring and supervising the implementation of public policy. Early Congresses developed their oversight by using techniques such as special investigations, reporting requirements, and resolutions of inquiry. Public laws and congressional rules have enhanced Congress' implied power under the Constitution to conduct such an oversight.

It was not until the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act, that oversight was given explicit recognition by statute. That Act required Senate and House committees to exercise ''continuous watchfulness'' over programs and agencies within their jurisdiction. The House Committee on Government Operations, which grew out of that act, the predecessor of the present Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, was given an explicit oversight mandate in connection with its broad jurisdiction.

The creation of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight stemmed from the concept that the Federal Government must be financially accountable to the taxpayer by verifying the way in which government spends taxpayers' monies. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has existed in many forms since the earliest days of the Republic.

We have had dozens of committees on executive expenditures, and under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, it was made very clear that the President at last would have a unified budget to send to the Congress, and an office then known as the Bureau of the Budget to help him design that budget. That office is now the Office of Management and Budget, OMB.

But another interesting thing happened in 1921, and that was the development of the General Accounting Office in the legislative branch, headed by a Comptroller General of the United States with a 15-year term, the emphasis being on the fiscal accounting primarily of the executive branch.

With the 1946 act, the La Follette-Monroney bill, program review also came under the purview of the General Accounting Office. So chief financial officers, in essence the idea has gone back 200 years, that the legislative branch wants to make sure that the leadership of the executive branch have the tools that will help them administer the laws and faithfully see that they are carried out.

It has been stated that the bipartisan Chief Financial Officer Act of 1990 was one of the most important legislative efforts in the last half century, and has gone very far in improving the government's fiduciary accountability. After several years of oversight and legislative hearings, Congress passed and the President signed the bill into law on November 15, 1990. This act sought to improve financial management practices by creating a new leadership structure for Federal financial management.

The Act created, among other things, two new positions within the Office of Management and Budget: a chief financial officer and a deputy chief financial officer of the Federal Government, the executive branch. It also instituted chief financial officers in each of the major cabinet departments and independent agencies. The Act was intended to improve agency accounting and financial management, to assure reliable financial information, and to deter waste, fraud and abuse of government resources.

Since passage of the Chief Financial Officer Act, other congressional initiatives have attempted to bring the major Federal departments and agencies into compliance with existing Federal financial management laws. The Government Management Reform Act of 1994 established a requirement for department and agency heads to submit to the Office of Management and Budget audited financial statements. In addition, the Act established a mandate for the department and agency heads to submit to the President and Congress an audited financial statement covering all Federal executive branch agencies for the preceding year.

That bipartisan legislation gave the executive branch five years in order to give us a balance sheet, and progress is slowly being made. But once we get the systems there, we can use the comptrollership and the financial officer function to assure that deterrence is made to any that would abuse the fiscal resources of the taxpayer as budgeted by Congress to the executive branch.

The Chief Financial Officer Act and those initiatives have incorporated concepts developed over 50 years to improve the Federal Government's financial management. The Federal Government must perform its financial management practices in a more businesslike manner, we all know that, using financial practices that have proved successful in the private sector, in the nonprofit sector, in universities, in any organized human entity. Obtaining better control of government spending will restore public confidence. It will also serve to eliminate the unacceptable costs associated with waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement that are prevalent in many types of government spending, and with money that would be better used in helping people in programs that have been created by the President and by the Congress.

Those who administer Federal departments and agencies must be accountable to the citizens and taxpayers of the Nation for their financial management. This right and proper notion should be no less true for the executive office of the President. In that spirit today, we are proposing to extend application of the Chief Financial Officer Act of 1990 to the Executive Office of the President.

The Executive Office of the President is a collection of various agencies, most of which seek to advise the President and help him in the management

role that he has as the chief executive of the United States in charge of the executive branch of government. Under President Franklin Roosevelt's Executive Order 8248 of September 8, 1939, divisions within the executive office and functions were designed and defined and established by that order. A variety of agencies were transferred to the Executive Office of the President by President Roosevelt's Reorganization Plans I and II of 1939. After that, often by statute or other Presidents.

