

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 10, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, for all who use their abilities in service to others and who by their efforts assist in the work of this institution. We are especially aware today of the contributions of our congressional pages, who have served this place with grace and dignity during this past year. As they prepare to leave, we offer our appreciation and thanksgiving for their presence with us and for their faithfulness to their duties and responsibilities. May Your blessing, O God, be with them and each of us, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. 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 240, nays 146, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Borski	Cooper
Ackerman	Boucher	Coppersmith
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Costello
Andrews (NJ)	Brooks	Coyne
Andrews (TX)	Browder	Cramer
Applegate	Brown (FL)	Danner
Archer	Brown (OH)	Darden
Bacchus (FL)	Bryant	Deal
Baesler	Byrne	DeLauro
Barca	Cantwell	Dellums
Barcia	Cardin	Derrick
Barlow	Carr	Deutsch
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Dicks
Becerra	Clayton	Dingell
Bellenson	Clement	Dixon
Berman	Clinger	Dooley
Bevill	Coleman	Durbin
Bilbray	Collins (IL)	Edwards (CA)
Bonior	Combest	Edwards (TX)

English (AZ)	Lantos
English (OK)	LaRocco
Eshoo	Laughlin
Evans	Lehman
Fazio	Levin
Fields (LA)	Lewis (GA)
Filner	Lipinski
Flake	Lloyd
Foglietta	Long
Ford (MI)	Lowey
Ford (TN)	Maloney
Frank (MA)	Mann
Frost	Margolies
Furse	Mezvinsky
Gedjenson	Markey
Gephardt	Martinez
Geren	Matsui
Gilman	Mazzoli
Glickman	McCloskey
Gonzalez	McCollum
Gordon	McCrery
Green	McCurdy
Gunderson	McDermott
Gutierrez	McHale
Hall (TX)	McInnis
Hamburg	McKinney
Hamilton	McNulty
Harman	Meehan
Hastings	Meek
Hayes	Menendez
Hefner	Mfume
Hilliard	Miller (CA)
Hinchee	Miller (FL)
Hoagland	Mineta
Hochbruckner	Minge
Holden	Mink
Houghton	Moakley
Hoyer	Mollohan
Hughes	Montgomery
Hutto	Moran
Inglis	Murtha
Inslee	Myers
Jefferson	Nadler
Johnson (GA)	Natcher
Johnson (SD)	Neal (MA)
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Johnston	Obey
Kanjorski	Oliver
Kaptur	Ortiz
Kasich	Orton
Kennedy	Owens
Kennelly	Oxley
Kildee	Pallone
Kingston	Parker
Klecicka	Pastor
Klein	Payne (VA)
Klink	Pelosi
Kopetski	Penny
Kreidler	Peterson (FL)
LaFalce	Pickle
Lambert	Pombo
Lancaster	Pomeroy

NAYS—146

Allard	Calvert
Armey	Camp
Bachus (AL)	Canady
Baker (CA)	Castle
Baker (LA)	Clay
Ballenger	Coble
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)
Bartlett	Crane
Bentley	Crapo
Bereuter	Cunningham
Bilirakis	DeLay
Bliley	Diaz-Balart
Blute	Dickey
Boehert	Doolittle
Boehner	Dreier
Bonilla	Duncan
Bunning	Dunn
Burton	Everett
Buyer	Ewing
Callahan	Fawell

Poshard	Huffington
Price (NC)	Hunter
Rahall	Hutchinson
Rangel	Hyde
Reed	Inhofe
Reynolds	Jacobs
Richardson	Johnson (CT)
Roemer	Johnson, Sam
Rowland	Kim
Rush	King
Sabo	Klug
Sanders	Knollenberg
Sangmeister	Kolbe
Sarpallus	Kyl
Sawyer	Lazio
Schenk	Leach
Schumer	Levy
Serrano	Lewis (CA)
Sharp	Lewis (FL)
Shepherd	Lightfoot
Skaggs	Linder
Skelton	Livingston
Slattery	Machtley
Slaughter	Manzullo
Smith (IA)	McCandless
Smith (NJ)	McDade
Spence	McMillan
Spratt	Meyers
Stenholm	Mica
Stokes	
Strickland	
Studds	Barton
Stupak	Bateman
Swett	Bishop
Swift	Blackwell
Synar	Brown (CA)
Tanner	Clyburn
Tejeda	Collins (MI)
Thornton	Condit
Thurman	Conyers
Torricelli	Cox
Towns	de la Garza
Traficant	DeFazio
Tucker	Dornan
Unsoeld	Emerson
Valentine	Engel
Velazquez	Fields (TX)
Vento	
Vislosky	
Volkmer	
Waters	
Watt	
Waxman	
Williams	
Wise	
Woolsey	
Wyden	
Wynn	
Yates	

Michel	Shaw
Molinari	Shays
Moorhead	Shuster
Morella	Skeen
Murphy	Smith (MI)
Nussle	Smith (OR)
Packard	Smith (TX)
Paxon	Snowe
Petri	Stearns
Porter	Stump
Portman	Sundquist
Pryce (OH)	Talent
Quillen	Tauzin
Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
Ravenel	Thomas (CA)
Regula	Thomas (WY)
Ridge	Torkildsen
Rogers	Upton
Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
Ros-Lehtinen	Walker
Roth	Walsh
Roukema	Weldon
Royce	Wolf
Saxton	Young (AK)
Schaefer	Young (FL)
Schiff	Zeliff
Schroeder	Zimmer
Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—47

Fish	Pickett
Gekas	Roberts
Gibbons	Rose
Gilchrest	Rostenkowski
Gillmor	Roybal-Allard
Hall (OH)	Santorum
Henry	Scott
Herger	Sisisky
Hoke	Solomon
Istook	Stark
Manton	Thompson
McHugh	Washington
McKeon	Wheat
Neal (NC)	Whitten
Payne (NJ)	Whitten
Peterson (MN)	Wilson

□ 1026

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Will the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] kindly come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag.

Mr. RICHARDSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce to the Members that he will entertain up to 10 1-minute statements on each side of the aisle.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 535. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution welcoming the XLVI Congress of the Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers (CIOR), commending the Department of Defense and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States for hosting the XLVI Congress of the CIOR, and urging other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate with and assist the XLVI Congress of the CIOR to carry out its activities and programs.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1993, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2333, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Friday, June 11, 1993, to file its report on H.R. 2333, the International Relations Act of 1993.

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

There was no objection.

URGING A FAIR DEBATE ON NAFTA

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, Ross Perot is at it again. He is back on the Hill trying to get attention. This time it is Mexico-bashing. He is on the Hill talking about distortions about NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, many of us here in this body have different views on NAFTA. I support it, and many of my colleagues have reservations about it. I think it is important that this debate be on the issues, on whether NAFTA is good for this country, whether it is going to create jobs, or as some people claim, it loses jobs; whether it is going to deal with the environment in a positive way or in a negative way.

Let us refrain from Mexico-bashing, from talking about hordes of immigrants steaming our borders. Let us keep the debate on the issues. Ross Perot is not keeping the debate on the issues, he is Mexico-bashing. He is trying to get attention. He likes to be in the newspapers. His facts are not there, and he should be held accountable.

□ 1030

CLINTON POTIONS ARE POISON FOR US ALL

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, we already know that the budget reconciliation package passed in the House last week was a tax-and-spend disaster whose negative effects will be felt for a long, long time. To add strike increases to this will cause mass production chaos, collective bargaining between labor and management will break down, and the economy is sure to go into economic meltdown.

Clinton says he is fighting for the working man, but, in the earliest days of his administration, he stole worker's rights by overturning the Bush administration's Executive order to implement the Beck decision. Now the working man does not have the right to be informed of his rights.

The worker is already hurting from the blows dealt it by this administration, and he will certainly continue to suffer if the striker replacement bill is signed into law.

The reconciliation bill was a bitter potion to swallow for Members on both sides of the aisle. While the striker replacement bill was arsenic on its own, it will really be economic poison if it is allowed to pass in the wake of this last disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject S. 5.

CLINTON ECONOMIC PACKAGE NOT HOLLOW RHETORIC

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party told the American people that they would end deficit spending. For 12 years they did not.

This year President Clinton took action that will reduce the deficit through the adoption of his economic package. The President's package contains real spending cuts. That has upset some people. The President's package contains real revenue increases, and that has upset some people.

But the President's package really reduces the deficit. The President's package invests in the future of working Americans, and the President's package will please Americans next year when they see that President Clinton and the Democratic Congress did not engage in hollow rhetoric, but took tough action to lead a strong people to a better future.

PROMOTING STRIKES

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, would you rather have more strikes or less?

If you are a pitcher you would rather have more. If you are a bowler, you would rather have more.

But if you are an American worker, a small-business owner, or an entrepreneur, you would rather have less.

You would rather have fewer strikes because strikes kill productivity, slow economic growth, hurt the average working man, and destroy management-labor relations.

If you want more strikes, and all of the devastating effects that come with more strikes, then you will vote for the striker replacement bill that is due on the floor next week.

If you want to maintain the critical balance that we now have in labor relations, you will oppose this strike-promoting, job-killing legislation.

Let us leave the promotion of strikes to Nolan Ryan, Earl Anthony and JIM BUNNING.

IT'S SLAVE TRADE, NOT FREE TRADE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Chester Hoist Co. of Lisbon, OH, in my district makes one of the finest chain hoists in the entire world. Nevertheless, the U.S. Army bought 15,000 chain hoists from China that were made at a Chinese prison, ladies and gentlemen. Think about it.

China is a brutal, totalitarian state that treats the Chinese people like cattle. Yet, Uncle Sam bypasses the Chester Hoist Co. in my district and buys these cheap hoists from China.

I say it is time for Congress to tell the U.S. Army that we could hire generals a lot cheaper from China too. This is not free trade. This is slave trade, and Uncle Sam is conducting the sale, ladies and gentlemen.

It is time that Congress puts its foot down on slave trade and illegal trade.

CAPTAIN CLINTON

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bill Clinton must be looking more and more like Captain Bligh of Mutiny on the Bounty fame to some House Democrats.

But he has asked his allies in the House to walk the plank more than that infamous captain ever did. First, he twisted arms and meted out punishment to all those who would not agree to his economic plan forcing the Members to vote against the interests of their districts.

In fact, the Democratic caucus met to decide how to punish those subcommittee chairs who did not want the largest tax increase in history.

And next week, the President will ask his Democratic colleagues to walk the plank again on his special-interest, labor union striker replacement legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to those Democrats who are upset with the leadership of Captain Clinton, who do not want to increase taxes, who do not want to increase spending, I say do not mutiny in the Democratic ranks.

Jump ship. Join the Republican Party, where you will never be punished for opposing more taxes.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR CUTTING THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, I get a little bit tired of hearing the fiscal masochists who get their jollies watching Americans sink into despair because of low-income jobs and bad tax policy and not willing to do anything about it.

Here is a start if you want to do something about trying to balance the budget:

First, let us cut foreign aid and stop sending American tax dollars to every other country in the world when we have got the need here.

Second, cut defense that is protecting every part of the world except the United States. In the 1980's we spent \$3 trillion protecting the whole world, and we did not pay for any of it.

Third, stop giving tax breaks to foreign companies who do business in the United States.

Fourth, let us change our trade laws and keep American jobs in America, and stop sending them to China, to Mexico, to South America, and now it is going to be to Vietnam.

I think it is time this Congress and the administration wake up to reality. Think about it.

#### CUT SPENDING FIRST

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week, at one of the town hall meetings in my district, Jim Meadows of Alabaster, AL, held up this sign. The message Mr. Meadows and many other tax-burdened Alabama citizens want me to deliver to Washington is loud and clear: "No more taxes."

Since the Democrats in this House passed the President's tax bill last month, the President has been scrambling to compromise and eliminate cer-

tain portions of what is the largest tax increase in the history of the world.

But for the American people, there is no compromise. People like Jim Meadows do not trust Congress to raise taxes and later cut spending. They are demanding that Congress "Cut spending."

Mr. Speaker, the tax-burdened American people are desperately trying to send a message to this Congress and Washington. That message is "Cut spending first."

#### PUERTO RICANS, OTHER MINORITIES, FEAR DISCRIMINATION IN HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, will all American citizens be treated equally in the national health care program?

This is one policy decision that should not be difficult. Justice and equality for all are still the basic principles upon which this country was founded.

And yet, my constituents, the 3.6 million U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico, have not been told clearly whether or not our poor will be given equal access to quality health care.

A special allocation of \$300 million is being recommended for undocumented aliens, but there is no money for the American citizens of Puerto Rico?

Over the next 5 years, President Clinton's budget reconciliation package calls for collecting \$7 billion dollars in new corporate income taxes in Puerto Rico.

That exceeds the cost of equal access to health care for the disenfranchised American citizens of Puerto Rico.

Can anyone look at our deprived citizens—at thousands of veterans, widows, and orphans of men who died fighting for their country—straight in the eyes, and justify a health care policy which discriminates against Puerto Rican-Americans, African-Americans in the Virgin Islands, and other ethnic minorities in the territories?

□ 1040

#### DEFEAT URGED FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. KIM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that out of all the 13 annual appropriations bills that fund the Government next year, we are considering the one that pays for Congress first.

This should be last on our list.

Congress should lead by example and make real, significant cuts right here

in this House. However, today's appropriations bill cuts Congress by only 1 percent. Only 1 percent.

That is an insult to the American taxpayer. I have cosponsored a resolution to cut 25 percent.

I am outraged that the Democrats who control this House refused to allow us to even vote on a 25-percent cut amendment.

Before asking the American people to sacrifice, Congress should lead by example. I urge my colleagues to join me in cutting 25 percent, not just 1 percent.

Defeat the rule and the bill today.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, all over the country, thousands of our young people, including my own daughter Angie, reached a milestone in their lives by graduating from high school. This is truly an occasion to celebrate, and we should stop and commend these graduates for their hard work and commitment to their futures.

