

and choosing programs to adequately fund. We must ensure that the entire funding level for education programs is funded at an adequate level and only then will we see true improvements in achieving among our students. Americans must realize that we truly value all education initiatives and we do not pit one against the other.

I urge members to vote for this motion to instruct.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 222, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—205

Abercrombie	Dixon	Larson
Ackerman	Doggett	Lee
Allen	Dooley	Levin
Andrews	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Baird	Edwards	Lofgren
Baldacci	Engel	Lowe
Baldwin	Eshoo	Lucas (KY)
Barcia	Etheridge	Luther
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Maloney (CT)
Becerra	Farr	Maloney (NY)
Bentsen	Fattah	Markey
Berkley	Filner	Martinez
Berman	Ford	Mascara
Berry	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Bishop	Frost	McCarthy (MO)
Blagojevich	Gejdenson	McCarthy (NY)
Blumenauer	Gephardt	McDermott
Bonior	Gonzalez	McGovern
Borski	Gordon	McIntyre
Boswell	Green (TX)	McKinney
Boucher	Gutierrez	McNulty
Boyd	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Brown (CA)	Hill (IN)	Meeke (NY)
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Menendez
Brown (OH)	Hinchee	Millender-
Capps	Hinojosa	McDonald
Capuano	Hoeffel	Miller, George
Cardin	Holden	Minge
Carson	Holt	Mink
Clay	Hoyer	Moakley
Clayton	Inslie	Mollohan
Clement	Jackson (IL)	Moore
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)
Condit	(TX)	Murtha
Conyers	Jefferson	Nadler
Costello	John	Napolitano
Coyne	Johnson, E. B.	Neal
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Oberstar
Crowley	Kanjorski	Obey
Cummings	Kaptur	Oliver
Danner	Kennedy	Ortiz
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Owens
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Pallone
DeFazio	Kind (WI)	Pascarell
DeGette	Kleczka	Pastor
Delahunt	Klink	Payne
DeLauro	Kucinich	Pelosi
Deutsch	LaFalce	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Lampson	Phelps
Dingell	Lantos	Pickett

Price (NC)	Sherman
Rahall	Shows
Rangel	Sisisky
Reyes	Skelton
Rivers	Slaughter
Rodriguez	Snyder
Roemer	Spratt
Rothman	Stabenow
Roukema	Stark
Roybal-Allard	Stenholm
Rush	Strickland
Sanchez	Tanner
Sanders	Tauscher
Sandlin	Taylor (MS)
Sawyer	Thompson (CA)
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Scott	Thurman
Serrano	Tierney

NAYS—222

Aderholt	Gilman	Paul
Archer	Goode	Pease
Armey	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Goodling	Petri
Baker	Goss	Pickering
Ballenger	Graham	Pitts
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Pombo
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Pomeroy
Barton	Greenwood	Porter
Bass	Gutknecht	Portman
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hansen	Quinn
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bilbray	Hayes	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Regula
Biley	Hefley	Reynolds
Blunt	Herger	Riley
Boehlert	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Boehner	Hilleary	Rogers
Bonilla	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hoekstra	Royce
Brady (TX)	Horn	Ryan (WI)
Bryant	Hostettler	Ryun (KS)
Burr	Houghton	Sabo
Burton	Hulshof	Salmon
Buyer	Hunter	Sanford
Callahan	Hutchinson	Saxton
Calvert	Hyde	Scarborough
Camp	Isakson	Schaffer
Campbell	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Jenkins	Sessions
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Shays
Chambless	Kasich	Sherwood
Chenoweth	Kelly	Shimkus
Coble	King (NY)	Shuster
Coburn	Kingston	Simpson
Collins	Knollenberg	Skeen
Combest	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cook	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Cox	Largent	Smith (WA)
Crane	LaHam	Souder
Cubin	LaTourette	Spence
Cunningham	Lazio	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Leach	Stump
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Sununu
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Sweeney
DeMint	Linder	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Tancredo
Dickey	LoBiondo	Tauzin
Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Manzullo	Terry
Duncan	McCullum	Thomas
Dunn	McCrery	Thornberry
Ehlers	McHugh	Thune
Ehrlich	McInnis	Tiahrt
Emerson	McIntosh	Toomey
English	McKeon	Upton
Everett	Metcalf	Walden
Ewing	Mica	Walsh
Fletcher	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Foley	Miller, Gary	Watkins
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Fossella	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Whitfield
Gallegly	Norwood	Wicker
Ganske	Nussle	Wilson
Gibbons	Ose	Wolf
Gilchrest	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Packard	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Barr	Hoolley	Ros-Lehtinen
Gekas	Myrick	Stupak

□ 1820

Messrs. CANNON, GARY MILLER of California, POMEROY, KNOLLENBERG and RYAN of Wisconsin changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). The Chair will announce the appointment of conferees later today.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-76) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 106TH CONGRESS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 101) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 106th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 101

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Sixth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in that subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$8,564,493; Committee on Armed Services, \$10,599,855; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$9,725,255; Committee on the Budget, \$9,940,000; Committee on Commerce, \$15,537,415; Committee on Education

and the Workforce, \$12,382,569.63; Committee on Government Reform, \$21,028,913; Committee on House Administration, \$6,307,220; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,369,030.17; Committee on International Relations, \$11,659,355; Committee on the Judiciary, \$13,575,939; Committee on Resources, \$11,270,338; Committee on Rules, \$5,069,424; Committee on Science, \$9,018,326.30; Committee on Small Business, \$4,399,035; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$2,860,915; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$14,539,260; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$5,220,900; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$11,960,876.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1999, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2000.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$4,175,983; Committee on Armed Services, \$5,114,079; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,782,996; Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000; Committee on Commerce, \$7,597,758; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$6,427,328.22; Committee on Government Reform, \$10,301,933; Committee on House Administration, \$3,055,255; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,609,105.06; Committee on International Relations, \$5,776,761; Committee on the Judiciary, \$6,523,985; Committee on Resources, \$5,530,746; Committee on Rules, \$2,488,522; Committee on Science, \$4,453,860.90; Committee on Small Business, \$2,094,868; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,382,916; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$7,049,818; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,497,291; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$5,833,436.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2000, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2001.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$4,388,510; Committee on Armed Services, \$5,485,776; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,942,259; Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000; Committee on Commerce, \$7,939,657; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,955,241.41; Committee on Government Reform, \$10,726,980; Committee on House Administration, \$3,251,965; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,759,925.11; Committee on International Relations, \$5,882,594; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,051,954; Committee on Resources, \$5,739,592; Committee on Rules, \$2,580,902; Committee on Science, \$4,564,465.40; Committee on Small Business, \$2,304,167; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,477,999; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$7,489,442; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,723,609; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$6,127,440.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of

such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Sixth Congress. Amounts in the fund shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

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

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Sixth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in that subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$8,414,033; Committee on Armed Services, \$10,342,681; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$9,307,521; Committee on the Budget, \$9,940,000; Committee on Commerce, \$15,285,113; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$11,200,497; Committee on Government Reform, \$19,770,233; Committee on House Administration, \$6,251,871; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,164,444; Committee on International Relations, \$11,313,531; Committee on the Judiciary, \$12,152,275; Committee on Resources, \$10,567,908; Committee on Rules, \$5,069,424; Committee on Science, \$8,931,726; Committee on Small Business, \$4,148,880; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$2,632,915; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$13,220,138; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$4,735,135; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$11,930,338.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at

noon on January 3, 1999, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2000.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$4,101,062; Committee on Armed Services, \$5,047,079; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,552,023; Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000; Committee on Commerce, \$7,564,812; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,908,749; Committee on Government Reform, \$9,773,233; Committee on House Administration, \$2,980,255; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,514,916; Committee on International Relations, \$5,635,000; Committee on the Judiciary, \$5,787,394; Committee on Resources, \$5,208,851; Committee on Rules, \$2,488,522; Committee on Science, \$4,410,560; Committee on Small Business, \$2,037,466; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,272,416; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$6,410,069; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,334,800; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$5,814,367.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2000, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2001.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$4,312,971; Committee on Armed Services, \$5,295,602; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,755,498; Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000; Committee on Commerce, \$7,720,301; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,291,748; Committee on Government Reform, \$9,997,000; Committee on House Administration, \$3,271,616; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,649,528; Committee on International Relations, \$5,678,531; Committee on the Judiciary, \$6,364,881; Committee on Resources, \$5,359,057; Committee on Rules, \$2,580,902; Committee on Science, \$4,521,166; Committee on Small Business, \$2,111,414; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,360,499; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$6,810,069; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,400,335; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$6,115,971.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