The executive office currently now consists of the Executive Residence, the White House; the Council of Economic Advisors, which was authorized under President Truman; the Council on Environmental Quality; the National Security Council, another major agency authorized during the Truman administration; as well as the Offices of the Vice President; Office of Administration, to try to bring some order out of the functions within the Executive Office of the President; and of course the very powerful Office of Management and Budget, OMB, the descendent of the Bureau of the Budget that started out in the Treasury in 1921, until President Roosevelt reorganized it and put it in this executive office. Also, the National Drug Control Policy. Then there is the Office of Policy Development, the Science and Technology Policy that goes back to President Eisenhower; and the United States Trade Representative, a key position to coordinate other cabinet officials in terms of America's global economy and trade.

Over the years, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, there have been some egregious examples of financial waste and abuse in the Executive Office of the President due to poor accounting controls. For example, a chief financial officer might have uncovered and corrected the unorthodox accounting practices that prevailed in the White House Travel Office. That was not a partisan situation; that was a bipartisan Travel Office that did not have the kinds of financial safeguards they should have had in many areas. A chief financial officer would have provided the Travel Office managers with the guidance and the expertise that they sorely needed, but they never received.

Similar to the chief financial officers in 24 Federal departments and agencies, a chief financial officer in the Executive Office of the President would enhance accountability and ensure fiscal responsibility throughout the Executive Office of the President. H.R. 347, the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999, will accomplish this goal. Specifically, the bill would ensure that the Executive Office of the President complies with The Chief Financial Officers Act.

H.R. 437 stems from the Presidential and Executive Office Accountability Act of 1996, which passed the House by an overwhelming margin of 410 to 5 in the 104th Congress. The purpose of that act was to apply Federal workplace laws to the Executive Office of the President. Unfortunately, with little time remaining in the 104th Congress, several provisions of the House-approved bill, including the provision to apply the Chief Financial Officer Act to the Executive Office of the President, were removed prior to passage in the Senate.

In the 105th Congress, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight's Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology held a hearing on the proposal before us on May 1, 1997. The witnesses featured the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Mica), the author of the Presidential and Executive Office Accountability Act of 1996, Edward J. Mazur, and Cornelius E. Tierney. Mr. Mazur was Vice President of Administration and Finance at Virginia State University, former Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, part of OMB.

□ 1430

He was the first controller to be appointed pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act, and oversaw its implementation in executive branch agencies. Mr. Tierney was director, Center for the Public Financial Management, George Washington University School of Business and Public Management. Mr. Tierney was instrumental in drafting the Chief Financial Officers Act and in guiding its subsequent implementation.

The bill before the House today, H.R. 437, is identical to the legislation passed by this House in the 105th Congress, then known as H.R. 1962. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight completed its consideration of H.R. 1962 on September 30, 1997. The House of Representatives passed the measure by a vote of 413 to 3.

On February 2, 1999, 1½ weeks ago, I introduced the identical legislation, now known as H.R. 437, the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999. The bill was considered by the Committee on Government Reform on February 3, 1999, and subsequently passed unanimously by voice vote.

This measure places the agencies of the Executive Office of the President, to the fullest extent practicable, within the framework of the Chief Financial Officers Act. But in deference to the President, it is designed not simply to establish a position of chief financial officer within the Executive Office of the President, but it also gives the President the power to appoint or designate a chief financial officer who must meet the qualifications stipulated in the act of 1990.

For example, the individual must possess a demonstrated ability and knowledge of general financial management and extensive practical experience in financial management practices at large governmental or business entities.

The bill also provides that the chief financial officer in the Executive Office of the President shall have the same authority and functions that are required of chief financial officers under that act. The President shall grant this authority to the extent the President determines it is appropriate in the interests of the United States.