We should also take this opportunity to thank their teachers for the hours of extra work and special attention they gave to ensure this day would come.

I would like to congratulate the entire class of 1993 and I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our commitment to provide them with meaningful opportunities for the future. The class of 1993 has fulfilled its obligation and now it is our turn to ensure that their efforts are rewarded with post-secondary job training and a national service plan so they can afford to go to college.

Mr. Speaker, we extend our congratulations to the class of 1993.

#### A GAS TAX VERSUS A BTU TAX

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying, "You can dress up a skunk as much as you will, but the stench of a skunk remains with it still."

Well, President Clinton is now proposing a gas tax which is really a dressed-up Btu tax, but the stench remains still. In fact, candidate Clinton, when he was campaigning, said this about a gas tax: "It would grind the middle class and the lower middle class into the dirt." He even derisively dismissed it as, "a good idea if you live in Boston and ride the subway."

Mr. Speaker, a gas tax is bad for America. McGraw-Hill said that a Btu

tax would cost 400,000 jobs. Well, the proposed 7.3-cent gas tax will cost America about 200,000 jobs. It will cost every family, and particularly rural America. It will cost the trucking industry billions of dollars which, of course, will drive up prices to the American consumer. It will cost aviation nearly \$1 billion a year which is flat on its back.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, if we pass a gas tax which is not dedicated to improving transportation, we are never going to get full funding for ISTEA, our transportation legislation.

So when you go back home and your constituents complain about it, it is going to be tough to look them in the eye if you voted to raise taxes and at the same time hurt our transportation system.

#### IN CELEBRATION OF PORTUGAL'S NATIONAL DAY

(Mr. POMBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, as an American of Portuguese descent, and the only Portuguese-American Member of the House, I am proud to rise today in honor of Portugal's National Day celebrating the language, heritage, and culture of Portugal and the Portuguese communities around the world.

This day marks the anniversary of the death of Portugal's national poet, Louis Camoese, on June 10, 1580. As a poet, Camoese celebrated the travels and adventures of the Portuguese people around the globe. My grandparents were just such people, coming to America from the Azores early in this century. My family has been farming and ranching in California ever since.

Therefore, I am happy to commemorate the National Day of Portugal, and to celebrate the mutual respect and admiration between our two countries.

#### COMMEMORATION OF THE NATIONAL DAY OF PORTUGAL

(Mr. BLUTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, RICHARD POMBO of California, in recognizing Portuguese communities throughout the world who today are celebrating the National Day of Portugal. June 10 marks the anniversary of the death of Luis Camoese, the Portuguese poet who captured in words the great adventures, discoveries, and conquests of the Portuguese people.

Southeastern Massachusetts has the greatest concentration of Portuguese-Americans in the United States. I have observed in these people a strong sense of loyalty to family and friends; a

steadfast commitment to seize the opportunities America offers and a resilient spirit that is undaunted by the formidable challenges that our society presents. It is my honor and privilege to represent the Portuguese-Americans of the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts in this great institution of democracy.

I join with millions of others throughout the world in commemorating the history, culture, and heritage of the Portuguese people in this, the National Day of Portugal.

#### CUT FEDERAL SPENDING AND REFORM CONGRESS

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, a month ago the people of the Second District of Ohio sent me to Congress with a clear mandate: Cut Federal spending and reform Congress. Today when we consider the legislative branch appropriations, we have an opportunity to show the country that we have heard that message loud and clear. Congress must be willing to reform itself and do more for the people with less of their tax dollars.

Families in my district and across America must make difficult personal sacrifices every day to live within their means. As the servants of those families, we must make the same kinds of sacrifices in our own house.

Our constituents want us to cut spending before increasing taxes. Yet, this House recently voted in favor of the largest tax increase in our history. It asked Social Security recipients and small businessmen and women to pay more in taxes. It slapped a Btu tax on nearly every taxpayer. Those of us that opposed that measure were told to show where spending could be cut. Well, today, we have that opportunity. We can start with our own budget. Let us lead by example. Americans are watching what we do.

#### SPENDING CUTS, NOT TAXES

(Mr. INHOFE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, while it appears that President Clinton is now retreating on his Btu tax, he still does not seem to get it. Perhaps he did not hear the message that Texas voters sent him last Saturday on his misguided budget proposal. I was in south Texas during the Kay Bailey Hutchison landslide last week. I do not want to take anything away from her but the campaign was against Clinton not Krueger. In Hidalgo and Cameron Counties where they have never voted for a Republican, it was a landslide

against Bill Clinton and his huge tax increases. Now he is abandoning his Btu tax for just another repackaged list of energy taxes. He ought to listen to what Texas and the rest of America are saying. They want Washington to get serious about making real cuts in Government spending.

You see, Mr. Speaker, Americans are not going to be fooled by the new White House public relations machine's attempt to masquerade their tax increases by changing the name and dressing it up in different clothes. You can call it what you want, a Btu tax, a broad-based energy tax or a transportation fuels tax, but the fact is the American people are going to take a huge hit to pay for this administration's insatiable appetite for creating new spending programs that my grandchildren will have to pay for.

A poll released last month by a Democratic pollster in my State showed only 30 percent support for the President's energy tax. An even more overwhelming 89 percent of all Oklahomans agreed that spending should be reduced much more before any new taxes are considered. This is a clear message from Oklahoma to Washington that changing the name does not change the substance.

Unfortunately, the President's budget package, as it was passed by this House last week, still has \$6.35 in tax increases for every \$1.00 in spending cuts.

Mr. President, you have been told by your friends in Hollywood that the people of America are dumb enough to believe your double-talk. The elections around the country show that you are wrong. It is spending cuts, not taxes, that America needs.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate an announcement made last night by Chairman MOAKLEY regarding the Rules Committee plans to meet and grant a rule on the International Relations Act of 1993 on Monday, June 14. A request may be made for a structured rule, which would permit only those floor amendments designated in the rule.

The committee has circulated a "Dear Colleague" that requests all amendments to the bill be submitted to the Rules Committee no later than 12 noon on Monday, June 14, 1993.

In order to ensure Members' rights to offer amendments under the rule that may be requested, they should submit 55 copies of each amendment together with a brief explanation of each amendment to the committee office at H-312, the Capitol, by 12 noon on Monday, June 14. Members should draft their amendments to the substitute amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 8. Copies of the substitute are available in the offices of Legislative Counsel for the purpose of drafting amendments.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2348, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 192 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 192

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order under clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill are waived except as follows: beginning on page 31, line 20, through page 32, line 2. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI against amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

□ 1050

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded during the debate on House

Resolution 192 is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 192 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2348, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994 and has been recommended to the House by the Committee on Rules to provide for the orderly consideration of the first of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1994.

House Resolution 192 waives all points of order against the consideration of the bill and provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. While all points of order are waived against the consideration of the bill, the rule provides that points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized provisions or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, and clause 6 of rule XXI, which prohibits reappropriations in a general appropriations bill, are waived against all provisions of the bill except section 306(b). That section relates to retirement incentives for the GAO, GPO, and the Library of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 192 provides that when the bill is considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, only those amendments printed in the report accompanying this rule are in order and that they are to be considered in the order and manner specified in the report. The amendments are not subject to amendment, nor or are they subject to a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI are waived against the amendments printed in the report.

At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the rule provides that the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules heard testimony from Members all day and well into the night yesterday, and entertained a number of requests for amendments to this bill. However, the committee believes that because the Legislative Branch Subcommittee has recommended a bill that reduces actual outlays for the legislative branch in the coming fiscal year, that only a limited number of amendments to the bill should be made in order under the rule. Consequently, the committee report includes six amendments which are eligible for consideration when the bill is considered for amendment. Those amendments include an amendment which reduces the franked mail allowance by \$5.8 million, one which limits

staffing allowances and expenses for former Speakers, and one which directs the Committee on House Administration to develop regulations for overseeing the financial activities of legislative service organizations by January 1, 1994.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules believes that this rule allows the House to fairly and fully debate the issues relating to the funding of the legislative branch in the coming fiscal year. The subcommittee has, as I said, reported a bill which actually reduces outlays for the legislative branch. In order to achieve this reduction, the subcommittee worked long hours to assure that cuts would be spread equitably throughout the Congress and its related agencies without adversely affecting the level of services provided to the Congress. This is a major accomplishment on the part of the subcommittee and they are to be commended. The rule before Members allows full discussion of the funding of the legislative branch and I recommend its adoption in order that the House may consider the first of the 13 appropriations bills for the coming fiscal year.

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

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

I hope the Members back in their offices are listening. They ought to get over here on this floor and watch because the American people are watching and you are about to witness one of the most outrageous charades ever attempted on the floor of this House. Here are 432 pages of testimony of conscientious Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, who have been slapped in the face by the Democrat leadership; 40-some denied their rights on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, you are about to see the taxers, the spenders, the regulators, who control this House, the Democrat leadership, attempt to convince you and the American people that the bill that pays for the operation of this Congress has been substantially reduced.

I get so exercised when I see this. Mr. Speaker and Members, that is an outrageous charade. This bill does not reduce spending on we the Congress, it does not reduce spending by 20 percent, by 10 percent, by 5 percent, not even 2 percent. This bill authorizes spending on we the Congress of \$1,800,000,000, almost \$2 billion. And yes, the taxers and the spenders and the regulators who run this place have magnanimously cut this legislative budget by about 1 percent. Well, isn't that big of them? What do you think about that, Mr. and Mrs. America?

Typically, President Clinton and the Democrat leadership are attempting to foist on the American people the largest tax increase in American history, forcing each American family to cough up at least \$800 per year in new taxes,

forcing every American family to tighten their belts. Yet these same Democrats continue on their drunken spending spree, refusing to cut their own budgets.

And even worse, through this gag rule, refusing to let rank-and-file Republicans and Democrats—and here they are, Democrats, look at them, you have been slapped by your Democrat leadership—refusing to allow Republicans or Democrats to even offer amendments that would significantly cut our legislative budget.

Mr. Speaker, why is this a charade? It is a charade because the Democrat leadership, in an 11th-hour rules meeting yesterday, kidded 40-some Members, Democrats and Republicans alike—here they are—who came to us pleading to let them offer significant cutting amendments to the bill.

Why is this a charade, Mr. Speaker? Because after listening to all of these Members recite what their constituents were saying back home, "cut spending, cut spending, cut spending, cut spending, cut spending," the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee turned down on a party-line vote all 46 of the significant cutting amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats alike, amendments that would have cut several hundred million dollars from this bloated legislative expense budget that continues to hire 37,000 employees, which I think is just to make us look good.

Why is this a charade, Mr. Speaker? Because after refusing to allow any of the significant cutting amendments to be offered and debated on this floor, the Democrat leadership, in a cute little ploy—and you just heard it recited by the manager here—in a cute little ploy made in order six small amendments.

Have you people listened to it up there? Do you know what those six small amendments were for? They were good amendments, but none of them individually or in total significantly reduce this legislative budget.

□ 1100

To show you what a charade this gag rule really is, Mr. Speaker, and why I am so exercised and why the American people are going to be so exercised, if all six of these amendments pass, all six that were magnanimously made in order, which my good friend, the gentleman from Texas has said they were really gracious in allowing all these amendments, if all six were allowed to pass, they would not even cut our legislative budget by a tenth of 1 percent.

That means that Congress this year will continue to spend on itself almost the same amount that it always has, while socking it to the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, to portray this legislative budget as a cost-cutting bill is a charade.

The American people have had enough.

They have had it with a Congress that continues to raise their taxes so that they can spend the money on themselves. That is exactly what we are doing here.

They have had it with a Congress that continues to pass laws that regulate the American people, but exempt the Congress, exempt themselves.

They have had it with you. They have had it with a Democrat leadership that refuses to allow rank and file Republicans or Democrats to offer amendments that would do what their constituents sent them here to do this year. Cut spending. Cut spending. Cut spending. I cannot say it enough. Cut spending. Especially cut spending on themselves.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I urge defeat of the rule so that Democrats, like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], a good conservative Democrat, most conscientious Member on your side of the aisle, and another Democrat, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], another very good Member who has been slapped in the face by the Democrat leadership and refused to be able to come on this floor and offer their significant amendments that would cut millions out of this budget, and Lord knows we can afford to cut millions out of this budget.

So that our Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] could offer his amendment which could cut anywhere between 12 and 25 percent.

You know, they deserve the right to be able to come to this floor and do that.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, that is what the American people want, but it is what the Democrat leadership does not want.

Members, who are you for? Are you for the Democrat leadership or are you for the American people?

On behalf of the American people, vote down this rule and let these Members come on this floor and do what they were sent here to do; represent their people.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material on votes in the Rules Committee:

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1993

1. Open rule.—A one-hour open rule, with no waivers (see attached text). Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

2. Strike Waivers.—Strike the waiver of all points of order against the consideration of the bill, and of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized, legislative and transfer provisions) against all but specified provisions. Rejected: 4-6. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Gordon, and Slaughter.

3. Michel.—25% across the board cut in everything but Senate, with 12.5% eligible for restoration by March 31st if approved by House (with reprogramming allowed). Rejected: 4-6. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Gordon, and Slaughter.

4. Solomon.—Require random drug testing of congressional employees. Rejected: 4-6. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Gordon, and Slaughter.

5. Shepherd, Goss, Fingerhut, Fowler, Turkildsen.—Limits former Speakers' allowances to five years. Adopted: 9-0-1. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Gordon, Slaughter, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Present: Wheat.

6. Goss.—Cut CRS funds by 5%. Rejected 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

7. Dunn.—Four amendments moved en bloc: (a) 25% cut in House investigative staff; one-third for minority; (b) 25% cut in House investigative staff funds; (c) 25% cut in House statutory staff; (d) 5% cut in Doorkeeper's Office. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

8. Pomeroy.—Reduce franking account by \$5.8 million. Adopted: 8-0. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Slaughter, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss.