There is hereby established a reserve fund of \$3,000,000 for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Sixth Congress. Amounts in the fund shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this funding resolution, House Resolution 101, for the 106th Congress is the fairest and the most equitable in distributing the resources to the committees in the recorded history of the House. More resources, staff, equipment and dollars are being provided to the minority in this resolution than in any other Congress. Speaker Hastert has provided more resources than former Speakers, including Speaker Foley, Speaker Wright, Speaker O'Neill, Speaker Albert, Speaker McCormick, Speaker Rayburn. I think you have got the idea. That also includes Speaker Gingrich in the 104th and the 105th Congress. Our commitment to the goal of two-thirds for the majority and one-third to the minority is closer than at any time in the recorded history of the House. And it is deserving of the Members' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend in Hershey, many of us implicitly pledged to rise above our party labels and work as one when issues of right and fairness demanded it. Today, just 2 days later, after Hershey, we face the first test of that premise. If we pass the test, I have no doubt that the 106th Congress will take a step in reducing the air of animus and acrimony.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the motion to recommit that I will offer at the conclusion of this debate. Without altering the funding totals in House Resolution 101, my motion provides for a fair, one-third/two-thirds division of total committee resources between the majority and minority, and the complete discretion over the use of these resources.

I offer the motion, Mr. Speaker, because House Resolution 101 does not treat 212 Members of this body fairly, and, therefore, contravenes all that Hershey symbolizes. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this minority is the largest minority in this century.

It was not that long ago that I could have counted on the current majority to support my motion to recommit. In a March 30, 1993 letter, signed by 31 Republican leaders, 17 of whom still serve in this body, they wrote then and I quote: "If congressional reform means anything, it means fairness to the minority in allocation and control of resources."

I ask my majority colleagues to consider that language of 31 of their leaders. They went on to say that "reform without fairness is merely shuffling the cards in a marked deck."

Their letter went on to say further, and I quote, "A ratio of one-third/two-thirds for all committee staff, investigative as well as statutory, is a sine qua non, an absolutely essential component of, the effort for bridging the institutional animosities that now poison our policy debates."

It was that criteria of fairness, that PAT ROBERTS and JENNIFER DUNN included in their amendments, and in their motions to recommit on the floor, for which every Republican, save one, DON YOUNG of Alaska, voted in 1993 and 1994, of those Republicans who still serve in this body.

□ 1830

Now let me make it very clear to my colleagues on my side of the aisle. To his credit, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has fully adopted the one-third/two-thirds principle for the Committee on House Administration. I have thanked him for that, and I admire him for that. Since 1995 he has given our side one-third of the total funds, one-third of the staff, and control over our share of the resources.

Unfortunately, no other committee chairman has fully followed his lead. Frequently the chairman will speak of 30 percent as though it is the same as one-third. It is not. One-third equals 33.3 percent, not 30 percent, not 29.8, not 31. The 3.3 percent difference can add up to thousands of dollars in lost resources for the minority.

Again, I call my colleagues' attention to the definition of "fairness" incorporated in this statement, a definition that was then adopted by every Republican, save one, who was a Member of this body in 1993 and 1994, and is a Member today. However, when the chairmen talk about "fairness," they fail to explain why the minority does not control one-third of the nonsalary budget. That means whenever the minority staff needs to purchase a computer or a copy machine or a box of paper clips, it must ask the chairman for the money to make the purchase, a situation of which the then minority in 1993 and 1994 bitterly complained.

Often chairmen will claim that the minority receives one-third of the committee staff slots. That may in some instances be true, but if the minority does not also receive one-third of the total committed funding, the staff slots may be irrelevant. And if a chairman arbitrarily exempts any portion of a committee staff as nonpartisan administrative personnel even though these employees work full-time in the majority office, then the claim has been inflated.

Another refrain we hear to justify a less than perfect implementation of the one-third principle is that Democrats on some committees did not respect it when they were in the majority, and therefore it has taken time to "grow" their budgets to the full one-

third. That argument may have worked in the 104th, and perhaps in the 105th, but very frankly it is time to do, Mr. Speaker, what they said on the minority side was fairness. That is the criteria that they set; that is the motion to recommit that I will offer. It is exactly like that offered by PAT ROBERTS in 1993 and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) in 1994.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would only tell my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that perhaps he should have had the foresight to vote for that motion to recommit. Since he did not and no Democrat voted for it, they sent a pretty clear message that that was not something that they were for. Notwithstanding that, I think my colleagues will find that the new Republican majority has moved in that direction significantly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a very hard-working member of the committee.

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

First of all, I believe this is an excellent resolution. We, as my colleagues know, had some problems the last few years on this particular issue, but it is in much better shape now than it has been in the past, both in terms of a fair distribution and allocation among the committees as well as a modest overall increase which will better allow the committees to do their work.

The remainder of my comments will deal with the issues raised by the previous speaker, which I believe are outlined the ideal that we are striving for. I have several comments:

First, I have a chart here which reviews the historical development of relative staff allocation between the majority and minority on the various committees. My colleagues will note, as they look at the blue line which denotes, on this chart, the staff levels for the minority that designates the number of minority staff slots that are assigned for the various committees. The minority party resources are shown as a percentage, plotted on the left side, and the red lines indicate resources allocated to the minority. My colleagues can notice here a great jump as one goes from the Democratic-controlled House to the Republican-controlled House.

This jump is something that those of us in mathematics refer to as a step function. There is a discontinuity here. If any of my colleagues understand electronics, they will also recognize this as a diagram of the current flow through a transistor as a function of voltage. We can make a computer out of things like this! But that is not what

we are doing here. We are simply pointing out a tremendous dislocation of resources allocated to the minority, comparing the Democratic leadership to the Republican leadership.

I think we deserve a great deal of credit for the improvement the Republicans made immediately upon assuming the majority, and for the continuous improvement we are making now, trying to reach the ultimate goal of 33 percent. We are actually getting fairly close.

The other factor I note is that in doing some research on this, I discovered a Roll Call newspaper article from 1989. I discovered somewhat to my surprise that the Committee on House Administration at that time had set a 20 percent ratio for the minority, which is of course off the bottom of my chart here and does not even begin to compare with what the Republicans have done for the minority in this Congress.

But what is really interesting in this article is a quote from the then-chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Brooks, who made the comment that he did not see why we even needed the 20 percent figure for the minority because, after all, the Democrats had no say in the staffing of the Republican-controlled executive branch. Following that argument, we of course should be below the 20 percent level now because we now have a Democrat President running the country, and why should we allow the Democrats more than 20 percent? Mr. Speaker, I think that reasoning is faulty, but it is indicative of some of the attitude some Democrats had at that point.