In recognition of the decentralized structure of the Executive Office of the President and the separation of powers, and the respect for the presidency, since the unique functions that are performed in agencies by CFOs would not necessarily be performed in the Executive Office of the President, H.R. 437 anticipates that some exemptions may be necessary, and the President would have a right to make those exemptions.

In fact, the bill provides considerable discretion for the President to exempt the new chief financial officer from a number of the responsibilities stipulated in the Chief Financial Officers Act.

Notwithstanding such possible exemptions, the bill requires that the chief financial officer in the Executive Office of the President shall perform, to the extent practicable, the general functions and duties established under the CFO Act.

The chief financial officer would oversee financial personnel, would report directly to the head of the agency regarding financial matters, and in extending the CFO Act to the Executive Office of the President the bill provides that the President, at his discretion, may designate an employee as the ''head of the agency'' for purposes of complying with the reporting provision of the CFO Act.

The chief financial officer would be required to develop and maintain an integrated agency accounting and financial management system, which would include financial reports and strengthened internal controls. The chief financial officer would direct and manage the preparation of audited financial statements and the development of all executive office budgets.

Other responsibilities would include monitoring the financial execution of the budget in relation to the actual expenditures and the submission of timely performance reports. In addition, the chief financial officer must review on a biennial basis fees, royalties, rents, and other charges that might be imposed by an agency for services it provides. When necessary, the chief financial officer is required to make recommendations on revising those charges to reflect the actual costs incurred.

H.R. 437 requires the President to notify Congress of any provision of the

CFO Act that the President deems inapplicable to the chief financial officer in the Executive Office of the President. Within 90 days of enactment, the President is required to communicate to the chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs a plan for the implementation of H.R. 437.

Within 180 days of enactment, the President is required to appoint or to designate a chief financial officer under the provisions of the bill. The bill provides that the President may transfer offices, functions, powers, and duties, while promulgating the proposal.

The intent of this legislation is to foster improved systems of accounting and financial management throughout the components of the Executive Office of the President. This should facilitate prevention, or at least early detection, of waste and abuse within the Executive Office of the President. Implementation of these provisions will promote better accountability and proper fiscal management, which will provide greater efficiency and cost reductions.

H.R. 437, the Presidential Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999, is an important step forward toward ensuring confidence in the ability of the Executive Office of the President to conduct its financial affairs in a responsible manner.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the important reform that was adopted last year, as I noted earlier, with only three opposing it. I would hope, if a rollcall is sought, that we would have the same outcome this year.

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

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

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for his hard work on this legislation. As he mentioned, this bill passed this Congress overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion last session. I want to say, as the new ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, that it has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN). He conducts his committee in a bipartisan way, and we have come up here with a piece of legislation that will have overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle. I thank him for that.

H.R. 437 was reported out of our committee just last week, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) mentioned. The White House has been consulted regarding this legislation, and I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) in that regard.

This bill is called the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act. Its major component is that it requires the appointment of a chief financial officer in the White House. It would mandate that this chief financial officer in the White House comply with all the provisions of the Chief Financial Officers Act that was passed in 1990. But it does give the President significant discretion in implementing the act to meet the unique needs of the executive office.

This bill, as I said, is an expansion of an existing law which was noted to be landmark legislation when it was passed in 1990. I am proud to say it was sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), then the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. This bill was passed in a bipartisan way in 1990, and it brought about needed improvements to the executive branch by requiring for the first time financial audits and sound management practices in all of our executive agencies. This legislation is widely credited with changing the way the Federal Government keeps track of all of its finances.

In addition to this landmark legislation passed in 1990, this Congress passed in 1994 the Government Management and Reform Act, another bipartisan piece of legislation which mandated that major Federal agencies conduct independent annual audits of their financial statements. The Government Management and Reform Act of 1994 grew out of Vice-President AL GORE's National Performance Review initiatives.