9. Thomas (CA).—Ban on franked mass mailings (100 pieces or more). Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

10. Amendments moved en bloc: Roberts.—(a) Ban funds for LSOs (except DSG & RSC); (b) Cut franking dollar amount. Porter.—Amendment to Roberts 14(a), to reform LSOs. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

11. Amendments moved en bloc: Cox.—(a) Reduce GAO funds to \$330 million; (b) Reduce by 25% overall in specified accounts; Upton.—Change formula for franked mass mail limits to—(a) reduce from 3 to 2 the first class mass mailing allocation; or (b) reduce from 3 to 1.5 the first class mass mailings allocation; Fowler.—Require monthly public statements on Members' franking accounts. Inglis.—(a) Reduce franked mail appropriation by \$12 million; (b) Prohibit departing Member equipment purchases (other than desk and chair); (c) Reduce committee statutory staff funds by 60%. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

12. Castle.—Amendments moved en bloc: (a) Reduce, restrict and restructure official mail account; (b) Prohibit transfer of funds from office to mail accounts. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

13. Hoke.—Eliminate funds for Historical Society calendars. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

14. Zimmer.—Prohibit refilling elevator operator positions; abolish all in 2-years. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

15. Bartlett (MD).—Provides for a 50% reduction in Members' pay if all appropriations bills have not been passed by beginning of fiscal year. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

16. Amendments moved en bloc: Ridge.—Restrict funds for House Inspector General unless given certain duties. Grams.—(a) Prohibit select committees from becoming LSOs; (b) Strike funding for Democratic Personnel Committee in Office of Clerk; (c) Prohibit funding to move Members' offices during fiscal 1994. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

17. Santorum.—Amendments moved en bloc: (a) Rescind unspent House funds from left-over fiscal year '91-92 accounts and require past and future unspent funds to be returned to Treasury; (b) Rescind '94 funds for and privatize: House restaurant system, Post Office, Barbershop and Beauty Shop, and Folding Room; (c) Commission and make public independent financial audits of all accounts and operations of House. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

18. English/Stupak.—Rescind \$1.6 million in unspent funds from fiscal years 1991 and 1992. Adopted: 9-0. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss.

19. Grams.—Prohibit funds to be used for moving House offices in fiscal 1994. Adopted: 8-1. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Slaughter, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Wheat.

20. Penny.—Reduce all amounts in bill by 5%. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

21. Porter.—Authorize House Administration Committee to develop regulations by Jan. 1, 1994, for overseeing Legislative Service Organizations (LSOs). Adopted: 9-0. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss.

22. Inglis.—Prohibit departing Members from purchasing office equipment (other

than desk and chair.) Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

23. Klug.—Amendments moved en bloc: (a) Strike 50% of GPO funds; (b) Cut 5% across the board. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

24. Boehner.—Require Architect to submit quarterly report on expenses. Adopted: 9-0. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, Slaughter, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss.

25. Boehner: Ban all unsolicited mass mailings (100 pieces or more). Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

26. Camp/Talent/Zimmer.—Allow excess congressional office funds to be used for deficit reduction. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

27. Amendments moved en bloc: Thomas (WY).—(a) Cut GAO by 5%. (b) Cut GPO by amount detailees to Congress now cost. Ewing.—Cut maintenance funds for House buildings by 10%. Hefley.—Eliminate funding for Joint Committee on Taxation. Bunning.—Strike funding for Joint Economic Committee. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

28. Orton.—Reduce House Leadership fund by \$866,000. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter.

29. Adoption of Rule.—Modified closed rule, one-hour of general debate, making in order only six amendments, waiving points of order. Adopted: 5-4. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Wheat, and Slaughter. Nays: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss.

Note: The individual amendments would be printed in the Rules Committee report, would not be subject to amendment, would be debatable for 20-minutes each, and appropriate points of order would be waived.

H. RES. 192—PROVIDING AN OPEN RULE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994 (H.R. 2348)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Appropriations, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit."

Explanation: This amendment to the proposed rule provides for a one-hour, open rule for the consideration of H.R. 2348, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. The rule contains no waivers.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—95TH-103D CONGRESSES

Congress (years)	Total rules granted <sup>1</sup>	Open rules <sup>2</sup>		Restrictive <sup>3</sup>	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	17	4	24	13	76

<sup>1</sup>Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

<sup>2</sup>Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

<sup>3</sup>Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities, 95th-102nd Congresses; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103rd Congress, through June 9, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—103D CONGRESS

Rule number and date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58—Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5, R-25)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ: 246-176 A. 259-164 (2/3/93)
H. Res. 59—Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Register Act	19 (D-1; R-18)	1 (D-0, R-1)	PQ: 248-171 A. 249-170 (2/4/93)
H. Res. 103—Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2, R-5)	0 (D-0, R-0)	PQ: 243-172 A. 237-178 (2/24/93)
H. Res. 106—Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1, R-8)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ: 248-166 A. 249-163 (3/3/93)
H. Res. 119—Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4, R-9)	8 (D-3, R-5)	PQ: 247-170 A. 248-170 (3/10/93)
H. Res. 132—Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental approps.	37 (D-8, R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	A. 249-185 A. 3-18 (3/18/93)
H. Res. 133—Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2, R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2, R-2)	PQ: 250-172 A. 251-172 (3/18/93)
H. Res. 138—Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D-8, R-12)	9 (D-4, R-5)	PQ: 252-164 A. 247-169 (3/24/93)
H. Res. 147—Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit	6 (D-1, R-5)	0 (D-0, R-0)	PQ: 244-168 A. 242-170 (4/1/93)
H. Res. 149—Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D-1, R-7)	3 (D-1, R-2)	A. 212-208 (4/28/93)
H. Res. 164—May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Natl. Competitiveness Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (5/5/93)
H. Res. 171—May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (5/20/93)
H. Res. 172—May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	N/A	N/A	A: 308-0 (5/24/93)
H. Res.—May 18, 1993	MC	S. J. Res. 45: U.S. forces in Somalia	6 (D-1, R-5)	6 (D-1, R-5)	A: Voice Vote (5/20/93)
H. Res. 183—May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2D supplemental approps.	N/A	N/A	A: 251-174 (5/26/93)
H. Res. 186—May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget Reconciliation	51 (D-19; R-32)	8 (D-7, R-1)	PQ: 252-178 A. 236-194 (5/27/93)
H. Res. 192—June 6, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations.	50 (D-6, R-44)	6 (D-3, R-3)	

Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous Question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GER-ALD B. SOLOMON ON THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS RULE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1993

Mr. Chairman, I have a brief opening statement.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should let this occasion pass without noting for the record that this is the first time in my memory, and perhaps in the history of the House, that a rule for an appropriations bill has been requested by someone other than the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Today we have a letter of request from the chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Fazio.

Mr. Chairman, as most of my colleagues are aware, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Natcher, has not requested a rule and does not intend to do so for any Appropriations bill.

His reasons are quite simple and I think commendable. He does not want to encourage the practice of adding legislative and unauthorized matters to appropriations bills. That practice is in violation of House rules because it interferes with the prerogatives of the authorizing committees.

The main reason this bill is before the Rules Committee today is because someone is seeking protection for those unauthorized and legislative provisions. Otherwise, this bill could go to the floor as privileged without our help.

At the same time, I think we should recognize that the Legislative Branch Appropriations is really a cross between an appropriations bill and an authorization. We have no regular authorization for the legislative branch, so this vehicle often is used to insert legislative language. The committee report, for instance, notes some 32 provisions which are legislative.

That being the case, if the committee does decide to protect those provisions, I think it is only fair, by the same token, that we grant similar waivers to those amendments of a legislative nature which are being requested here today. And we intend to so move.

The other reason this bill is before us for a rule, I am told, is to restrict the amendment process—something which the House has refused to do for most of its 205 year history. In fact, we have had only five highly restrictive rules since the 95th Congress.

Four of those were on foreign operations bills and one was on the legislative branch appropriations bill in the last session.

Again, this is something Chairman Natcher says he opposes.

And yet, here we are, considering a rule that is contrary to his wishes. This is a sad day for the House, the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee. Thank you.

#### RESTRICTIVE RULES ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

For most of the 205 year history of the Republic, appropriations bills have been considered in the Committee of the Whole under an open amendment process.

A survey of Rules Committee "Activity Reports" dating back to the 95th Congress reveals that while there have been isolated instances in which amendments on particular subjects have been restricted, such as congressional pay and abortion, it wasn't until the 100th Congress that we have had any broad restrictions on amendments, and then only for the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

Since the 95th Congress, we have had just five highly restrictive rules on general appropriations measures (out of the 208 general

appropriations bills considered over that period). Five of those restrictive rules have been on the Foreign Operations Appropriations, and one, in the second session of the last Congress, was on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

[Data compiled by Rules Committee Minority Staff.]

#### RESTRICTIVE RULES ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 95TH-102D CONGRESSES

95th Congress.—Four restrictive rules were granted on regular appropriations bills: H. Res. 664 on H.R. 7932, the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, permitting open amendment process only one specified amendment on the subject of Congressional pay; H. Res. 1236 on H.R. 12928, Public Works Appropriations, prohibiting amendments only in one specified area; H. Res. 1220 on H.R. 12929, Labor-HEW Appropriations, making in order only two amendments to the abortion section; and H. Res. 1230 on H.R. 12932, Interior, prohibiting amendments that would make the availability of appropriations contingent on enactment of the relevant authorizations.

96th Congress.—One restrictive rule, H. Res. 335, was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 4389, Labor-HEW Appropriation, permitting only two amendments to the section on abortion.

97th Congress.—No restrictive rules were granted on a regular appropriation bill.

98th Congress.—No restrictive rules were granted on a regular appropriations bill.

99th Congress.—One restrictive rule (H. Res. 481) was granted on a regular appropriations bill: H.R. 5052, the Military Construction Appropriations bill, but it did not affect the regular amendment process—only a new title relating to Contra Aid.

100th Congress.—One restrictive rule (H. Res. 457) was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 4637, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, permitting only 18 amendments printed in the Rules Committee report (11 Republican and 7 Democrat).

101st Congress.—One restrictive rule (H. Res. 425) was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 5114, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, permitting only 11 amendments printed in the Rules Committee report (8 Democrat and 3 Republican).

102nd Congress, (First Session).—One restrictive rule (H. Res. 177) was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 2621, Foreign Operations Appropriations, permitting only 11 amendments (6 Democrat and 5 Republican).

(Second Session).—Two restrictive rules were granted in the second session of the 102nd Congress on regular appropriations bills; H. Res. 499 on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill for fiscal 1993 (H.R. 5427), permitting only 12 amendments (2 by Democrats and 9 Republicans, though five of the Republican amendments were left exposed to points of order, and one of which required a defeat of the motion to rise in order to be offered); and H. Res. 501 on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal 1993, permitting only 5 amendments (2 by Democrats and 3 by Republicans).

[Note: The above information does not include rules for continuing resolutions (CRs).] Source: Congressional Research Service and Rules Committee Minority Staff, based on Rules Committee Calendars, Rules Committee's "Notices of Action Taken," and examination of the texts of reported rules.

#### THE QUOTATIONS OF CHAIRMAN NATCHER ON APPROPRIATIONS RULES

Introduction: Appropriations Committee Chairman Natcher has made it clear pub-

licly, on more than one occasion, that he did not intend to request special rules from the Rules Committee to protect unauthorized and legislative provisions in his committee bills, to limit the amendment process, or to waive the three-day report availability requirement. Notwithstanding this pledge, the committee has already obtained several rules on supplementals doing some or all of the above (though without a specific request from Natcher). And, this practice will apparently continue with the consideration of most of the 13 general appropriations bills for fiscal year 1994. The way the Chairman's pledge will be finessed will be a letter from the chairman seeking rules on behalf of the subcommittees involved. [See attached Roll Call article]

Below are some of the things Chairman Natcher said before a hearing of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on March 11, 1993, in response to both oral and written questions: "This is no secret, Mr. Walker. The Speaker of the House, after a number of the chairmen on authorizing committees, legislative committees, appeared before him and asked him to meet with us, and he did, he resolved this problem, I think once and for all. We met with him, it took place, it should not have happened, and the agreement now is there will be no legislation in an appropriations bill, none."<sup>1</sup>

I don't believe the facts support the premise that our bills are kept secret until floor consideration. The record of how we develop our bills clearly shows that all Members are given the opportunity to participate in the appropriations process—both on the floor and through the hearing process. . . . Concerning the availability of our reported bills, it is the practice of the Committee to make available "committee prints" of all bills and reports (including bill changes adopted by the full committee) to any member and to the general public immediately after each bill is reported by the full committee in room H-218 Capitol: "Last year, all 13 of our regular appropriations bills and accompanying reports were available at least 3 legislative days prior to their consideration on the floor. . . . In addition, nearly all our bills are considered under an open rule or no rule at all. All proper amendments, especially amendments to cut, are usually in order when our bills are considered in the House. The availability of our bills and the manner in which they are considered on the House floor I believe overwhelmingly demonstrate that every Member of Congress has an effective way to participate in funding decisions."<sup>2</sup>

[From Roll Call, June 7, 1993]

#### NATCHER PREFERS NO RULES ON HIS PANEL'S BILLS, BUT DEMOCRATS PLAN THEM ANYWAY

(By Mary Jacoby)

Appropriations Committee Chairman William Natcher's (D-Ky) opposition to protective rules on spending bills has put the Rules Committee in a sticky situation, just as the first of 13 appropriations bills is set to come to the floor this week.

The seemingly arcane disagreement actually can have profound significance for legislation; it can mean the difference between life and death for some programs.

The reason: Programs not authorized through the normal legislative process often can be funded in a backdoor manner by inserting "legislative," or "authorizing," language in an appropriations bill. This method

<sup>1</sup>"Budget Process: Testimony of Hon. William H. Natcher," Hearing before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, March 11, 1993, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, response to written questions, pp. 42-43.