The point is simply that the Republicans have made a very good effort to achieve the goal of a two-thirds majority, one-third minority allocation of resources and staff slots. We are making good progress. Frankly, I hope we get there very soon, and we may be able to do that in the next funding cycle. But certainly no one can fault us for our efforts to achieve that goal. I am proud of what we have achieved, and we will continue to work in that direction.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our constituents sent us here to tend to their business and represent their views to the best of our abilities. This debate today is central to fulfilling that mission.

We talk about committee funding. What we are really talking about is whether Members of Congress have adequate resources to represent their constituents in committees, and much of the most important work in Congress, the fact-finding, takes place in committee.

The Democrat minority has made a very fair and responsible request. We make up 49 percent of the House of Representatives, and we are simply asking for one-third of the committee funding. As former Speaker Newt Gingrich once said, giving one-third of the funding to the minority is absolutely indispensable for bridging the institutional animosities that now poison our policy debates. We all know the damage this institution has suffered recently because of venomous partisan clashes. It is my sincere hope that these dark days are behind us and we can forge a stronger bond of trust to work together for the good of our Nation. A more just distribution of resources will take us down this path.

Let me cite the work of one committee as an example of why it is so important that we have the one-third ratio. The performance of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight illustrates what can happen when there is nothing to rein in an overly zealous partisan agenda. The committee held few hearings, spent huge sums of money, duplicated resources available elsewhere, and even manipulated transcripts to advance their agenda. Had the minority had the opportunity and resources to participate more fully in the conduct of the committee's business, it might have been able to serve as a restraint on this committee's record.

Despite its record, this committee has asked for a 7 percent funding increase while freezing the minority's resources at 25 percent. This is unacceptable.

Back in 1995 the Committee on House Administration stated its goal was to have one-third funding, and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has lived up to that goal. Unfortunately, several committees have not.

Let me close with two final points. There has been a lot of talk about what the Democrats did and what the Republicans have done. It is important to keep in mind that over 43 percent of the House Members serving here today, 189 Members, did not serve in this Congress prior to 1994. We are not so much interested in the history of who did what to who. We are interested in serving our constituents and moving forward.

One of my favorite sayings is: "Everybody is entitled to their own opinion, but not to their own version of the facts." And we all know, Democrats and Republicans, that one of the places where we can come together and minimize disagreement is agreeing upon what the facts are. Unless the Democrats have the staff support they need to do their work so we can come together on the fact-finding in the committees, then we cannot truly do what we were sent here to do, which is debate our opinions.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution today and to support the Hoyer motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are a lot of Members who have not been here long and therefore their history is not as deep or as long as some others. I am going to introduce the new chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This is a headline from Roll Call, March 27, 1989. The headline says: "Six Committees Fail to Meet the New 20 Percent Minority Ratio Test." The Democrats were using a 20 percent goal. On the Committee on the Judiciary the ratio in 1989 was 82 percent to the majority, 18 percent to the minority. That is clearly unacceptable. But when we have to move funding of a committee the size and scope of this one, and this one was not alone, we have got to move over time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who is here to tell us what we are doing in the 106th Congress.

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

This institution is charged with a critically important function. We are elected to adopt policy and to oversee its implementation. The enormity of this responsibility is sometimes forgotten as we go about our day-to-day business, but we all know that without the assistance of experienced staff we could not possibly keep ourselves sufficiently informed on the workings of a government that will spend nearly \$1.8 trillion in the year 2000. The committees must be adequately funded and staffed if Congress is going to have any ability to make informed judgments as to the operation of that government or the existence of unmet needs.

Given the enormity of this task, I believe that the \$180.4 million, 2-year budget that the Committee on House Administration has proposed for the 19 House committees will be money well spent. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I can personally attest to the invaluable role that committee staff plays in advising and preparing Members to make difficult policy choices that will shape the laws of our country.

But we cannot expect to attract and retain the high-quality, expert staff we need if we cannot afford to offer salaries that are competitive with the private sector. We must be able to reward good work with merit raises, and we must be able to pay cost-of-living increases when necessary.

Mr. Speaker, that is largely what the modest 1.5 percent yearly increase in this resolution will be used to fund, but beyond that we must make sure that we have sufficient staff to undertake our legislative and our oversight responsibilities.

In the 105th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary was one of the most active committees in the House. We were referred over 15 percent of the total legislative measures introduced and were responsible for the enactment of 70 bills and 10 private laws. We anticipate the committee will continue if not increase this pace in the 106th Congress.

□ 1845

Statistics are not everything. Our charge is not to turn out legislation with the speed of light but to produce legislation that is thoughtfully and thoroughly considered so it will stand the political and legislative test of time.

A short listing of the issues we deal with in our committee shows the complexity and controversy of our agenda. For example, in the 106th we will take up bankruptcy reform which failed to be enacted in the last Congress. Other high-profile legislation we anticipate handling includes juvenile justice reform and encryption export controls. Religious freedom legislation and a victims' right constitutional amendment, complex and volatile issues that will be on our calendar. Criminalization of partial-birth abortions, employment preferences and set-asides, civil asset forfeiture reform, intellectual property and other high tech legislation are topics we will revisit.

The committees are constantly challenged with trying to stretch inadequate resources to cover all of these issues and more. If we are forced to spread our staff resources too thin, our work product will suffer. I am concerned that we do not have the resources both to continue our legislative pace and do meaningful oversight of agencies under our jurisdiction. That is why I have asked for additional staff to engage in comprehensive oversight of the \$21 billion, 120,000 employee Department of Justice.

The Committee on the Judiciary's 2-year, \$12.2 million budget allocation pales in comparison with the Federal resources we are charged with overseeing. The work of the committee is ultimately the work of the people, and we must not hamstring them by denying them adequate resources.

I applaud the Committee on House Administration for the well-crafted budget package we are considering and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 101, and I urge support for the motion to recommit with instructions offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) to guarantee the minority control of at

least one-third of the resources of all committees and one-third of disbursements from the reserve fund.

One would think that it is fairly clear that if the ratio in the full House of Representatives is approximately 51 percent to 49 percent, that at the very least the 49 percent should have at least one-third of the human resource allocations and one-third of the funding, but that is not the case, and that is why this resolution is so inherently unfair.

I think that my Committee on Banking and Financial Services is probably in better shape than most with respect to fairness, but even in my own case we have severe difficulties.

For example, in 1994 our committee had 93 slots. The committee's work has increased exponentially and we have reduced the number of slots to 65. Assume that we could understand and accept that, but there is a difficulty. Of the 65 slots, we who have 49 percent of the vote have but 19 of the 65 slots. That is not fundamental fairness. That is not fundamental fairness at all.

It is very difficult to do the job if there are inadequate resources. What is the job that we have to do? Broad housing and economic development jurisdiction, expansive consumer jurisdiction, broad authority over the regulation of financial services firms, substantial economic policy responsibilities, broad authority over all of the international development institutions and global economic issues.

We have one staff person who handles all consumer and community development issues; one detailee who handles international economic issues, since we cannot afford to actually hire appropriate staff.

I recommend approval of the motion to recommit with instructions and defeat of the committee funding resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the new chairman of the Committee on Rules in the 106th Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to simply extend congratulations to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, my very good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and just say that he has led us very, very strongly in the direction of creating a very, very strong balance on this issue of minority representation.

Having served in the minority for so many years, we are very sensitive to that concern on this side of the aisle. I believe that the balance that has been struck is a very healthy one, and I hope that the House will move and pass this resolution so that we can begin to address a lot of the concerns that are out there.

Technologically, we need to make sure that the equipment is available.

We need to have first class staff, and I think we have that, but we have to compensate them and I think that this measure does just that.

I thank my friend and congratulate him for his fine work.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1993, as I said earlier, 31 Republican leaders wrote to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and Mr. Hamilton in their capacity as cochairs of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. The gentleman heard the "*sine qua non*" quote, that one-third of the resources were necessary to overcome the poisonous atmosphere that existed.