I was very pleased to see the Clinton administration and Vice President GORE initiate the National Performance Review because, as a former member of the Texas legislature, our State during that time provided the initial leadership for the idea of reinventing government, making it more accountable to the taxpayers.

In 1993 Vice President GORE was appointed to lead the National Performance Review. That effort has resulted in saving over $137 billion in taxpayer monies. It has reduced the Federal civilian work force by 351,000, creating for us the smallest Federal civilian work force as a percentage of the national work force since 1931. The National Performance Review has placed in our Federal agencies over 350 reinvention labs, where management and labor are working together to try to make government work more efficiently.

In the process of implementing the recommendations of the National Performance Review, we have eliminated over 16,000 pages of Federal regulations and we have rewritten and recodified an additional 31,000. In our Federal agencies we have created organizations, over 500 of them, that are attempting to make the Federal Government and its agencies more customer-friendly.

I am pleased that this legislation to create chief financial officers in all of our Federal Government was part of Vice President GORE's National Performance Review. Again, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for his leadership in expanding that act to cover the office of the President.

When we look at this legislation, what we see is that the Federal Government, in a bipartisan way, is attempting to make the Federal Government and its financial practices accountable to the taxpayers. The presence of a chief financial officer in our Federal agencies and the requirements of that act have dramatically improved the financial management practices throughout government.

We believe that a chief financial officer in the Executive Office of the President will continue that positive trend which has been established in our Federal Government. For this reason, we are pleased to join with the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) in bipartisan support of H.R. 437.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and two of his predecessors have done an outstanding job on the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology. I have been fortunate to have the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), and now the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). We are all working together to try to bring order out of a very complicated executive branch that numerous presidents, regardless of party, regardless of ideology, have had difficulty managing.

What we try to work on and have done historically out of this committee is to get the type of functions and systems that would then provide leadership by whatever administration is in power so that the taxpayers could get the most for their money.

It is much like the creation of the city manager movement back in the 1920s. The question was not was it Democratic garbage or Republican garbage on the sidewalks, it was a matter of cleaning it up and getting the garbage out of the city and getting an efficient type of governance. That is exactly what we are about here, is a results-oriented type of government. The chief financial officers are absolutely integral parts of such a responsible government.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), whose committee I do not serve on, who is promoting this legislation. But we have the pleasure, I hope, of serving on

the Committee on Science, and I want to commend him for his overwhelming interest and efficiency, and particularly his interest in technology.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his leadership as the ranking member, and rise to support this legislation and offer a few thoughts, if I might, to suggest that Congress does in fact have good ideas. It is very helpful when Congress can work in a bipartisan manner for efficient government, and to provide the government with the right kinds of tools in order for government to be both effective and efficient.

I am glad that the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN) emphasized that the CFO that might find its way into this Administration's White House is not an indictment or comment on the present administration, but in fact this legislation will provide for a chief financial officer for all of the executives to come, and that it is in fact a bipartisan approach, as was the Office of Management and Budget and as is the Congressional Budget Office. It is to make all of us more efficient.

I am reminded of Vice President GORE's leadership on reinventing government. In fact, I can say how proud I was to be part of the first effort to reward government agencies for their efficiency in that the U.S. General Store, located in my district, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, was one of the first to receive the hammer award, hammering out waste, fraud, and abuse.

So we must acknowledge when we are able to present legislation that can hammer out waste, fraud and abuse, and I hope that the chief financial officer, as it did pass overwhelmingly in the House the last time, will be rewarded with such a vote, but that it will be taken as a signal, again not of indictment, but of recognition as an asset and a tool to be more effective.

□ 1445

I cannot go to my seat, then, without acknowledging these waning moments of the impeachment process, and hopefully that this vote will signal that we in Congress, and as the administration has already been doing, are ready to roll up our sleeves and get back to work. So many in America have acknowledged that this very tragic period, delaying period in our history, has taken us away from the real business of efficient and effective government. We have been bogged down with accusations and charges and personal accusations. But now we are able to signal the call for coming together and work in a bipartisan manner.