## HISTORY OF NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION TAXPAYERS' FRIEND'S AWARDS—Continued

Member	Total awards won	Year												
		1990	1989	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984	1983	1982	1981	1980	1979	
Crane	12	TF	TF											
Dannemeyer	12	TF	TF											
DeLay	6	TF	E											
Dorman	2	TF						TF	E	X				
Douglas	2	TF	TF	E										
Dreier	10	TF	E											
Duncan	2	TF	TF	E*										
Fawell	4	TF		TF	TF	TF	E							
Fields	9	TF	E											
Frenzel	9	TF	E											
Gekas	2	TF	TF									E		
Gingrich	1	TF												
Gradison	4	TF			TF	TF	TF							
Hancock	2	TF	TF	E										
Hansen	9	TF	TF		TF	E								
Hefley	3	TF	TF		TF	E								
Henry	2	TF					TF	E						
Herger	3	TF	TF		TF	E								
Hopkins	3	TF			TF		TF							
Kasich	2	TF	TF								E			
Kyl	3	TF	TF		TF	E								
McCandless	8	TF	E											
McCollum	3	TF					TF						E	
McEwen	1	TF											E	
Miller	6	TF							TF	TF	TF	TF	TF	TF
Moorhead	11	TF	TF		TF	TF								
Nielson	7	TF	TF		TF	TF								
Packard	1	TF									E			
Petri	1	TF												
Porter	6	TF	TF		TF	TF	TF	TF				TF		
Roberts	3	TF				TF	TF	TF						E
Rohrabacher	7	TF			TF	TF	TF	TF	TF	TF			E	
Roth	2	TF	TF	E										
Schaefer	6	TF	TF		TF		TF						TF	TF
Schulze	5	TF			TF	TF		TF		TF	E			
Sensenbrenner	1	TF												
Sensenbrenner	12	TF	TF											
Shumway	12	TF	TF											
Shuster	4	TF												
Smith, R. (NH)	6	TF	E											
Solomon	10	TF	TF		TF			TF	TF	TF	TF	TF	TF	TF
Stump	12	TF	TF											
Thomas	1	TF	E*											
Upton	2	TF			TF	E								
Walker	11	TF		TF										

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members of the Rules Committee for the excellent job they have done on this rule and to speak in behalf of it.

Obviously, I will have more time to speak in general on this bill later on; but as the Speaker in the Chair well knows, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is one of our most articulate and effective spokesmen for his party positions. He certainly has done well this morning, and I feel constrained to respond in some degree. So I would just like to clear the record a bit as to the reductions that are contained in this bill.

First of all, this bill is 14 percent below the amount requested of us in the budget submitted to us by the President. That is something in the neighborhood of \$300 million below what we were asked to spend in order to provide for the funds that were identified as necessary by the various elements of the legislative branch.

I want to point out that, of course, 40 percent of this bill does not relate directly to Congress. It simply funds agencies that happen to be historically placed by the Founding Fathers in this branch of Government.

Of course, this bill is below the base line. That is the standard by which

most bills are evaluated, but in this case we look at something far more rigid and reflective of what will actually be spent. The base line, however, is cut by \$100 million, something in the neighborhood of 5.3 percent.

The bill, however, is most effectively judged by what it cuts in terms of outlays, money actually spent over what was spent last year. This bill is a 6.4 percent reduction in actual spending below that which was spent in the 1993 fiscal year bill. That is a very, very tough reduction, and when added to what we took last year we are now talking about reducing in 2 fiscal years something in the neighborhood of 13 percent, well on the way to a 25-percent reduction, which is what I think Members of this institution have given this committee and our leaders an opportunity to accomplish.

Certainly we know the legislative branch has to set an example, has to be more stringent in its funding than any of the other bills. Later on I will be indicating how our budget stacked up over time with those of the executive branch, with those of the Office of the President and other institutions that we need to look at.

But I think we have been successful in achieving these results in part because of a franking reform that we put in place. Congressman Frenzel, a former Member, a Republican, and myself offered legislation a few years ago which truly has had an impact on spending on the frank. This bill reflects further savings, coming to a \$167 mil-

lion total over 4 years, a reduction in what would have been the anticipated expenditures for the frank. That is a 50-percent reduction in mail costs over 4 years. I think it is something of which we can all be proud. I think it indicates that we have heard the concerns of the American people, and I think it does show that this institution is on a path to reduction over time in a humane and thoughtful way.

For example, you will hear more later on, when the bill is brought to the floor, about the provision for early retirement incentive, which will have the effect of reducing the number of people employed in our branch of Government by a continuing amount. It is often said that we have grown out of control in terms of staffing, and yet if you look at the amount of people employed by the legislative branch since 1981, 12 years ago, we have reduced the legislative branch by 5.8 percent, almost 6 percent.

In staffing, we have eliminated 2,200 positions.

We have accomplished this in the past through attrition, through tightening down on spending and increasing productivity. In the future we hope to do it through encouraging people to take early retirement, and we will not allow their positions to be filled, so that we are then in a position to really have made the savings that would have been otherwise spent on salaries for people who work for the General Accounting Office, for the Government

Printing Office or for the Library of Congress.

This is in fact a bill of which we can be proud, like so many that have come before.

Now, I do not fully anticipate a great deal of support for my assertion from the minority. After all it has been said that the role of the minority is to become the majority. One of the things that is traditional around here is to let the majority carry the burden of funding the branch of Government that we happen to be at the moment responsible for. So it is not unusual that we would have the kind of rhetoric we have heard today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] leaves the floor, I would just like to respond a little bit, because our argument is not with the gentleman. As I said upstairs in the Rules Committee, the gentleman has great respect on this side of the aisle. He has one of the most difficult jobs there is. So does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG]. Both gentlemen do outstanding work, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] who preceded the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate that.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would not want the gentleman's job.

Mr. FAZIO. I did not want it either. I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I do not know why I cannot get rid of it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, the gentleman's job is like mine. I did not want this job either, necessarily.

Mr. FAZIO. But the gentleman does it well.

Mr. SOLOMON. But let me just say, Mr. Speaker, the argument is over the fact that for 205 years you have brought this bill—not the gentleman personally, but this bill has been brought to the floor under an open process where Members could at least represent their constituents. We are not being allowed to do that.

It is not just the Republicans. It is the Democrats. That is where our argument is. We ought to let the floor work its will, because this is the people's House. It is money we are spending on ourselves. Every single one of us ought to have that opportunity, and we are being denied it; but I thank the gentleman and respect him for the good work he does.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], a very outstanding Member of this House who has an equally difficult job.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are not debating the bill right now. We are debating the rule

that brings to the floor one of our most favorite appropriations bills. I say most favorite somewhat facetiously because this bill tends to be somewhat of a target. I think appropriately so, because during this last campaign, many Members and especially our freshmen Members, the large freshman class, campaigned with a determination to make changes in the way that the Congress operates. One of the very few places they get to do that is on this appropriations bill.

While I might not agree with all of the amendments that Members asked to present, I do agree that they have the right to present them and they have a right to make their arguments.

A lot of the debate for or against the amendments would provide information that the people of America ought to have about how this Congress actually functions. But they are going to be denied that once again because the Rules Committee has taken it upon itself to become the legislative body on the House side of our legislative branch of government.

□ 1110

Mr. Speaker, I read the Constitution again this morning just to make sure that I was on solid ground. Article I, section of the Constitution provides that all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives, and then articles in further sections go on to explain how the Members of the Congress have rights and authority as elected Members of Congress. There is nothing in here that says that the Committee on Rules is going to decide which amendment gets offered or which amendment does not get offered. When they do that, they take upon themselves the role of the legislative body, and that is not their function, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Rules is not the legislative body.

Whether or not an amendment is going to become a part of a piece of legislation should be determined by all of the Members of this House and not my very good friends who serve on the Committee on Rules. But that is what has been happening.

I have to oppose this rule. It brings to the floor a bill that I think is a better bill than it was last year, but the rule itself just takes away the rights of Members to be a part of this process.

We have a very large freshman class on both sides of the aisle. Many of them testified at the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules met until 9:30 last night, and these Members were there sincerely asking for an opportunity to be a part of this process, to have an opportunity to offer an amendment that might be debated, and maybe approved, or maybe not approved. The fact is most of them, most of them, have been denied that oppor-

tunity to make those arguments, to make their case, to follow through on the promises they made in their political campaign to try to do something to change the way the Congress operates and the Congress functions.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a bad rule, and I think to close out Members from offering all but six amendments of the nearly 50 requested is just not what our Constitution envisioned when it was created by our Founders.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have never been so unified and so adamant that the Federal Government must cut spending first, and today we consider the first of 13 spending bills. Appropriately it is the bill that pays for what we do around here, and many Americans believe we take better care of ourselves than we do of our constituents, and so now here is our chance to prove we are listening by making some real and significant cuts in this legislative appropriation.

But we blew our chance for real change once again in the Committee on Rules last night. Members are being denied even the chance to debate thoughtful amendments, well presented, those that have been presented to us by Democrats and Republicans alike, and these amendments cut spending. They have been shut out by the Democrat majority in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats now call such gag rules structured. They used to be called restrictive. Sometimes they were called closed. But regardless of what they are called, average people know this: These rules are not open, they are not fair, and they are not good government.

In the Committee on Rules we heard about proposed across-the-board cuts ranging from 5 to 25 percent, saving tens of millions of dollars. We heard about cutting back on Members' free mail. We heard about ways to increase the accountability of shadow organizations called LSO's. We were presented some 50 amendments in more than 6 hours of testimony, but we made in order only 6 whose value, in terms of spending cuts, barely nicks the surface of this almost \$2 billion bill. These six amendments cut less than \$7.5 million, a lot of money to be sure, but it is barely a fraction of the savings possible from all the amendments that were proposed.

My colleagues might ask, "Why cut legislative appropriations?" Willie Sutton had the answer: It is where the fat is. It is also where the perks are, the perks that are paid for that so many Americans are upset about.

Mr. Speaker, decisions about priorities, about how tax dollars are spent, are the business and purview of each

Member of this body, and it is our job, and it is what this bill includes, in fact, \$700 million to pay us to do. But the chairman of the Committee on Rules said that amendments to make more cuts were unnecessary because the bill is already good enough. Well, when looking at the fine print in this bill, I doubt my constituents would agree. It is still overloaded with perks and patronage that should be offloaded now.

For more than 200 years, every Member has had a chance to offer cuts, and the House worked its will. Now we are rewriting that process in the Committee on Rules, subjugating the will of many to the wishes of the few. It is a very ominous and dangerous move.

I admit there are some bright spots, Mr. Speaker, but they certainly do not outshine the ominous storm clouds that surround this rule and what it portends, and I urge my colleagues to vote it down, and for the gentleman from California who said that the aim of the minority is to become the majority, I say, "Wrong. The aim of the minority is to provide good legislation for the United States of America."

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our new freshman the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], one of the Members who appeared before our committee during this 11-hour charade. The gentlewoman had four reasonable amendments to offer, and she was denied.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, to give voice to all those Americans who believe the House should at least consider making deeper cuts in our own congressional spending.

A number of Members petitioned the Rules Committee yesterday to allow a short debate on the floor of this Chamber, on amendments to make deeper cuts. We were motivated by the belief that the Congress must lead the way in making painful spending reductions \* \* \* and we certainly must do that before we impose tough spending cuts and long, long before we even whisper about raising taxes on working and retired Americans. We should lead the way, Mr. Speaker, to maintain at least some credibility with the voting and taxpaying public.

But the rule before us will not allow us to discuss the merits of having Congress make more meaningful cuts. This rule only allows discussion of a half-dozen amendments, none of which allow for bold reductions in future spending.

Mr. Speaker, the American people complain that Congress is not listening \* \* \* that Congress should make a significant sacrifice rather than a 1-percent nibble. We should heed that call, Mr. Speaker. We should defeat this rule, and at least debate and vote on substantial cuts in committee staffs and other parts of our overgrown bureaucracy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are still no speakers on the other side of the aisle, and, therefore, I yield 4 minutes to our Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], who was denied his amendment as well. It was a very reasonable amendment that should have been allowed on this floor for debate, particularly because of his status.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I thought I had seen it all, but I have never seen a rule as outrageous, antidemocratic, and antireform, as this rule on the legislative appropriations bill that we are considering today.

Make no mistake. This rule breaches precedent by limiting the right of Members to offer amendments that cut appropriations bills. If this rule is any indication of how the majority intends to consider our spending bills, the American people should understand now that the majority does not plan to cut spending one little bit around here.

Mr. Speaker, last night, at 9:30, I guess after the reporters had gone home, the Committee on Rules reported out this blatant attempt to silence the voice of reform.

Going into this debate, I must say to my colleagues quite frankly, I was determined to act responsibly on this measure. I knew there were some amendments out there to be offered that would make what I would consider to be far deeper cuts than could be accommodated in this body, having served in it as long as I have. I once served on the Committee on Appropriations, 20-some years or so, and I guess maybe, if I have any reputation as a legislator, it was made during the course of my service on that committee. It was there that I offered legislative alternatives to Members on any variety of bills from time to time.

□ 1120

Oh, I took my defeats as best I could. I was not always out there cutting. There were some items I thought deserved a reordering of priorities on. In those days, when you had the opportunity under a free and open process here to offer amendments, you would say, "I intend to cut spending on such and such in section this of the bill because quite frankly I think in a section later on in this bill we ought to add more money and I want to offset it, if I can, by simply reordering the priorities as I see them."

You would be allowed to make your arguments. If it was the will of the House to accede to your amendment, then, of course, you prevailed for the day. If you lost, you lost, but you had your day in court.

It seems to me particularly in these times when everybody's attention is focused on how do we really make an honest effort to reduce Federal spending, we have got to first look at our own house and how are we acquitting ourselves.

Admittedly last year there was some restraint. I would like to see more restraint continue to be applied.

Yes, many of you older Members remember our old friend Silvio Conte. If it was the issue of policemen in the Capitol, he happened to think we had too many from time to time, he would make an issue of it. I remember one year I was so ticked off with the large member of elevator operators we had, we offered an amendment on that score.

You have to look introspectively at yourself from time to time. Where can we make some changes right in our own backyard or on our own front doorstep, before we go out finding other places.