Did the gentleman agree with that premise?

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I did. The problem that we faced was that we were never able to get that measure even considered on the House floor, and that was very frustrating for many of us.

Mr. HOYER. I will tell the gentleman that it was considered twice, on a motion to recommit by Mr. ROBERTS, and a motion to recommit by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), and the chairman of the Committee on Rules voted for it twice. He will have the opportunity to vote for it a third time.

Mr. DREIER. Did my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, vote for it at that time, is the question that we need to ask? We welcome the gentleman to the fold.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary talked about the necessity for resources. Also included in that motion to recommit was a cut of 25 percent of the resources available to the committees. We did not think that was wise at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, standing before the House today is like *deja vu*. Two years ago, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform, I argued that the House should reject the committee funding resolution because the majority allocated only 25 percent of the budget of the Committee on Government Reform to the minority.

I could make virtually the same statement today. The work of the Committee on Government Reform last Congress was extraordinarily partisan. The committee's campaign finance investigation was widely acknowledged to be one of the most unfair, abusive and wasteful investigations since the McCarthy hearings, and the most expensive congressional investigation in history.

As described by Norman Ornstein, a congressional expert at the American Enterprise Institute, and I am quoting him, the Burton investigation is going to be remembered as a case study in how not to do a congressional investigation.

At the outset of this Congress I hoped that things would have changed. In early January I wrote the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and asked for three things: Fair rules for issuing subpoenas; fair subcommittee ratios; and a fair budget. Unfortunately, the majority rejected each of these requests.

The committee adopted rules that once again allowed the chairman to issue subpoenas unilaterally with no opportunity for the minority to appeal his decision to the full committee. The committee then adopted subcommittee ratios that once again gave the minority far fewer seats than we were entitled to, and today the majority is proposing another unfair budget.

The majority falsely claims that it is substantially increasing minority funding over the last Congress, but that is just an accounting gimmick. As this chart here indicates, the indisputable fact is that the committee Democrats are being allocated only 25.9 percent of the committee's budget, an increase of less than 1 percent over the last Congress, less than 1 percent.

It was 25 percent in the previous Congress; 25 percent in the Congress before that. In the year 2000, Democrats will receive 25.9 percent of the committee's budget. That is not reasonable progress toward the third by anyone's definition. It is not the 33 percent of the budget the majority adopted as House policy. I urge my colleagues to vote against this partisan and unfair resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, in 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) indicated that there was an accounting gimmick which was being used to distort the percentages. In 1992, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means at that time, Mr. Rostenkowski, stated that the committee had 14 shared administrative staff.

In 1994, in the markup, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said it is inconceivable that other committees have no nonpartisan staff such as the receptionist, the calendar clerks, et cetera, who serve both the majority and the minority. Many committees have reported them to us.

The Democrats when they were in the majority routinely used the allocation of shared administrative staff. The problem is now, when we in the majority use it, it is somehow an accounting gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a very valuable member of the committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think tonight what we have to deal with in Congress are the facts. I think the American people and the Members of Congress and history are interested in the facts.

The facts, my friend, are quite simple. In the 103rd Congress, under the Democrat majority, the Democrats expended \$223 million to run the committees. The fact is, under the 106th Congress, we are expending \$183 million, committee funding of \$40 million less than when the Democrats controlled the House of Representatives.

The facts are that the numbers of staff in the 103rd Congress under the Democrat majority were 1,639. The facts are in this budget, proposed by the Republican majority, the staff positions are 1,153; 30 percent less staff.

In addition to staff levels that have been reduced, the Republican majority in these 4-plus years have privatized the dining room, privatized the barber shop, privatized the printing office, provided public parking, which is a new thing that we provided the public, in addition to cutting staff, cutting funding.

We even stopped the delivery of ice to Members' offices, long after refrigerators were instituted, with an additional 12 staff cuts. Those folks do not deliver ice anymore to us, even though we have refrigerators.

We did all of this and we did it fairly, because I stood up here in the 103rd Congress and held up a chart similar to this that said 55 to 5. We may recall, and history recorded it very well in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that was the staff ratios on the predecessor of the Committee on Government Reform, which was Government Operations, 55 to 5. I just made a new one for tonight. This is the ratio accorded to us.

In this budget, in fact, we give them 28 percent of the budget and 30 percent of the staff. If we just take a minute and look at the minority resource comparison, and these are the facts, my colleagues, 33 percent more we are providing. In the 103rd, there were only two. In the 106th Congress, the number of committees provided are now 9 with 33 percent of the staff; 25 to 32 percent was 12, is now 8; and less than 25 percent, in the 106th Congress, zero.

□ 1900

We are being fair. We are being even-handed. We are equally distributing the resources in a very progressive manner. The score was 5 to 55 giving the old minority this ratio, very unfair. Today we see an equitable distribution. These are the facts and these are the figures, and this is what we must deal with, Mr. Speaker.

I believe the Republicans have done an excellent job in both allocating resources and at the same time address-

ing the concerns of the American people. That is cutting the staff and the expense and the bureaucracy in Washington and in this Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JOHN CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and one of the senior members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. STENY HOYER) as the ranking member for doing such an excellent job of studying where we are getting to, not where we have been. I love these allusions back into the past, as if they are some guide or reason for injustices to continue into the present.

Now, as one of the most partisan—the ranking member of one of the most partisan committees in this Congress, I want to tell the Members that the funding and staffing problems go right to the core of many of our problems.

I quote the present chairman of this Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HENRY HYDE), who has said, "Two-thirds and one-third ratios are used in the Senate, and I believe its realization in the House would enormously reduce the often acrimonious proceedings to which the House is subjected." And yet, and yet, even with some improvements at this late date, we are still trying to get somewhere near this goal.

I am very disappointed. I have little else to do but to urge that we accept the alternative that has been put out that states what everybody keeps saying they support, and yet will not get to. This goes beyond a recommit and final passage, this is the matter of simple fairness.

I, for one, am finding it more difficult to suffer through simple requests for publications, witness travel, stenographers, this is the Committee on the Judiciary, legal publications; no control over the funding. And here we now come, and even in impeachment it was the past Speaker that got us beyond the four out of 18 slots, if Members can believe it, for a committee on impeachment.

I come here very disappointed and not happy at all about the position that we find ourselves in in the 106th Congress. It is unnecessary. This has gone on, this partisanship that affects our resource and staff allocations, and it is now affecting our ordinary work.

For that reason, I am not able to support the proposal that is before us, and I really hope that we can turn this matter back until we get a further understanding of how we reach this very complex physicist's evaluation of one-third and two-thirds.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) who just spoke is on the Committee on the Judiciary now. I indicated that the ratio at that time was 82 percent majority to 18 percent minority on the Committee on the Judiciary, but actually, it was the Committee on Government Operations at that time, and that ratio was 85 percent majority and only 15 percent minority.

Let me also say that the Committee on the Judiciary is getting 10 new staff in this Congress. Rarely does a committee get double-digit increases in their staff, but the Committee on the Judiciary is getting 10 new staff. What is the split? Is it like it was in the old days, eight and two? No. Is it seven and three, the request that they are making? No. Is it six and four? No. Unprecedented in the history of this House, the majority is dividing 10 new staff, five to the minority and five to the majority, a 50/50 split.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), a member of the Committee on House Administration who has now spent enough years in the process of listening to this case to have that kind of institutional knowledge that so many of the Members do not share.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of our committee, for the excellent work he has done in bringing this resolution to the Floor for this Congress that really does bring about a continued effort for fairness for both parties as we try to do our legislative job.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of fairness, there has been an awful lot of it talked about on the Floor tonight. I have been here in the Congress for 8 years. I have spent 6 years on this committee dealing with this issue. Thankfully, the last session of Congress and this session we are dealing with a 2-year budget cycle. We have to go through a lot of this rhetoric every year. It is always acrimonious, because when one is in the minority they always feel like they should have more.