I think this particular committee that deals with the oversight and technology, offering this legislation on efficiency is a fine signal to suggest to us that we must end this terrible process in our history, and we must cease and desist and move forward to heal this Nation and begin to work on issues dealing with Social Security and education and other vital issues.

For that let me thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the ranking member for the time allotted to me. I certainly will be supportive of this efficient tool. I do think it is important that Americans realize that Congress does have good ideas and we can work in a bipartisan way with the hand of friendship extended across the aisle.

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

I believe that the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) said that he had no further speakers, so I will close by simply saying that I appreciate again the gentleman's leadership on this legislation and his efforts to work in a bipartisan way; and I also want to thank the minority members of the committee who worked on this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for their efforts. I urge an ''aye'' vote for this legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 437 is as follows:

H.R. 437

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 ''Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) There shall be within the Executive Office of the President a Chief Financial Officer, who shall be designated or appointed by the President from among individuals meeting the standards described in subsection (a)(3). The position of Chief Financial Officer established under this paragraph may be so established in any Office (including the Office of Administration) of the Executive Office of the President.

''(2) The Chief Financial Officer designated or appointed under this subsection shall, to the extent that the President determines appropriate and in the interest of the United States, have the same authority and perform the same functions as apply in the case of a Chief Financial Officer of an agency described in subsection (b).

''(3) The President shall submit to Congress notification with respect to any provision of section 902 that the President determines shall not apply to a Chief Financial Officer designated or appointed under this subsection.

''(4) The President may designate an employee of the Executive Office of the President (other than the Chief Financial Officer), who shall be deemed 'the head of the agency' for purposes of carrying out section 902, with respect to the Executive Office of the President.''.

(b) PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall communicate in writing to the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate a plan for implementation of the provisions of, including the amendments made by, this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—The Chief Financial Officer designated or appointed under section 901(c) of title 31, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall be so designated or appointed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) PAY.—The Chief Financial Officer designated or appointed under such section shall receive basic pay at the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—(1) The President may transfer such offices, functions, powers, or duties thereof, as the President determines are properly related to the functions of the Chief Financial Officer under section 901(c) of title 31, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)).

(2) The personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, arising from, available or to be made available, of any office the functions, powers, or duties of which are transferred under paragraph (1) shall also be so transferred.

(f) SEPARATE BUDGET REQUEST.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (30) the following new paragraph:

''(31) a separate statement of the amount of appropriations requested to carry out the provisions of the Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1999.''.

(g) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 503(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7) by striking ''respectively.'' and inserting ''respectively (excluding any officer designated or appointed under section 901(c)).''; and

(2) in paragraph (8) by striking ''Officers.'' and inserting ''Officers (excluding any officer designated or appointed under section 901(c)).''.

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

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) having assumed the Chair, Mr. CALVERT, 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. 437) to provide for a Chief Financial Officer in the Executive Office of the President, pursuant to House Resolution 44, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 2, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Paul
Royce

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman
Bono
Brady (TX)
Buyer
Ehrlich
Engel
Everett
Graham
Kingston
Kolbe
Lantos
Lofgren
Maloney (NY)
Meek (FL)
Mica
Rush
Sanders
Taylor (MS)

□ 1508

Mr. EDWARDS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. Bono.

Mr. Ehrlich.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 21, because of my participation in a Florida Anti Drug Summit and meetings with Florida Governor Bush in Tallahassee I was not present. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 437.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for today, the remainder of the week, and when next we meet?

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week.

Tomorrow the House will meet at 10:00 a.m. for a pro forma session. As today's Whip Call indicated, there will be no legislative business and no votes tomorrow.

Next week, the House will stand adjourned for the President's Day district work period.

The House will return from the work period on Tuesday, February 23, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2:00 p.m. for legislative business. Votes are expected after 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 23.

Mr. Speaker, a Whip notice outlining legislative business for the week of February 23 will be distributed to Members' offices next week. But we do expect to conclude legislative business