This is that bill. It is kind of unfortunate that it is the very first of the 13 regular appropriation bills we are to be considering. If we do not open it up to consider the kinds of things that ought to be done on any appropriation bill, at least giving Members an opportunity to speak their will, to make their case. If it is a good case, it will be treated affirmatively; if it is a bad case, it will be defeated.

As I say, before this rule came before us, as restrictive as it is, I frankly was prepared to make some arguments verbally against some of the amendments I thought were too extreme, yes, even for ourselves, because I know how difficult it is around here to try to run a shop efficiently and do the kind of job we have to do for our constituents.

But for the moment, I sure do not like this rule. If it is any indication of what we are going to be looking at down the road, then I want it to be perfectly understood that in opposing the rule, it is on good grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] on the Committee on Rules, fighting the battle as they have done every day, slugging it out, trying to get an opening up of the process so the American people will be better represented and will be able to get a feel for how this place operates by the offering and either accepting or rejecting of amendments.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 21 minutes remaining, and I have 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to use all of the time at this point, and, quite frankly, I do not know if we will have additional speakers at this juncture.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this gag rule. I believe very strongly that we need to cut spending first. That is what my district says and that is what most

of us here in Congress want to do with regard to this deficit. The Congress has to take the lead if we are going to ask others to sacrifice.

Yesterday the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and myself went before the Committee on Rules and asked to offer an amendment that in every other year I have been in the Congress we have been allowed to offer, and that is to cut our own office budgets, particularly the frank, the mailing privilege that we have, by, in this case, \$10 million.

In previous years we have been allowed to offer this amendment. In previous years we have lost some of those battles, but last year we won. Our amendment in fact was able to strike \$20 million from this account.

Why did we come up with \$10 million this year? Well, the committee did a little bit better job than they did in the past. The amount they allocated for the frank was \$45 million. But we tried to cut this thing by \$10 million, and we were denied the opportunity to even offer our amendment.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. It is wrong, when people across this country are saying to cut spending first, and I think it is a shame that our amendment, which would have had a good chance of passing, which had strong bipartisan support, is not even allowed to be debated on this House floor, let alone voted on later this day.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], a former marine and an outstanding Member of this House.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am upset. I have got 2 minutes to try to explain why the Committee on Rules did not allow an amendment of mine to reform a national scandal. Two minutes. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I was granted last session the opportunity to offer an amendment to reform the special interest caucuses we have around this place, 28 of them, called LSO's.

What is wrong with LSO's? Let us move to the chart.

My independent 10-year review shows that Members of Congress have funneled more than \$34 million in tax funds on LSO operations. Those LSO's in return report spending \$26.8 million.

The next chart shows the total dollars Members have given to LSO's, \$7.7 million are absent. Where have these funds gone? At the very least we should have an outside audit and investigation. What has happened to the funds?

The next chart shows a 10-year summary of receipts and expenditures. Where are the missing funds? I see the chart is upside down, and so are the LSO's and so is this rule, in terms of at least a decent time to explain this. Will the assistant turn the chart.

So this chart is up here, and it shows that, first, LSO's can really create a

budgetary cushion or carryover fund. Second, there are bookkeeping errors and unreported spending.

The last chart, here, in regard to bookkeeping errors, some LSO's did not move the clerk-hire figure over to that final column. I know, that sounds like gobbledygook to people back home and everybody else, but it is sloppy bookkeeping, and like writing a check without it showing the balance.

Lastly, there are misspent funds for things like receptions and parties, travel, stipends, and God knows what else. And all of that is being swept under the rug in regard to this rule, in which I only have 2 minutes to further an amendment that was granted in order last year and is not made in order as of this year.

It is especially galling to this Member, who has worked for 10 to 12 years to try to reform these LSO's and to try to come up with a decent proposal, only to find out you cannot even discuss it on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage, it will be swept under the rug, and I do not like it as an individual Member being denied an opportunity in regard to further my explanation and amendment.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage in a brief discussion with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], if the gentleman would accommodate me. I would just like to have a word with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly was not our idea to eliminate any debate on this issue. In fact, there is an amendment made in order, as I understand it, by the Republican Member from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], which bases its purpose on the authority of the Committee on House Administration, of which this Member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], is one of the leading members.

I hope that that committee will be coming forward with legislation that will certainly address the issues that the gentleman has brought to our attention. I know the gentleman has been in the habit of discussing this problem on appropriations bills, but it certainly has been the subject of a lot of work being done, I believe on a bipartisan basis within the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly expect later on to hear from the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] and others who have an interest in this question, and I hope that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] will be able at that time to have his say on the issue.

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

Mr. FAZIO. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, since I have my blood pressure down a little bit and since the gentleman has been kind enough to at least afford me a response, I understand why those on that side of the aisle do not want to speak to this, that it true. We have had two task forces and we have had a special subcommittee review and report, and yet another special subcommittee review and report over the past 10 years.

□ 1130

I have been a principal player in each one of those. When we had the amendment, as of last year, many LSO's were helpful. I do not mean to perjure LSO's, some do a very fine job and some have been very helpful in regard to recommending some kind of a management system where there is public disclosure and where there is some accountable bookkeeping, I am not trying to do that.

I am just trying to say that over the past 10 years our investigation has shown real and lasting problems. After LSO's said to me in the last session, "You only looked at 2 years; why don't you look at 10," we did.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for just a moment, I just wanted to say, partly at the behest of this gentleman, we did work out in the report accompanying this bill last year a uniform accounting standards provision which, I think, will go a long way to assuring Members that LSO's are operating in an appropriate and above-board manner.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if I could just respond, our 10-year study showed \$7.7 million missing. And in the agreement that we reached last year, there was to be a GAO audit and report. There was no GAO audit, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] and I have been meeting with the GAO, and we are informed the report will be put off until September.

I will make a prediction. This will disappear into the same black hole that it has for 12 years. We can have all of this fine special interest research work done off of Capitol Hill, not using taxpayer funds, without a hint of scandal.

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I would conclude by saying, if we adopt the Porter amendment, which will be in order with a number of Republican authors, we will be increasing the incentive for the Committee on House Administration to report legislation, which I think is in the bipartisan best interests of the Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a distinguished outstanding new Member of this House

who was sent here to reform the House and to bring some fiscal conservatism to this House.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, right over here in this corner of this podium, I filed a bill, No. 1505, not long ago, to reduce the budget of the legislative branch by 25 percent.

I come as a freshman, of course, and I had some difficulty getting the bill straight and everything else. I put it over there. I have since been told that was not the proper procedure.

So I went to the Committee on Rules, and I got with some other Members and we proposed an amendment. All we are asking for is for this body to have some obligation to express to the American people why 25 percent was not a proper amount or why a reduction of substantial reduction was not a proper amount.

I went up there to that Committee on Rules. It is a little bitty room up there that has a circular thing, went up there, and my body was down here on the floor at 9:30. Nothing was done. Nothing was said. I have not been told why 25 percent is not the proper percentage. No one here has told me that, and I am not going to hear it when it comes up in the hearing on the original bill.

I think it is wrong that an explanation was not given.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. This is a restricted closed rule that does not allow the full House a true opportunity to participate in the debate of the legislative branch appropriations bill.

As a matter of principle, I am against closed rules, but I am really disappointed that the Rules Committee has seen fit to grant a restrictive rule on the bill that appropriates funds for our own operations. All Members are directly effected by the outcome of this bill.

I am also against this rule because I had asked that the rule for the legislative branch appropriations bill include an amendment that the inspector general of the House of Representatives be accountable to the American public and true to its function as an independent watchdog before funding is appropriated. Otherwise, hard earned taxpayer dollars will be wasted on an impotent and useless office.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee refused to include this amendment. I ask that you vote against this rule to send a message to the Rules Committee that you want my amendment to be considered on the House floor.

Congress has consistently placed itself above all other branches of government. Last year, amidst the House bank and post office scandals, the cries for reform were unprecedented. In a triumph of symbolism over substance,

a mislabeled reform package included a provision to establish an Office of inspector general. Yet, we created a position that was completely powerless. The IG is not independent of the House of Representatives, it is not autonomous like those found in the executive branch and it is not designed to respond to individual Members or staff.

That was 14 months ago, and yet, the House has failed to even appoint its powerless inspector general. The amendment I proposed would have ensured that the duties and responsibilities of the inspector general would be the accountable and independent office it is supposed to be and would require an office fashioned like the 61 IG offices already established in executive branch departments and agencies.

Inspectors general have existed in the Federal branch of our Government since 1976 when Public Law 94-505 established an inspector general for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare [now HHS]. Since that time, Congress has enacted legislation creating Offices of Inspectors General in a total of 61 Federal entities. These include: all 14 Cabinet Departments, major executive branch agencies; independent regulatory commissions; various Government corporations and foundations; and one legislative branch agency, the Government Printing Office [GPO].

Congress has vested impressive authority in these inspectors general to prevent and detect fraud and abuse and to promote the efficiency and effectiveness in their respective agencies. In fiscal year 1990 alone, IG's were responsible for almost 5,500 criminal convictions and the recovery of \$750 million through fines, out-of-court settlements and other monetary penalties. On top of that, according to President Bush's Council on Integrity and Efficiency, the implementation of IG recommendations for making better use of funds saved the Government \$16.6 billion in 1990.

Not only have the IG's proven their worth and effectiveness in the executive branch but, as I am sure you are well aware, Congress also relies heavily on them for their input. The IG's are required by law to report semiannually to the Congress on their activities and congressional committees consistently call upon IG's to testify on government waste, fraud, and abuse. Last year alone, an IG, or representative from their office, testified at congressional hearings nearly 180 times. If we have vested so much interest in the true form of the IG, why would Congress want to fund a watered down version? Should we not be held to the same level of accountability as all other branches of government?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is time that Congress becomes accountable to the public rather than just ourselves. For this reason, I ask for your support

in defeating this rule and ask that my amendment to allow the House to have an IG that is more than just a lap dog of the Committee on House Administration. If we are to fund an Office of Inspector General, then let's be sure we fund one which has the power and authority to bring real reform and efficiency to this institution.

If you promised voters that you would reform Congress during your campaign, then you owe it to them to defeat this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule, even though I have one of the six amendments that was made in order under the rule. But because there were only six amendments that were allowed to be offered, the amendment that I suggested to the committee, that would ban the mailing and the use of the Congressional frank for unsolicited mail, cannot be debated on this floor. I think that that is unfair.

The congressional frank, our free mailing privileges, are going to cost the taxpayers about \$34 million this year, approximately. Last year we spent that amount of money.

The fact is is that in my case, I spent \$14,000 out of the \$170,000 that I had allotted to me last year and \$14,000 the year before. And I answered every piece of mail that came into my office.

I think that we ought to ban the sending of newsletters, and we ought to ban the sending of questionnaires and save the taxpayers additional funds, because I believe that there is too much abuse in what is going out of here under the congressional frank.

Now, my amendment may not have passed, but that amendment at least deserves the opportunity to be heard. And that debate ought to occur for us and for the American people to see, the use of the frank, why would we have it, whether we should expand it, whether we should restrict it, but I do not have that opportunity to be heard under this rule.

I said it many times: There is more democracy today in the Moscow City Council than there is in the Congress of the United States. When we cannot have full deliberation in this body over the issue of the day, the issues that affect us and our constituents, we do ourselves a disservice. And we do the American people a disservice.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and he is a good friend, classmate of mine who came to this Congress the

same time, what seems like forever ago, characterized the minority as being obstructionist and wanting to take over the majority.

He is right in that I would love to be chairman of the Committee on Rules, and I think it is going to happen in 1994.

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

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with that. That is an aspiration that everyone on the gentleman's side of the aisle should feel. And so I just thought it was the natural environment we operate in.

I do not think the gentleman is trying to be obstructionist, but he obviously has a political purpose or he would not be here.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I have a philosophical purpose. It is called vision. Ronald Reagan, vision, remember? It is what we need in the White House right now, let me tell my colleagues.

What I really resent is this: I came here with the gentleman 15 years ago, and I am looking at the National Taxpayers' rating here. It shows that this gentleman, even though I spend money on franking like everybody else does, I have got copies of my frank here, which shows a comprehensive questionnaire which goes out.

□ 1140

I really depend on that. Every mailing I make is districtwide. I do not target, I do not try to con anybody.

The problem is this. For 205 years in this body every Member of this Congress has with this bill been able to come here. They have been able to offer amendments with whatever their philosophy is. If they think government is too big, they want to cut it back. If they think government is too little, they want to defend what is there.

I remember the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our Republican leader, in his testimony yesterday saying, "There are a lot of things here we can justify." He was willing to come to this floor in this well and stick up for the gentleman and for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and for your budget.

We are reasonable people and we would do that. Sure, some of these amendments do cut too deep. Why can we not debate them on the floor as we have done for the past 205 years? The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the most outstanding, respected gentlemen in this body ever to serve, has never come to this floor with a rule that has been restricted or structured like this. He has always brought that to the floor and let the House work its

will on all appropriation bills, because it is the people's money that is being spent. That is all we have been asking for here.

I am not going to belabor the point. I have already asked unanimous consent to submit extraneous matter on things I have been talking about here. However, I really urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to let the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], a good Democrat, come to this floor and offer his reasonable amendment. Let the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], another Democrat, come to the floor and offer his amendment. Let the House work its will. Let the American people be proud of us, not ashamed of us the way they are now. It is heart-breaking, it really is.

Defeat the previous question. We will come back with a rule which would allow all of these people who spent 11 hours testifying, that are represented by all these people in the gallery, watching this thing on C-SPAN, let them represent their people. Vote down the rule and vote down the previous question.

#### AN AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

On page 2, at line 11, strike the words, "No amendment shall be in order except those" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "It shall be in order to consider the amendments".

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to this rule. I supported an amendment to cut 25 percent from this particular appropriation.

Some people say talk is cheap. But in Congress, the lack of talk can be very expensive.