I think my friends on the other side of the aisle will acknowledge that we, the majority now, are treating the minority much more fairly than we were ever treated when we were in the minority.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and I had this discussion in the committee last week. When we took control after 1994 there was a great debate, and there were some on my side in the majority who wanted to treat the Democrats the way they treated us when we were in the minority. Many of us argued that, no, we should treat the minority in the House the same way that we had asked to be treated.

When we look at our efforts at trying to get committee funding for the mi-

nority up to the one-third goal, we have made a significant effort. So I think that as we now approach about 31 percent on average, with more than half of the committees at one-third or more, that we are making an honest effort and a good try toward the goal we set out.

We should not forget what is really more I think at the base of the problem and the argument that we are having tonight. It goes back to 1994, when we promised the American people in the Contract With America that we would cut committee funding by one-third.

In 1995, we did cut committee funding by one-third, cutting over \$50 million out of the committees, reducing the number of slots. Even today, some 4½ years later, we are spending \$40 million less this year than what was spent in 1994, the last year of the Democrat majority. So there is not as much money to go around.

But I remember quite clearly on the opening day of this session of the Congress, when the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) offered the olive branch to the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), saying, I think, I am going to do everything I can to go halfway, and maybe even more so at times.

I think what we are asking the entire House to do is to do more with less, to live within the constraints that we promised the American people we would do when we took the majority. The budgets are cut. We are trying to pinch our pennies. If we look at the budget over the next 2 years we will see that there is a 3 percent increase in total. That is 1½ percent per year, well below the rate of inflation.

We made that commitment to the American people that Congress could do more with less. We are trying to make that commitment and keep that commitment, and also at a time while we are treating the minority with the fairness that we had asked for.

Is it perfect? No, it is not. It was not perfect before and it will not be perfect even the next time. But our goal and our word to work towards that one-third goal is genuine, and I think that the minority understands as clearly as I do that we are doing much better in terms of the way we are treating them than the way we were being treated when we were in the minority.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the President of the incoming freshman class.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, and speak today as someone who is new to this institution.

I have been listening for the past number of minutes to people recounting old battles and old wars and old perceived injustices. We are new as freshmen to this institution, our first term. When we came here at orienta-

tion we pledged on both sides, Democrats and Republicans, to work together in a spirit of bipartisanship and a spirit of fairness.

It is to that spirit of bipartisanship and fairness that I speak to my Republican colleagues today. I have to ask a simple question: If the ratio of Members in this House is divided 49 to 51, how is it possibly fair that the ratios in terms of funding for committees should be less than one-third to two-thirds? This is not, today, about injustices of the past. This is about a simple discussion of what is fair and what is right and how we should conduct ourselves.

I am calling today on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, freshman Democrats and freshman Republicans, to ask a simple question: What is fair, and do we stand for fairness?

I would submit that the request that has been made as a minimum of one-third to two-thirds ratio is perfectly fair. In fact, it is factually quite imbalanced, but we are only asking one-third to two-thirds. I would call on my friends and colleagues from the Republican side to join with me and with the freshmen to achieve that balance which just a couple of years ago people asked to achieve, and which frankly is perfectly just, perfectly reasonable, and would set this institution on a true bipartisan course.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman from Washington that in the spirit of Hershey, when a gesture is made, that gesture ought to be returned. Now, I would tell the gentleman that if he would examine the committee funding, there are a number of committees that exceed that one-third request that is being made: The Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Budget, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. One hundred sixty-seven Democrats sit on a committee that now meets the two-thirds/one-third ratio.

So I am not looking at the past, I tell my friend, the gentleman from Washington, I am looking at today. One hundred sixty-seven Democrats are now sitting on committees that meet that figure. The reason the other committees have not moved is that they had such an egregiously low base. We have made progress every Congress so that no committee is less than 25 percent, and we will continue to make progress.

It would seem to me that as a new Member, in the spirit of Hershey, if we reach out to one hundred sixty-seven Members of the Democratic Caucus, at

least one would reach back and say, thank you, the two-thirds/one-third is appropriate, it is necessary. The one hundred sixty-seven Democrats, by their vote, can prove that what we are choosing to do is right and proper. It will be quite surprising to me if not one Democrat out of the one hundred sixty-seven reaches his or her hand across the aisle to say, you are doing what you committed to do, that which we never did.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I really would like to speak to my dear friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle and state that, in the spirit of Hershey, a one-third/two-thirds split is totally fair, and builds on two votes that were taken on this floor that supported such action.

As my dear colleague just pointed out, there has been some progress, but when the majority created a new committee, the Census Committee, this would have been a perfect opportunity, an absolutely perfect opportunity to put forward the fair two-thirds/one-third division.

□ 1915

But what happened when they created a Subcommittee on Census is they only provided the minority with 25 percent of the resources, not 33.3 percent, but 25 percent of the resources. In the ratios of slots of Members assigned to the committee, it was terribly unfair, 11 to 4, 11 Republicans to 4 Democrats in the allocation of slots.

The census is supposed to be about fairness and fair counts. This would have been an opportunity to implement the one-third/two-thirds division. But my colleagues gave us 25 percent, the same as what my colleagues gave the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight over the past 6 years. There has been absolutely no movement.

I must say that the Republican funding resolution, which does include a 3 percent increase, does nothing to guarantee the minority a fair one-third/two-thirds split in resources.

The reserve fund is allocated at \$3 million for the 106th Congress, but the Republicans are allocating \$2.4 million to the Subcommittee on Census of the Committee on Government Reform, money that came out of the reserve fund in the 105th. Democrats are only getting 25 percent and again only four of the 15 slots.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the spirit of Hershey to support fairness, the one-third/two-thirds split, the Hoyer amendment, and motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I tell the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that we are beginning in the name of Hershey, to call out. Perhaps we can bring it a little closer to home. I have a Roll Call editorial from earlier this month, March 4, which I think is quite succinct in summing up much of the debate that we have heard so far. The editorial says, "Quit Whining". It says, "The more we look at history, the less it appears the Democrats have much basis to whine."

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, what I told Roll Call, and what I repeat now, is that we are not whining. We are reminding our Republican colleagues, who said when they were in minority, that fairness was one-third of the resources of the committees. We are now reminding them of their statement and saying, if they want fairness, do fairness. Do it tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to recommit. We should not make this a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. It is a simple matter of fairness. By adopting this motion, we will help both parties to better serve the American people.

I recently became the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, and I must commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) for the bipartisan manner in which he has run the committee. Even though we do not always agree on policy, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) has made every effort to accommodate both myself and my staff and to run the committee in a fair manner. Although we have had some difficulties with funding, once the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) became aware of the problem, he worked to rectify it.

We are now working out our problems through the committee process, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for working with me to solve this problem. The bipartisanship of our committee should serve as an example to the rest of Congress.

However, too often committee funding has been used as a political tool. Too often the party in the majority has turned committee funding into a partisan issue. This must change.

I have told the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) that the mi-

nority should control one-third of the committee's budget. This is only fair, and this is what this motion will do. As the ranking members, we are committing ourselves today to ensure that the minority party will be able to serve the Members and the American people.

I for one do not believe that access to periodicals, journals, computer software and basic office supplies should be turned into political game. These things are needed to properly run any office and to provide a basic level of service to those Members serving on a committee.