Once again, the Rules Committee has shut Members of Congress out. It has shut Members out of a process that is supposed to ensure an opportunity for free-wheeling debate and open discussions. When I talk with the people of the 2d District of Iowa, there are no modified closed rules preventing our open discussions. That is why I have better debates at town meetings and with farmers at 7 a.m. in the Chit Chat Cafe in Thornton than I have here on the House floor. Everybody gets equal time to discuss whatever subject is important to them.

I believe we have lost something very precious in this body—the ability for great debate and open and honest discussions. Someone please tell me why are we not allowed to debate or offer amendments to a spending bill that funds our own operations? Why can't we discuss openly which programs can be cut, eliminated, or consolidated? Does this bill not affect every one of us? Why can't we cut our own spending first?

Like last year, I strongly supported an across-the-board cut in the legislative branch appropriations bill and several Members wanted to offer such an amendment to cut our own spending by 25 percent—it was soundly rejected by a Rules Committee that is comprised

of nine Democrats and only four Republicans. Give us a chance to decide for ourselves if we want to kill this amendment or vote in favor of it. Don't jam down our throats a rule that does not reflect the will of the people. To me, a vote in favor of this rule represents a vote in favor of repression and tyranny.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had inquired earlier and I had assured him that I was going to close following his remarks, since they had used up all of their time. However, we do have a Member who has just come on the floor who has asked for time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, just to show that I am not an obstructionist, I have no objection.

Mr. FROST. For purposes of debate only, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding me this time, especially in light of the fact that I do not support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by this rule, because we were given assurances not too long ago by our own party leadership that we would end the practice of closed rules or limited rules as much as possible for the duration of this session. Yet today we see ourselves continuing in that vein. A variety of amendments to cut various programs within the legislative department were rejected. Some amendments to cut across the board were rejected. We are left with a handful of amendments dealing with very small sums of money.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why in this Congress we are afraid of more open rules. I do not say they all have to be open, but they do not have to be as limited as this. We seem to be determined to manipulate the outcome by limiting the options. This is not democratic. This is not consistent with the principles of the Democratic Party to which I belong.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has attempted to craft a balanced, fair rule for a very controversial piece of legislation. This is a piece of legislation that in fact reduces outlays by 6.4 percent, and when we combine that with the reduction in outlays of last year we have almost a 13-percent reduction in outlays over a 2-year period. This is a good faith effort on behalf of the legislative branch appropriation committees to do a very tough job. I think it is a good bill and a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. 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 240, nays 177, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Glickman	Natcher
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Neal (MA)
Andrews (ME)	Gordon	Neal (NC)
Andrews (NJ)	Green	Oberstar
Andrews (TX)	Gutierrez	Obey
Applegate	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Bacchus (FL)	Hamburg	Orton
Baesler	Hamilton	Owens
Barca	Harman	Pallone
Barcia	Hastings	Parker
Barlow	Hayes	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hilliard	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Hinchee	Pelosi
Berman	Hoagland	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Bilbray	Holden	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hoyer	Poshard
Blackwell	Hughes	Price (NC)
Bonior	Hutto	Rahall
Borski	Inslee	Rangel
Boucher	Jefferson	Reed
Brewster	Johnson (GA)	Reynolds
Brooks	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Browder	Johnson, E.B.	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rose
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Kaptur	Rowland
Byrne	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Cantwell	Kennelly	Rush
Carr	Kildee	Sabo
Chapman	Kleczka	Sanders
Clay	Klein	Sangmeister
Clayton	Klink	Sarpallus
Clement	Kopetski	Sawyer
Coleman	Kreidler	Schenk
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lancaster	Schumer
Conyers	Lantos	Serrano
Cooper	LaRocco	Sharp
Coppersmith	Laughlin	Shepherd
Costello	Lehman	Skaggs
Coyne	Levin	Skelton
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Slattery
Danner	Lipinski	Slaughter
Darden	Lloyd	Smith (IA)
de la Garza	Long	Spratt
Deal	Lowey	Stenholm
DeFazio	Maloney	Stokes
DeLauro	Mann	Strickland
Dellums	Manton	Studds
Derrick	Margolies-	Stupak
Deutsch	Mezvinsky	Swett
Dicks	Markey	Swift
Dingell	Martinez	Synar
Dixon	Matsui	Tanner
Dooley	Mazzoli	Tauzin
Durbin	McCloskey	Taylor (MS)
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Tejeda
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Thornton
English (AZ)	McHale	Thurman
English (OK)	McKinney	Torres
Eshoo	McNulty	Torricelli
Evans	Meehan	Towns
Fazio	Meek	Traficant
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Tucker
Filner	Mfume	Unsold
Fingerhut	Miller (CA)	Valentine
Flake	Mineta	Velazquez
Foglietta	Minge	Vento
Ford (TN)	Mink	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Volkmer
Frost	Mollohan	Washington
Furse	Montgomery	Waters
Gejdenson	Moran	Watt
Gephardt	Murphy	Waxman
Geren	Murtha	Wheat
Gibbons	Nadler	Whitten

Williams  
Wilson  
Wise

Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn

Yates

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 185, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—226

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus (AL)  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Billrakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehrlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Clinger  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emerson  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Fish  
Fowler  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gekas  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte  
Goodling

NAYS—177

Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Houghton  
Huffington  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Inhofe  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kyl  
Lambert  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levy  
Loren  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
Machtley  
Manzullo  
McCandless  
McCollum  
McCreery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McMillan  
Meyers  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (FL)  
Mollinari  
Moorhead  
Morella

Myers  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Paxon  
Penny  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Ramstad  
Ravenel  
Regula  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Santorum  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Talent  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Weldon  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Abercrombie	Green	Oberstar
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Obey
Andrews (ME)	Hall (OH)	Olver
Andrews (NJ)	Hamburg	Ortiz
Andrews (TX)	Hamilton	Owens
Applegate	Harman	Pallone
Bacchus (FL)	Hastings	Pastor
Baesler	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Barca	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hilliard	Pelosi
Barlow	Hinchee	Peterson (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Hoagland	Pickle
Becerra	Hochbrueckner	Pomeroy
Beilenson	Holden	Poshard
Berman	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bevill	Hughes	Rahall
Bilbray	Inslee	Rangel
Bishop	Jefferson	Reed
Blackwell	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Bonior	Johnson, E.B.	Richardson
Borski	Johnston	Roemer
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rose
Brewster	Kaptur	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Kennedy	Rowland
Brown (FL)	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Rush
Bryant	Kleczka	Sabo
Byrne	Klein	Sanders
Cantwell	Klink	Sangmeister
Carr	Kopetski	Sarpallus
Chapman	Kreidler	Sawyer
Clay	LaFalce	Schenk
Clayton	Lancaster	Schroeder
Clement	Lantos	Schumer
Coleman	LaRocco	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Laughlin	Shepherd
Collins (MI)	Lehman	Skaggs
Conyers	Levin	Skelton
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Slattery
Coppersmith	Lipinski	Slaughter
Costello	Lloyd	Smith (IA)
Coyne	Long	Spratt
Cramer	Lowey	Stenholm
Danner	Maloney	Stokes
Darden	Mann	Strickland
de la Garza	Manton	Studds
Deal	Margolies-	Stupak
DeFazio	Mezvinsky	Swett
DeLauro	Markey	Swift
Dellums	Martinez	Synar
Derrick	Matsui	Tanner
Deutsch	Mazzoli	Tauzin
Dicks	McCloskey	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McCurdy	Tejeda
Dixon	McDermott	Thornton
Dooley	McHale	Thurman
Durbin	McKinney	Torres
Edwards (CA)	McNulty	Torricelli
Edwards (TX)	Meehan	Towns
English (AZ)	Meek	Traficant
English (OK)	Menendez	Tucker
Eshoo	Mfume	Unsold
Evans	Miller (CA)	Valentine
Fazio	Mineta	Velazquez
Fields (LA)	Minge	Vento
Filner	Mink	Visclosky
Fingerhut	Moakley	Volkmer
Flake	Mollohan	Washington
Foglietta	Montgomery	Waters
Ford (TN)	Moran	Watt
Frank (MA)	Murphy	Waxman
Frost	Murtha	Wheat
Furse	Nadler	Whitten
Gejdenson	Natcher	
Gephardt	Neal (MA)	
Geren	Neal (NC)	
Gibbons	Gordon	

NOT VOTING—16

Bateman  
Brown (CA)  
Cardin  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Engel

Ford (MI)  
Gilchrist  
Henry  
McKeon  
Oliver  
Pickett

Scott  
Sisisky  
Stark  
Thompson

□ 1208

Messrs. GREENWOOD, WALSH, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. SHEPHERD and Mr. DERRICK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the resolution.

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

NOES—185

Allard	Baker (LA)	Bentley
Archer	Ballenger	Bereuter
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Billrakis
Bachus (AL)	Bartlett	Bliley
Baker (CA)	Barton	Blute

Boehlert	Hoekstra	Petri
Boehner	Hoke	Pombo
Bonilla	Horn	Porter
Bunning	Houghton	Portman
Burton	Huffington	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Hunter	Quillen
Calvert	Hutchinson	Quinn
Camp	Hutto	Ramstad
Canady	Hyde	Ravenel
Castle	Inglis	Regula
Clinger	Inhofe	Ridge
Coble	Istook	Roberts
Collins (GA)	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Roth
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Crane	Kim	Royce
Crapo	King	Santorum
Cunningham	Kingston	Saxton
Deal	Klug	Schaefer
DeLay	Knollenberg	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Dickey	Kyl	Sharp
Doillittle	Lazio	Shaw
Dornan	Leach	Shays
Dreier	Levy	Shuster
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Smith (MI)
Everett	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Ewing	Linder	Smith (OR)
Fawell	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Fields (TX)	Machtley	Snowe
Fingerhut	Manzullo	Solomon
Fish	McCandless	Spence
Fowler	McCollum	Stearns
Franks (CT)	McCrery	Stenholm
Franks (NJ)	McDade	Stump
Gallely	McHale	Sundquist
Gallo	McHugh	Swett
Gekas	McInnis	Talent
Gillmor	McMillan	Taylor (MS)
Gilman	Meyers	Taylor (NC)
Gingrich	Mica	Thomas (CA)
Goodlatte	Michel	Thomas (WY)
Goodling	Miller (FL)	Torkildsen
Goss	Molinar	Upton
Grams	Moorhead	Valentine
Grandy	Morella	Vucanovich
Greenwood	Myers	Walker
Gunderson	Nussle	Walsh
Hall (TX)	Orton	Weldon
Hancock	Oxley	Wolf
Hansen	Packard	Young (AK)
Hastert	Parker	Young (FL)
Hefley	Paxon	Zeliff
Herger	Penny	Zimmer
Hobson	Peterson (MN)	

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say this is another closed rule. It is tyranny of the majority. There will be more votes.

Mr. SPEAKER, I object.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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 31, nays 361, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—31

Allard	Duncan	Pryce (OH)
Armey	Fawell	Quillen
Baker (CA)	Herger	Rohrabacher
Balleger	Hoke	Roth
Bartlett	Kim	Stump
Bentley	Kingston	Sundquist
Burton	Klug	Taylor (NC)
Cox	Knollenberg	Thomas (WY)
Crane	Molinar	Torkildsen
DeLay	Myers	
Dickey	Pombo	

NAYS—361

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Ackerman	Bryant	DeLauro
Andrews (NJ)	Bunning	Dellums
Andrews (TX)	Buyer	Derrick
Applegate	Byrne	Deutsch
Archer	Callahan	Diaz-Balart
Bacchus (FL)	Calvert	Dicks
Bacchus (AL)	Camp	Dingell
Baesler	Canady	Dixon
Baker (LA)	Cantwell	Dooley
Barca	Carr	Dornan
Barclia	Castle	Dreier
Barlow	Chapman	Dunn
Barrett (NE)	Clay	Durbin
Barrett (WI)	Clayton	Edwards (CA)
Barton	Clement	Edwards (TX)
Bellenson	Clinger	Emerson
Bereuter	Coble	English (AZ)
Berman	Coleman	English (OK)
Bevill	Collins (GA)	Evans
Bilbray	Collins (IL)	Ewing
Bilirakis	Collins (MI)	Fazio
Bishop	Combest	Fields (LA)
Blackwell	Conyers	Fields (TX)
Bliley	Cooper	Filner
Blute	Coppersmith	Fingerhut
Boehlert	Costello	Fish
Boehner	Coyne	Flake
Bonilla	Cramer	Foglietta
Bonior	Crapo	Ford (MI)
Borski	Cunningham	Ford (TN)
Brewster	Danner	Fowler
Browder	Darden	Frank (MA)
Brown (FL)	Deal	Franks (CT)