Six years ago, the Republican minority talked about using a one-third/two-thirds ratio as a way to help bridge the institutional animosity which too often plagues this body. Today we are asking them to deliver on this promise. I urge both sides of the aisle to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), one of our Members who I think has demonstrated a commitment to fairness throughout his career here.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me this time, and I rise in favor of the motion to recommit.

But first of all, I want to address what this debate is about. I do not need a chart. I do not need a graph. I do not need to put all kinds of statistics and facts and figures out there. This is very simple. It can be about one word, and that is fairness.

It is the fairness, if the Democrats represent 49 percent of this Chamber, they should get 49 percent of the funding. If Republicans represent 49 percent of the Chamber, they should get 49 percent of the committee funding. It is so critically important to be fair on this funding resolution for committee work.

Such scholars as Richard Fenno have said that the work of Congress is the work of its committees. We can have our partisan fights out here on the floor, and I hope we would be civil about it; but back in our committee rooms across the halls, I would hope that we could be bipartisan and fair about how we fund our committee staffs and our trips to our Districts and how we allocate funds to represent those Districts.

Woodrow Wilson, who was a scholar and a President, talked about the importance of committee work in representing our constituents. I hear time and time again from the other side about 1989 and what the Democrats did, and they admit it was wrong; in 1992 what the Democrats did, and they say it was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we study history in order not to repeat the mistakes of the past and not to justify action today that is based on mistakes of yesterday.

I would hope both sides could come forward and commit, whether Democrats or Republicans have the majority, after the year 2000 elections, that

we would agree simply on fairness to fund these committee resolutions at the percentage of the respective bodies on both sides.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a member of the Committee on Rules and also a member of this new majority leadership team, to discuss this resolution.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee funding resolution as fair and responsible legislation that will allow our committees to fulfill their policy, legislative and oversight responsibilities to all the American people.

I see no reason why any Member of the House should oppose this legislation.

First of all, this committee funding resolution is fiscally responsible. It provides a modest 3 percent increase in overall funding for our committees. That is a mere 1½ percent increase each year. This increase recognizes some of the modernization needs of our committees, while adhering to the principle of doing more with less.

This committee funding resolution is fair to the minority. It moves more committees toward the overall goal of allocating one-third of committee resources to the minority's control. In fact, nine committees of the 106th Congress will provide one-third or more of their resources to the minority. This compares to only two committees that met this goal in the 103rd Congress when Republicans were in the minority.

Under the Republican majority, 31 percent of staff is allocated to the minority, and 32 percent of staff salaries go to the minority. So I think the cries from the other side of the aisle that they are being mistreated and misused are just disingenuous or, at the very least, some people have very, very short memories.

Further, the committee funding resolution scales back the reserve fund to 62 percent. Instead of offering a tempting pot of overflowing dollars for committees to dip into, this reserve fund will serve as a true rainy day fund for the unanticipated needs that are likely to arise over the course of 2 years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out how very far we have come since the Republicans took over control of Congress. This year's committee funding resolution is still \$40 million less than the 103rd Congress. The overall number of committee staff is still 30 percent below the staff levels of the 103rd Congress. Again, we are doing more with less in the true spirit of government reform.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, there is much work which we, in a bipartisan

way, must accomplish for the American people. Much of this work is done in our congressional committees by very talented, very hardworking staff on both sides of the aisle. We should pass this committee funding resolution to ensure that that work gets done. I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that we have 3½ minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) used the word "disingenuous," and then she changed it. I know she did not mean to cast any aspersions, nor do I.

The gentlewoman from Ohio, like 109 of her colleagues who were here in 1993, voted for the motion to recommit that I will offer. She voted that one-third of the resources represented fairness.

I will tell the gentlewoman from Ohio that, notwithstanding the representations of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the committee, he and I disagree on the assertions. There is but one committee that provides one-third of the resources and control to the minority—just one. To his credit, it is the committee of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS). No questions asked. As the gentleman from California has pointed out, it is really more than one-third of the resources, because we divided equally a staffer on the Joint Committee on Printing.

My friends, if we want fairness, we need to give fairness. It has been said that we did not do right. Let me accept that premise. Is it, therefore, to be like the Hatfields and McCoys—that you did not do right, so we are not going to do right, and we will continue to fight? We will continue to create a poisonous atmosphere, of which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) spoke, and of which 30 other Republican leaders in their letter spoke, when they—not the Democrats—but the Republicans said "one-third of the resources, not just staff, but of the resources available is fairness."

I am offering a motion to recommit, which was offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and Mr. ROBERTS. The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) said, and I will not quote it all, for my colleagues can see it here on the chart, "The American people have been clear about something else, as well, Mr. Speaker. They want fairness, bipartisanship, and responsibility in spending from their Congress."

She went on to say, "I want to use my time, Mr. Speaker, to talk about

how, even at this 11th hour, the House could move toward fairness and reform taxpayers so earnestly desire." She said, therefore, among other things, "that we achieve the goal by limiting the majority to a 2 to 1 staff advantage." One-third/two-thirds.

□ 1930

I am going to offer that motion to recommit. I will pass out a sheet that will show my colleagues how they voted on it before. Only one Republican voted against that, and that was the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. ROBERTS said in 1994, and I want all my colleagues to see this. This is Mr. ROBERTS. "If lightning strikes, and the sun comes up in the west, and Republicans take over Congress, we are going to do that for you. You will at least get one-third."

The Sun came up in the west, much to the chagrin of my side of the aisle, my colleagues. And my Republican colleagues said when it did, we would get one-third. It is time to redeem that promise. Vote for the motion to recommit that I offer, as previously offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JENNIFER DUNN) and Senator PAT ROBERTS, then Congressman PAT ROBERTS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman from Maryland noted that that was former Representative PAT ROBERTS. He is not here to vote on the resolution or the motion to recommit. As a matter of fact, when the motion to recommit was presented previously, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Maryland, not one Democrat voted for the motion to recommit. Not one.

Had they been prescient about the sun coming up, maybe some of them would have, and then, of course, we would have accomplished our goal. It would have been locked in. But since they did not have the foresight, since they left us with 12 percent of the resources, 15 percent of the resources, 18 percent of the resources, when we became the majority we had to start building toward that one-third. We have built toward that one-third in every Congress we have been in the majority.

Under the leadership of the Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), this majority, in House Resolution 101, is not repeating the mistakes of the past. This committee resolution is the fairest and most equitable in the recorded history of the House.

One hundred sixty-seven Democrats sit on a committee that divides the resources two-thirds, one-third. I would think that if my colleagues missed their opportunity on the motion to recommit to lock in two-thirds, one-third, some of my Democratic colleagues would be smart enough to lock in the two-thirds, one-third on those committees.

Give us some votes so that I can say yes, the Democrats get it. The more we work together, the more we are able to give my colleagues the two-thirds, one-third. Instead, my colleagues say we have to deliver all the votes.

The next time we do the committee resolution, this majority, in the 107th Congress, I am going to turn to these people and ask them what they need. Because we reached across the aisle in the spirit of Hershey and said 167 Democrats have got what they want. Give us one vote; we will return the gesture on the motion to recommit, just as my colleagues did on ours. But, please, on final passage, on this House Resolution, the fairest and most equitable in the history of the House, give us at least one Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

[From Rollcall, Mar. 4, 1999]

QUIT WHINING

The evidence suggests that Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) really does mean to reach out to Democrats and make the House a less ferocious place than it was under ex-Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-GA). We suggest that Democrats stop grouching and meet him halfway—at least to the extent of not boycotting this month's Hershey, Pa., civility retreat.

Hastert is meeting regularly with Democrats on budget issues and is promising to permit votes on raising the minimum wage and campaign finance reform. Meanwhile, House Administration Chairman Bill Thomas (R-Calif.) may help Democrats gain a larger share of the budgets on the Judiciary and Government Reform Committees.