Franks (NJ)	Lloyd	Rose
Frost	Long	Rostenkowski
Furse	Lowe	Roukema
Gallely	Machtley	Rowland
Gallo	Maloney	Royce
Gejdenson	Mann	Rush
Gekas	Manton	Sabo
Gephardt	Manzullo	Sanders
Geran	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Sangmeister
Gillmor	Markey	Santorum
Gilman	Martinez	Sarpalus
Glickman	Matsui	Sawyer
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Schaefer
Goodlatte	McCandless	Schnef
Goodling	McCloskey	Schiff
Gordon	McCormack	Schroeder
Goss	McCollum	Schumer
Grams	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Grandy	McCurdy	Sharp
Green	McDade	Shaw
Greenwood	McDermott	Shays
Gunderson	McHale	Shepherd
Hall (OH)	McHugh	Shuster
Hall (TX)	McInnis	Skaggs
Hamilton	McKinney	Skeen
Hansen	McNulty	Skelton
Hastert	Meehan	Slattery
Hastings	Meek	Slaughter
Hayes	Menendez	Smith (IA)
Hefner	Meyers	Smith (MI)
Hilliard	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hinche	Michel	Smith (OR)
Hoagland	Miller (CA)	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Snowe
Hochbrueckner	Mineta	Solomon
Hoekstra	Minge	Spence
Holden	Mink	Spratt
Horn	Moakley	Stearns
Houghton	Mollohan	Stenholm
Hoyer	Montgomery	Stokes
Huffington	Moorhead	Strickland
Hughes	Moran	Studds
Hutchinson	Morella	Stupak
Hutto	Murphy	Swett
Hyde	Murtha	Swift
Inglis	Nadler	Synar
Inhofe	Natcher	Talent
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Tanner
Istook	Neal (NC)	Tauzin
Jacobs	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Jefferson	Oberstar	Tejeda
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Thomas (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Olver	Thornton
Johnson (SD)	Ortiz	Thurman
Johnson, E. B.	Orton	Torricelli
Johnson, Sam	Owens	Towns
Johnston	Oxley	Trafficant
Kanjorski	Packard	Tucker
Kaptur	Pallone	Unsold
Kennedy	Parker	Upton
Kennelly	Pastor	Valentine
Kildee	Paxon	Vento
King	Payne (NJ)	Visclosky
Kleczka	Payne (VA)	Volkmer
Klein	Penny	Vucanovich
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Walker
Kopetski	Peterson (MN)	Walsh
Kreidler	Petri	Washington
Kyl	Pickle	Waters
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Watt
Lambert	Porter	Waxman
Lancaster	Portman	Weldon
Lantos	Poshard	Wheat
LaRocco	Price (NC)	Whitten
Laughlin	Quinn	Williams
Lazio	Rahall	Wilson
Leach	Ramstad	Wise
Lehman	Ravenel	Wolf
Levin	Reed	Woolsey
Levy	Regula	Wyden
Lewis (CA)	Reynolds	Wynn
Lewis (FL)	Richardson	Yates
Lewis (GA)	Ridge	Young (AK)
Lightfoot	Roberts	Young (FL)
Linder	Roemer	Zeliff
Lipinski	Rogers	Zimmer
Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—41

Andrews (ME)	Cardin	Eshoo
Bateman	Clyburn	Everett
Becerra	Condit	Gibbons
Boucher	de la Garza	Gilchrist
Brooks	Doillittle	Gingrich
Brown (CA)	Engel	Gutierrez

NOT VOTING—22

Bateman	Dunn	Rogers
Browder	Engel	Scott
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	Sisisky
Callahan	Gilchrist	Stark
Cardin	Henry	Thompson
Clyburn	Kasich	Torricelli
Condit	McKeon	
Dooley	Pickett	

□ 1226

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:  
Mr. Engel for, with Mr. McKeon against.

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks during debate on House Resolution 192.

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

Hamburg	McKeon	Scott
Hancock	McMillan	Serrano
Harman	Mfume	Sisisky
Hefley	Pelosi	Stark
Henry	Pickett	Thompson
Hunter	Rangel	Torres
Kasich	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Kolbe	Saxton	

□ 1247

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 2295, THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1994**

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may meet and grant a rule to H.R. 2295, the Foreign Operations Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1994, during the week of June 14, 1993. A request may be made for a structured rule, which would permit the offering of only those floor amendments designated in the rule.

Earlier today, the committee circulated a Dear Colleague letter which requests that all amendments to the bill be submitted to the Rules Committee no later than 12 noon on Tuesday, June 15.

In order to ensure the right to offer amendments under the rule that may be requested, Members should submit 55 copies of each amendment, together with a brief explanation of each amendment, to the committee office at H-312, the Capitol, by 12 noon on Tuesday. Members should draft their amendments to the Union Calendar version of H.R. 2295 which reflects the action of the Appropriations Committee. Copies of the reported bill will be available in the office of Legislative Counsel tomorrow for the purpose of drafting amendments.

**LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 192 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2348.

□ 1248

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MINK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA], a new Member, for a question.

Mr. BARCA. Madam Chairman, I am relatively new here, but I am just curious why in the middle of the day we would have a motion to adjourn which obviously did not have that many votes? It just seems to me like there is still a considerable amount of business left that the House has to transact during the course of the day, and it seems like these kinds of delays do cost time and money.

□ 1250

I just wondered if the gentleman could explain that to me, as a new Member.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, the gentleman asks a worthy question. It is very hard to estimate what adding 20 minutes to the time of the House today will cost, but, clearly, if we went another 20 minutes beyond what we normally do in the special orders, Members have estimated it costs as much as \$2,000. I do not know that that is analogous, but there is clearly the possibility of overtime costs for security personnel, clerical personnel, additional electricity for air-conditioning, additional costs per page, if there are going to be other things printed in the RECORD.

I guess the bottom line is, there really is not much point in this. It is simply a dilatory tactic, and occasionally it is used simply to make us stay here longer, even on a day when most Members are ready to go back and deal with their constituents in their district.

I do appreciate the gentleman's question. It is a natural question for a new Member to ask.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], Chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

At this time I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], chairman of this subcommittee, and our friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

This is one of the most important subcommittees that we have on our full Committee on Appropriations, and it is one, Madam Chairman, that is one of the most difficult subcommittees to serve on.

All of the 11 members composing the Subcommittee on Legislative are able

members of our committee and able Members of the House. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] are two of the ablest Members in this House, and they are two of the ablest members on this subcommittee. I want to commend them, along with the other members of this subcommittee on a good bill.

Madam Chairman, this is a good bill. It is one that we can all support.

As my colleagues know, on our full committee, we have 13 subcommittees. At this time we have marked up eight of our bills. They have been marked up. We have two bills today that are in the process of being marked up, the two today, energy and public works and transportation. That would make a total, then, of 10 bills marked up. We only have three to go.

The budget, as submitted to the Congress and to our committee, Madam Chairman, totals about \$1,512,000,000,000. We divide that into 13 parts. We said to the Members of the House that we will pass all of our appropriations bills by the 4th day of July and send them to the other side. Madam Chairman, we intend to do it.

Both sides of this aisle have helped us, and I want my colleagues to know that on our committee, we appreciate it.

We are going to send them to the other side saying, again, to them, Madam Chairman, we don't want any continuing resolution, no continuing resolution at all. We don't want any Santa Claus grab bag where they put a lot of things we can't approve.

I want to commend the chairman of this committee and the ranking member and all of the members on a job well done.

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

Madam Chairman, it is a pleasure to present H.R. 2348, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994, to the House. I do not intend to go into every detail of the bill. I think the report and the bill have been available, and I know that many Members and staff have gone over it very thoroughly. It has had a very thorough discussion in the Committee on Rules.

Before I begin though, I want to thank each member of our subcommittee.

The Subcommittee on Legislative is not one of the most popular committees within our 13. In fact, other than the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, which has obviously some heavy lifting as well, there is really very little incentive for Members to want to serve on this committee. Given the low level of public esteem that the Congress, these days, is held in, regrettably, lower than recent history we are constantly under pressure to find ways to economize and to justify our activities. But the Members who have been

willing to serve on this committee have served diligently, and I believe we give as thorough a review of this committee's work as any of the committees that deal with far greater numbers.

First of all, I want to join with the commendation of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], delivered by our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. He is a gentleman. He works hard. He is fair. He is objective, and he is a good guy. He is also very decent to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but particularly on his side for his willingness to accept this responsibility.

He has been a longtime member of our committee, for 20 years, and obviously, he is still paying back for his privilege of service on this committee.

His predecessor, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS], is a close, personal friend of mine who has been and will be someone I value the friendship of my entire life. But I could not find a better partner than the person who had replaced him this year, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and I want to put that on the RECORD.

In addition, we have a number of new members of our committee, and I think they deserve recognition: the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], who has been particularly diligent, spent a great deal of time with the committee, is second ranking; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], who are very active Members of the institution, have consented to serve once again, giving us some continuity, historic perspective; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], two other very active members of our committee with very serious assignments on other subcommittees, who have joined us as well.

In addition, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] have become new members as well and have put in a great deal of time, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], so that their imprint is on this bill, even as we bring it to the floor today.

I think we must point out that this committee works very closely with a number of other committee, most certainly the Committee on House Administration, chaired by the eminent gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] and with the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], my good friend.

We also work closely with other committees, other subcommittees of that committee, but also other committees of the House, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the committee of jurisdiction over the GAO, the Committee on Government Operations. And we value our relationships.

We particularly want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for the work that he has done with us, providing for an early retirement incentive issue that really does affect his domain. He has been very kind to work closely with us.

This is the annual bill for the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, but there are many Members who do not realize that we are just a very small part of the total budget picture. We are one-third, of course, of the Federal system, under the Constitution, but one spending is only 0.13 percent, that is thirteen one hundreds of 1 percent, of the entire Federal budget. That is a very, very small fraction of the total budget. But the budget is a little deceptive as well in that it is only, as we bring it to the floor today, 60 percent for the operations of Congress. Forty percent of it relates to other agencies that are available to the general public and do work that goes far beyond any assistance they provide to us.

We do have support agencies, such as the Architect of the Capitol, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Technology Assessment and the Congressional Research Service. But there is also the agency that ferrets out waste, fraud and abuse and conducts financial audits of government programs, the General Accounting office, also the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and a very small entity called the Copyright Royalty Tribunal.

There are a number of other minor agencies in the bill. One very important one is the Copyright Office that is so important to intellectual property in this country. There is also a very important program at the Library of Congress that relates to our constituents in the homes of our libraries around the country. We are the entity that does the cataloguing for the entire Nation.

□ 1300

The Library of Congress provides a subsidy of several hundred million dollars to State and local libraries in this context.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House totals some \$1,783,000 in budget authority for fiscal 1994. That is a very severe reduction, \$19 million under the budget authority enacted and available in the fiscal year 1993. That is a 1.1 percent reduction under a hard freeze.

The most important figure we look to in this bill is the outlay figure. We have come to appreciate outlays, the money actually spent each year, as the standard by which this committee and other committees should be judged. We are very proud of the fact that for the second year running we have reached an outlay reduction of over 6 percent. Together with the cut last year, we are well on our way, halfway, to a 25-per-

cent reduction, which I know is the target many Members have for a reasonable downsizing of this branch of government.

We have cut almost \$300 million, or some 14 percent, from the amount that was requested by the agencies directly. We have cut \$100 million from the baseline, which is the budget that most committees are judged by as they move into the next fiscal year. They move along a baseline, which accounts for inflation and for additional eligibility.

We do not take that approach. We use outlays, the amount actually spent. We have continued to reduce for the second year running by a very sizable amount. I would like to give some indication as to how we have been able to do that. I hope I can accomplish that using some charts which really do indicate, I think, the historic context in which we look at the legislative branch.

We are constantly being told that our budget, our staffing, is growing by leaps and bounds, it is out of control. In fact, if we look in the 1978, the year that I happen to have been elected to Congress, to 1994 time frame, I think the Members can see we have actually been very restrained.

The green line here is the House. The blue line is the legislative branch. If we look closely, we will note that we have actually reduced the funding in the legislative branch during that period of time in real terms by something in the neighborhood of \$20 million. In real dollars we are actually spending less today than we were in 1978.

At the same time we look at the executive branch and we can see that the executive branch budget is up some 29 percent. That is a sizable increase since 1978. The cost of living, of course, has gone up 130 percent, so we have seen the legislative branch reduced by 6.6 percent in the face of 130 percent in the cost of living index and, as I said, a 29 percent increase in the executive branch.

We always focus on employment. We talk a lot about the great growth in the staffing in the legislative branch. I would like to point out that essentially it is a steady state. In fact, it has declined as well. If the Members look at the bottom line here, that green line which relates to the House, the Members can see that there is a reduction, and in the legislative branch as well a sizeable reduction. We are down 5.8 percent in the legislative branch. That is down 2,200 people.

The House of Representative is down 500 people, 4.3 percent, while, of course, the executive branch has grown during this period. Really, since the beginning of the time I took the chair of this committee, the beginning of the Reagan-Bush era, the executive branch has grown by 200,000 people, an increase of 7 percent.

We will in this bill require an additional reduction of 920 people in the

legislative branch. This I think puts even more starkly the budget, the black line here, the legislative branch budget, in comparison to the other two branches.

First of all, the judicial branch, which has a rather sizeable increase of 190 percent, and then the executive branch, which has gone up a significant 37 percent, is this red line. The black line, the legislative branch, is obviously at a steady state level figure. We have seen the White House and the Executive Office of President go up during this period of 1978 to 1994 by significant increases over what we have seen in our branch of government.

For example, the Executive Office of the President went up some 56 percent, the White House some 19 percent, as opposed to our 6.1-percent decline in constant dollars for the legislative branch.

This chart, I think, is even more dramatic in its reflection of the reform attitude we have had in this institution about expenditure for the frank. We enacted significant frank mail reform in 1990. Congressman Frenzel and I worked together to assign to each Member responsibility for their franking. We have not allowed the unlimited use of the frank, as existed before 1989 and 1990.

The Members can see that we have saved already \$167 million that would have been expended had we stayed under the same structure and method of operation that we had historically in the House of Representatives. This year, and I believe it will be amended further on the floor in a few minutes, we have for the first time in recent history, certainly since anyone has recorded it, reduced the amount of funding in the franking budget in an election year from the prior year, when it was a nonelection year.

I would not be surprised that by the end of the day we will be spending \$40 million on franking, as opposed to \$60 million in 1982, despite the fact that we all know the cost of mail has increased in that period. We have come a long way in dealing with our postage problem here. It was crowding out other important elements of our budget, and I am proud to say not only that we have saved that kind of money, but we will save a great deal more in the future.

I think this is a significant example of what we can do when we work together to reduce the cost of government in our own back yard.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. Years ago, I served as a ranking member with him on the Sub-

committee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations, and have the privilege of serving with him now on another subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I appreciate the comments that he made about all of the members of our subcommittee, the majority members and the minority members.

To my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], I would say that I have learned a lot from him. As he pointed out, this is not the most attractive job in the Congress to be on this subcommittee, because we are not presenting America's favorite appropriations bill.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has been generous with time, he has been understanding when we questioned and required information, and I would like to say that we share another relationship on which I would like to take just a minute.