Democrats have been loudly complaining about membership ratios of committees and about committee budgets and some ranking members have cited the disparities as reasons they refuse to co-operate with leadership efforts to bring GOP and Democratic Members and their families together for the weekend of March 19-21 at Hershey.

The more we look at history, the less it appears the Democrats have much basis to whine—although they should note well how ill-used they feel and vow to do better by the Republicans should Democrats be returned to power in the House.

In 1993, when Democrats last were in the majority, Republicans held 41 percent of House seats, but Democrats accorded them an average of 24 percent of committee staff positions—falling to 13 percent on the old Government Operations Committee and 11 percent on Judiciary. Democrats now are complaining that they only control 25 percent of the resources on Government Reform and 23 percent on Judiciary.

Back then, Republicans complained that fairness demanded they get at least one-third of committee budgets and staff slots rather than less than one-fourth. By this standard, Democrats have little to which they can object—except on Judiciary and Government Reform where they get just a quarter of committee resources.

Funding ratios meet or nearly meet the one-third majority standard on Budget, Education and the Workforce, Rules, Veterans' Affairs and House Administration. On most other committees the GOP-Democratic ratio is nearly 70-30—not up to the ideal, but better than the 76-24 average back when Democrats ruled the House.

As we've noted before, the same basic situation prevails with committee assignments.

Democrats say that they should have something like 48.5 percent of committee slots, reflecting their strength in the House, but actually have between 41 and 45 percent on major committees. In 1993, though, Republicans averaged 38 percent of the slots on major committees, not their 41 percent in the House.

We suggest that Democrats and Republicans talk about these problems, among others, at Hershey. Now that the Gingrich era is over—and in spite of the recent impeachment unpleasantness—it ought to be possible to begin solving them.

MINORITY RESOURCE COMPARISON—103rd CONGRESS VS 106TH CONGRESS

	Democratic Majority, 103rd Congress	Republican Majority, 106th Congress
33% or more	2	9
25% to 32%	12	8
Less than 25%	5	0

Committees with non-partisan staff, Armed Services and Standards of Official Conduct, are not listed. Authorized by the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this Resolution, which sets the funding for our Committees here in the House. This resolution is an important one, because in many respects, with its passage, we begin to erode the spirit of bipartisanship that I had hoped would permeate the work of the 106th Congress.

When the Majority first took control of the House, we had expected that they would still respect the views, if not the voting power, of the Minority. Yet that has not been the case. Here, half a decade down the road from the "Contract with America," we see that the Minority is limited to just 28% of the House budget. This is appalling in light of the fact that we are just five votes short of holding a majority of our own. In fact, this resolution takes away almost half the value of our vote—and the value of the resources that we have for the constituents that we represent.

For those of you who believe that Committee funding makes little difference in how the policies of our country are forged I must note that the two Committees which reported the most partisan legislation, the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on the Judiciary, have the worst funding ratios. As it stands in the current form of the resolution, the Judiciary Committee on which I sit, has approximately three-quarters of its resources dedicated to the Majority. As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I find that deeply disturbing because it means that theoretically, my staff is outnumbered three to one as it regards my Republican counterpart.

The Democratic alternative to this bill is much more palatable to our common sensibilities—although it still does not do all that it could to recognize our small numeric deficit. It simply asks that one-third of all Committee funds are designated for Minority use. The difference between the two resolutions is a mere 5%, surely a small price to pay to guarantee a more cooperative environment here in the House of Representatives.

I would hope that all of my colleagues would vote to defeat H. Res. 101, and for the Democratic alternative.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER. Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. HOYER. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves to recommit House Resolution 101 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report promptly back to the House a resolution identical to the text of House Resolution 101 as amended by the House, except as follows:

(1) Strike sections 1, 2, and 3 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Sixth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in that subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$8,414,033 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Armed Services, \$10,342,681 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$9,307,521 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on the Budget, \$9,940,000 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Commerce, \$15,285,113 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$11,200,497 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Government Reform, \$19,770,233 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member);

member); Committee on House Administration, \$6,251,871 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,164,444 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on International Relations, \$11,313,531 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on the Judiciary, \$12,152,275 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Resources, \$10,567,908 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Science, \$8,931,726 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Small Business, \$4,148,880 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$2,632,915; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$13,220,138 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$4,735,135 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); and Committee on Ways and Means, \$11,930,338 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member).

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1999, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2000.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$4,101,062 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Armed Services, \$5,047,079 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Banking and Financial Services,

\$4,552,023 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Commerce, \$7,564,812 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,908,749 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Government Reform, \$9,773,233 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on House Administration, \$2,980,255 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,514,916 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on International Relations, \$5,635,000 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on the Judiciary, \$5,787,394 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Resources, \$5,208,851 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Rules, \$2,488,522 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Science, \$4,410,560 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Small Business, \$2,037,466 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,272,416; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$6,410,069 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,334,800 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); and Committee on Ways and Means, \$5,814,367 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by

the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member).

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2000, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2001.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$4,312,971 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Armed Services, \$5,295,602 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,755,498 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Commerce, \$7,720,301 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,291,748 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Government Reform, \$9,997,000 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on House Administration, \$3,271,616 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,649,528 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on International Relations, \$5,678,531 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Resources, \$5,359,057 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Rules, \$2,580,902 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); and Committee on Ways and Means, \$5,814,367 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member).

member); Committee on Science, \$4,521,166 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member; Committee on Small Business, \$2,111,414 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,360,499; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$6,810,069, (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,400,335 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member); and Committee on Ways and Means, \$6,115,971 (1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member).

(2) Strike section 6 and insert the following:

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

There is hereby established a reserve fund of \$3,000,000 for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Sixth Congress. Amounts in the fund shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration. Of the amount allocated to a committee from the fund, 1/3 of such amount, or such greater percentage as may be agreed to by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee, to be paid at the direction of the ranking minority member.

Mr. HOYER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 218, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—205

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Becerra
Allen	Baldwin	Bentsen
Andrews	Barcia	Berkley
Baird	Barrett (WI)	Berman

Berry	Holden	Ortiz	Hastert	McInnis	Sensenbrenner
Bishop	Holt	Owens	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh	Sessions
Blagojevich	Hooley	Pallone	Hayes	McKeon	Shadegg
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pascrell	Hayworth	Metcalf	Shaw
Boniior	Insole	Pastor	Hefley	Mica	Shays
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Payne	Herger	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi	Hill (MT)	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Boucher	(TX)	Peterson (MN)	Hilleary	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Boyd	Jefferson	Phelps	Hobson	Morella	Simpson
Brady (PA)	John	Pickett	Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Skeen
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy	Horn	Ney	Smith (MI)
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)	Hostettler	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Capps	Kanjorski	Rahall	Houghton	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Capuano	Kaptur	Rangel	Hulshof	Nussle	Souder
Carson	Kennedy	Reyes	Hunter	Ose	Spence
Clay	Kildee	Rivers	Hutchinson	Oxley	Stearns
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez	Hyde	Packard	Stump
Clement	Kind (WI)	Roemer	Isakson	Paul	Sununu
Clyburn	Kleczka	Rothman	Istook	Pease	Sweeney
Condit	Klink	Roybal-Allard	Jenkins	Peterson (PA)	Talent
Conyers	Kucinich	Rush	Johnson (CT)	Petri	Tancredo
Costello	LaFalce	Sabo	Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Tauzin
Coyne	Lampson	Sanders	Jones (NC)	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Cramer	Lantos	Sandlin	Kasich	Pombo	Terry
Crowley	Larson	Sawyer	Kelly	Porter	Thomas
Cummings	Lee	Schakowsky	King (NY)	Portman	Thornberry
Danner	Levin	Scott	Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Thune
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano	Knollenberg	Quinn	Tiahrt
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Sherman	Kolbe	Radanovich	Toomey
DeFazio	Lofgren	Shows	Kuykendall	Ramstad	Upton
DeGette	Lowey	Sisisky	LaHood	Regula	Walden
Delahunt	Lucas (KY)	Skelton	Largent	Reynolds	Walsh
DeLauro	Luther	Slaughter	Latham	Riley	Wamp
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Smith (WA)	LaTourette	Rogan	Watkins
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Snyder	Lazio	Rogers	Watts (OK)
Dingell	Markey	Spratt	Leach	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)
Dixon	Martinez	Stabenow	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
Doggett	Mascara	Stark	Lewis (KY)	Roukema	Weller
Dooley	Matsui	Stenholm	Linder	Royce	Whitfield
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner	Lucas (OK)	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
Engel	McDermott	Tauscher	Manzullo	Salmon	Wolf
Eshoo	McGovern	Taylor (MS)	McCullum	Sanford	Young (AK)
Etheridge	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)	McCrery	Scarborough	Young (FL)
Evans	McKinney	Thompson (MS)	McHugh	Schaffer	
Farr	McNulty	Thurman			
Fattah	Meehan	Tierney			
Filner	Meek (FL)	Towns	Ackerman	Ganske	Sanchez
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Trafficant	Brown (CA)	Goodling	Saxton
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Turner	Cardin	Myrick	Stupak
Frost	Millender-McDonald	Udall (CO)	Cox	Neal	
Gejdenson	Miller, George	Udall (NM)			
Gephardt	Minge	Velázquez			
Gonzalez	Mink	Vento			
Gordon	Moakley	Visclosky			
Green (TX)	Mollohan	Waters			
Gutierrez	Moore	Watt (NC)			
Hall (OH)	Moran (VA)	Waxman			
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Weiner			
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Wexler			
Hill (IN)	Napolitano	Weygand			
Hilliard	Oberstar	Wise			
Hincheey	Obey	Woolsey			
Hinojosa	Oliver	Wu			
Hoefel		Wynn			

NAYS—218

Aderholt	Calvert	Ehlers
Archer	Camp	Ehrlich
Armey	Campbell	Emerson
Bachus	Canady	English
Baker	Cannon	Everett
Ballenger	Castle	Ewing
Barr	Chabot	Fletcher
Barrett (NE)	Chambliss	Foley
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Forbes
Barton	Coble	Fossella
Bass	Coburn	Fowler
Bateman	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Bereuter	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Biggert	Cook	Galleghy
Bilbray	Cooksey	Gekas
Bilirakis	Crane	Gibbons
Biley	Cubin	Gilchrest
Blunt	Cunningham	Gillmor
Boehlert	Davis (VA)	Gilman
Boehner	Deal	Goode
Bonilla	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bono	DeMint	Goss
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Bryant	Dickey	Granger
Burr	Doollittle	Green (WI)
Burton	Dreier	Greenwood
Buyer	Duncan	Gutknecht
Callahan	Dunn	Hansen

Hastert	McInnis	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	McIntosh	Sessions
Hayes	McKeon	Shadegg
Hayworth	Metcalf	Shaw
Hefley	Mica	Shays
Herger	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hill (MT)	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Hilleary	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Hobson	Morella	Simpson
Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Skeen
Horn	Ney	Smith (MI)
Hostettler	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Houghton	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Hulshof	Nussle	Souder
Hunter	Ose	Spence
Hutchinson	Oxley	Stearns
Hyde	Packard	Stump
Isakson	Paul	Sununu
Istook	Pease	Sweeney
Jenkins	Peterson (PA)	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Tancredo
Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Tauzin
Jones (NC)	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Kasich	Pombo	Terry
Kelly	Porter	Thomas
King (NY)	Portman	Thornberry
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Thune
Knollenberg	Quinn	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Radanovich	Toomey
Kuykendall	Ramstad	Upton
LaHood	Regula	Walden
Largent	Reynolds	Walsh
Latham	Riley	Wamp
LaTourette	Rogan	Watkins
Lazio	Rogers	Watts (OK)
Leach	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (KY)	Roukema	Weller
Linder	Royce	Whitfield
LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Lucas (OK)	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
Manzullo	Salmon	Wolf
McCullum	Sanford	Young (AK)
McCrery	Scarborough	Young (FL)
McHugh	Schaffer	

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1952

Messrs. TOOMEY, BURTON of Indiana, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, noes 210, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Biggert	Buyer
Archer	Bilbray	Callahan
Armey	Bilirakis	Calvert
Bachus	Biley	Camp
Baker	Blunt	Campbell
Ballenger	Boehert	Canady
Barr	Boehner	Cannon
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Castle
Bartlett	Bono	Chabot
Barton	Brady (TX)	Chambliss
Bass	Bryant	Chenoweth
Bateman	Burr	Coble
Bereuter	Burton	Coburn

Collins
 Combest
 Cook
 Cooksey
 Crane
 Cubin
 Cunningham
 Davis (VA)
 Deal
 DeLay
 DeMint
 Diaz-Balart
 Dickey
 Doolittle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Ehlers
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 English
 Everett
 Ewing
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fossella
 Fowler
 Franks (NJ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Ganske
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Gutknecht
 Hansen
 Hastert
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Hill (MT)
 Hilleary
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Horn
 Hostettler
 Houghton

NOES—210

Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Istook
 Jenkins
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kasich
 Kelly
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuykendall
 LaHood
 Largent
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lazio
 Leach
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 LoBiondo
 Lucas (OK)
 Manzullo
 Smith (TX)
 Souder
 Spence
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntosh
 McKeon
 Metcalf
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Moran (KS)
 Morella
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Ose
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pease
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Pombo
 Porter
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Quinn
 Radanovich

Ramstad
 Regula
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rogan
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (KS)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scarborough
 Kolbe
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 McDonald
 Miller, George
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Moolohan
 Moore
 Moran (VA)
 Murtha

Lantos
 Larson
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Luther
 Maloney (CT)
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Millender
 Miller
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Moolohan
 Moore
 Moran (VA)
 Murtha

NOT VOTING—8
 Ackerman
 Brown (CA)
 Cardin
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Phelps
 Pickett
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Serrano
 Sherman

Shows
 Sisisky
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stark
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor (MS)
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thurman
 Tierney
 Towns
 Traficant
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Velázquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Wise
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn

PROVIDING FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF BARBER B. CONABLE, JR. AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 26) providing for the reappointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, for the purpose of explaining the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, this is in fact an appointment of regents of the Smithsonian Institution. There is a 17-member board. It is composed of the Chief Justice and the Vice President of the United States, three Members of the House of Representatives, three Members of the Senate, and nine citizens who are nominated by the Board and approved jointly in a resolution of Congress. This is the first of three joint resolutions that we will present, and as was indicated, this provides for the reappointment of our friend and former colleague, Barber Conable of New York.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, proceeding under my reservation, we obviously will not object. We support not only this resolution but the next two resolutions that will be offered for the purposes of accomplishing the objectives set forth by the chairman. I will not object to the next two and will allow them to pass simply by unanimous consent immediately upon being read.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 26

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Barber B. Conable, Jr. of New York on April 11, 1999, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent for a term of six years, effective April 12, 1999.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a

□ 2010

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 800, EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships:

Messrs. GOODLING, HOEKSTRA, CASTLE, GREENWOOD, SOUDER, SCHAFFER, CLAY, KILDEE, GEORGE MILLER of California, and PAYNE.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow all Members 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 101, just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

Green (TX)
 Gutierrez
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hastings (FL)
 Hill (IN)
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Inslee
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind (WI)
 Kleczka
 Klink
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 Lampson