VIC FAZIO and I have a lot of things in common. We both have daughters who had a deadly form of leukemia. Both of our daughters had bone marrow transplants. Both of our daughters got a miracle and are alive and well today. Both of us have worked together with so many other Members of the House to create a national registry of potential bone marrow donors who are willing to contribute bone marrow to give people dying of leukemia and other types of blood disease a second chance at life, so I really have a tremendous admiration and respect for Mr. FAZIO and the work that we have done together over the years on this extremely important issue.

However, I think it is important to note, and I hope the people of America understand, that Members of Congress who appreciate each other and respect each other can still have differences of opinion without being disrespectful. The gentleman from California and I may have a few differences on this bill, but those differences are ones of substance. They are not personal in any way.

The truth of the matter is, Madam Chairman, the bill is a better bill than was the one presented to the Congress last year. It makes the reductions the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] discussed, and it gives an indication that further reductions will be made in the future.

There are those among us who believe that we can solve all of the country's financial problems with this legislative appropriations bill. Not true. As a matter of fact, we could eliminate the Congress, which of course the Constitution would not allow, but we could eliminate funding for the Congress totally and we would not affect the national debt for more than 2 days, because the entire legislative budget that we present today would only pay 2 days' worth of interest on the national debt.

I say that to indicate that this is not a large appropriations bill, but it is one that has a lot of symbolic value, because many Members of this House in their political campaigns for election last year campaigned on reforming the House. I say amen to that. I think, that is a great motivation, and we should all be part of that effort. This bill is one of the few ways that the average Member of the House will have to exercise his or her will.

□ 1310

But again, going back to the subject that this is not a large appropriation bill, of the 13 regular appropriation bills, 11 are larger than this one, and only 1 is smaller. That is the District of Columbia appropriations.

This bill is less than the \$2.5 billion appropriation the committee approved just today as an assistance program for Russia. This bill is only half of the amount that we appropriate for Indian programs. This bill is only two-thirds of the amount that we appropriate for the National Science Foundation. Madam Chairman, I have four or five additional pages of comparisons to show that this is not a large appropriations bill, but it is symbolic, and it is the place where some changes could and should be made.

This bill does contain mandated reductions in personal and administrative costs that we think will be even more substantial than the amount the White House has said that they intend to reduce their funding.

This bill also creates a personnel reduction program for the General Accounting Office, as the Chairman said, the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress.

This bill rescinds \$1.5 million of fiscal year 1993 funds that had been appropriated for select committees that now no longer exist.

Within this bill there are reductions to the Clerk hire accounts, the official mail, and allowance and expenses accounts.

There are some things that I think could be done to make this bill a better bill. There are six amendments that the Rules Committee has made in order, and I think that we will find that most of those will be very constructive and will make this bill even a better bill.

There were others that I think should have been made in order, and we expected that they would have been made in order. As a matter of fact, during our subcommittee markup we took the time to discuss that we could do more in reductions, but we had better leave something for our colleagues in the House to do, because they want to be part of this process, and well they should be. The Members of this House should be part of this process because so many of them ran their political campaigns on the issue of reforming

the House and the way the Congress does it business. Nearly 50 of our colleagues went to the Rules Committee yesterday and asked for an opportunity to present amendments. Most of them were turned down, and their constituents and the people of this great country will not know that the effect of those amendments would have been. The amendments may have been good or they may not have been good, but the Congress and the people of America are never really going to know, because we were denied the opportunity to debate those amendments.

All in all, Madam Chairman, I think this committee has done a good job. We have presented a bill that spends less of the taxpayers' dollars than we actually had anticipated.

I have additional speakers who would like to speak, some supporting the bill and some in opposition to the bill. But this is a good time to debate those issues that many Members feel are crucial and symbolic in making a move toward reform of the way Congress does its business.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a very diligent member of this subcommittee, who has made great contributions to the work of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Chairman, I would just like to take a moment to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee and all of the staff and all of the members of the committee who worked hard on the bill. Let me say that I appreciate it very much.

Madam Chairman, I rise to commend the efforts of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee staff and Chairman FAZIO. The legislative appropriations is one of the most difficult bills this body addresses each year. Now that the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee has concluded its work on the budget for fiscal year 1994, Congress and the American people must take note at the lack of reductions in this spending bill.

The Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee reduces budget outlays by 5.8 percent from 1993 legislative operations levels. It is a weak attempt at reducing Federal spending, when the House has voted to increase taxes on its citizens. The American people are sick and tired of being burdened with endless Government spending and a spiralling Federal deficit. As a member on this committee, it is my responsibility to see that every effort is made to reduce waste and excess spending.

The efforts of the minority were not represented to the extent that I would have liked to see in this appropriations bill. Many issues such as further reductions in funding levels and the elimination of duplication in legislative operations still remain unresolved. If we ask the American people to sacrifice a portion of their current spending level, then we must set the standard of budget reductions for them to follow. While this bill does cut spending, it does not go far enough in setting a standard for the American people to follow.

Last November, the American people voted for change. They sent a strong signal to the White House and Congress that they wanted a budget that cuts the cost of running the Government. This committee has failed to accomplish the task of reducing Federal spending that the American people voted for in November. The American people deserve better.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I would like to also mention that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], a very hard-working and diligent member of this subcommittee, also offered an amendment. His amendment was not successful, but it was a very substantial amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

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

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this appropriation bill.

My principal objection to this bill is the highly restrictive rule that has been imposed on us by the majority leadership. This rule prohibits the House from working its will, openly and democratically, in accordance with the precedents of this House for appropriation bills. As a result, more taxpayer money will be provided to run this Congress than would otherwise be available through the sunlight of an honest and open debate.

Madam Chairman, in frankness, we are experiencing a tyranny of the majority party on the majority of the House.

Madam Chairman, mine is neither a cynical nor a disingenuous position. This Member is fully prepared to live within the judgment of the democratic—small "d"—majority of this House. But in the absence of the basic right to achieve that judgment, I am obliged, on behalf of my constituents, to vote against this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Chairman, let me put this in context. Today this country is \$4 trillion in debt. On an annual basis we continue to spend more than \$250 billion per year than we collect in taxes.

Nineteen percent of the American people think we are doing a good job. And we just passed the largest tax increase in this country's history.

We are sending the American people a clear message today. As we take a look at how much money we spend on ourselves, we have taken the courageous position of finding that we can cut our spending by 1 percent. During this next year, proportionately, this bill will add \$200 million to the deficit, \$200 million to our national debt.

As we look at our spending, we find that pork starts at the top. Rather than setting an example, our House

leadership on both sides of the aisle is getting \$300,000 more than what they had last year.

The real issue is, we are trying to set an example for the country. As we take a look at what businesses do when business gets tough, through employee suggestions they cut costs and streamline their business. When we had additional suggestions to cut costs, we in our ultimate wisdom said no, we will not even let those amendments be brought down to the floor for discussion. No, we will not discuss Members' suggestions to have an across-the-board cut of 25 percent. No, we will not consider suggestions banning or reducing the use of the frank.

We are not setting the kind of example that this country is looking for to really earn the title of being a Congress committed to reform.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislative branch appropriations bill because it just continues business and spending as usual for the Congress.

One area which should be drastically revised and cut is funding for congressional mail.

I believe that the practice of franking—mailing under a congressional signature—should be ended completely and the amount of funds allocated for congressional mail should, at the very least, be cut in half. The legislation before us today includes \$47.5 million for congressional mail. That is an outrageous amount and a waste of taxpayers' money.

Madam Chairman, the American taxpayer is tired of footing the bill for millions of pieces of unsolicited mail from Members of Congress. In addition, Americans genuinely resent the use of the frank. It is exactly the kind of special privilege Congress reserves for itself which the average American does not have.

I believe Members of Congress should be able to correspond with their constituents and even send followup letters on issues of interest to the residents of their districts. An average mail budget of \$200,000 for each Member is simply unnecessary. The majority of these funds are used for unsolicited mass mailings which the American people view as another form of junk mail.

Cutting funds for congressional mail and ending the use of the frank is not only good government, it is a major contribution to campaign reform. It will level the playing field and make congressional elections more competitive.

I support the amendment which will be offered today to cut \$5.6 million

from the House mail allowance, but I believe we should take much bolder action on this issue. Congress should do the following:

First, end the use of franked mail by the House. Congress should replace signed mail with more standard forms of postage including mail meters, prepaid envelopes, and stamps. Congress should send its mail the same way as other citizens.

Second, cut the total House mail allowance in half to \$23.8 million in fiscal year 1994. I believe the allowance should be cut by a greater amount, but I have used a conservative estimate pending further study. I will urge larger cuts in future legislation.

Third, return any unused funds in the official mail allowance to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

Fourth, ban the use of office expense and personnel funds for official mail. Members should not be permitted to transfer \$25,000 from office expenses and clerk-hire to their mail account. This is too often used to boost the campaigns of incumbents in close races.

Madam Chairman, franking, which comes from a French word meaning "free," was created by the Continental Congress in 1775. It has become an outdated, abused congressional perk that should be eliminated.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I am happy to yield 6 minutes to my good friend and diligent colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

□ 1320

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, this bill that funds the Congress itself will always be an awkward and difficult bill to pass.

Under the leadership of the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], whose leadership has set a standard of excellence within this body, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], this bill rises to the challenge that we set a standard in the way that we fund ourselves.

Mr. Lombard, the staff director, has done a truly professional job in providing the committee members with information on every component of this budget and its relative importance.

But let us first put some things into historical perspective that Chairman FAZIO emphasized when he spoke, because it is important that we recognize that over the last dozen years the executive branch of Government has grown by more than 200,000 people. This is about a 7-percent increase. Over that same time period, this legislative branch has cut back its staff by 2,200 people, a 6-percent decrease. If you go back to 1978, and we include a Democratic President, the executive branch has increased by 37 percent, the White

House by 19 percent, because there have been tremendously increased governmental responsibilities, and the judicial branch has increased by 200 percent since 1978. The legislative branch has cut itself back over that time period by 7 percent.

But still, year after year, Members will get up on this floor to cut this bill further. Some amendments have been legitimate. Many of them have been accepted, but many have been cynical, hypocritical attempts to gain political advantage at the expense of this institution and our colleagues who depend upon adequate resources to do their job effectively.

Many of the amendments that you will hear about today were offered, in my opinion, with little constructive intent but for personal political gain. But we know that Congress-bashing sells well back home. It is what our constituents want to hear.

But, you know, there is really nothing short of total elimination of all of our salaries and staff that is going to satisfy a lot of those people. But this committee is aware of that and has anticipated that in this bill.

Madam Chairman, we are on track to achieving more than a 25-percent reduction in legislative branch spending. From fiscal years 1993 through 1996, over this 4-year period, we will achieve a 25-percent reduction. Last year we cut spending by 6.5 percent for the legislative branch. This year it is another cut of 6.4 percent in spending for the legislative branch. We are halfway toward that goal already.

This bill is a 14-percent reduction below the budget request.

Now, franked mail is one of the most controversial parts of this bill. We have cut another \$2 million from franked mail. It is the first time that Members will have less to spend in an election year than they had in the previous year. Over the last 4 years the frank has been cut by \$167 million. It is a 50-percent reduction over the last 4 years in how much can be used for allowable franking.

Staffing is the next most controversial issue. Madam Chairman, we have not found 2,318 authorized positions. We actually eliminated 248 positions.

We have cut the money so tight for the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress that we had to impose an early-out option to avoid RIFing. RIFing does not work. You wind up getting the highest paid people bumping the lowest paid people. You get a mismatch of skills and responsibilities, and the people that wind up losing their jobs are oftentimes the last-hired, lowest paid employees.

What we are going to do is the same thing that the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency are doing. We are offering an early-out incentive of \$25,000 or severance pay,

the lower of either. We expect that this is going to result in 900 positions that are currently filled being eliminated from the legislative branch appropriations bill. These are warm bodies, jobs that will be cut as a result of this appropriations bill.

Madam Chairman, let me conclude by saying that this bill sets a fiscally responsible standard. It is one that all of us can be proud of to vote for.

But if we do not respect ourselves and this institution of which we are a part, how can we expect our constituents to respect us?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I hope America is listening to this bunk. Baloney.

The deficit is out of control. The national debt has quadrupled in the last 10 years. They do not want to cut spending, and yet they keep coming down here and giving you these platitudes and telling you what they are doing and doing for you. The fact of the matter is, in fiscal year 1993 they spent \$1.8 billion on the legislative branch, and in fiscal year 1994 they are going to spend a hair less than that, but it is going to be another \$1.8 billion.

They talk about spending cuts that are going to take place from 1993 to 1996. There are going to be two Congresses elected between now and then. Those spending cuts in the out years will never take place. That is what they always tell you, "We are going to raise your taxes now, and we are going to raise spending now, but 3 or 4 years from now we are going to cut spending," and they never ever do it.

I would like to say to my Democrat friends, Did you watch the results in Texas? Did you take a look at Texas? The eyes of Texas are upon you. Twenty-seven out of twenty-nine Democrat counties went Republican overwhelmingly.

Did you look at Los Angeles? First time in 30 years a Republican mayor was elected.

Did you look at that legislative race that was supposed to go 75-percent Democrat, and they barely won it?

Now, let me tell you guys something. You had better get with it. The American people want spending cuts first. They want you to cut the legislative branch of Government. They want you to take a meat cleaver to this Government and not come up with more spending programs.

You know, this just is not hyperbole, guys. I know you do not like to hear me say this. But the fact of the matter is cut spending first, or you are going to lose your jobs. Two years from now a lot of you will not be in this Chamber. You will be working someplace else, because you are not listening to the people of this country.

Do not raise taxes. Cut spending first.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The guests who are in the gallery are not to express their views one way or another during the debate. The Chair reminds them of the rules of the House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Madam Chairman, my colleagues, as a Member in my sixth term, I must express disappointment with both the procedure applied in really denying Republicans and Democrats the opportunity to deal with the issues of the organization and structure and spending of the legislative branch. This Chamber and the legislative process is not the exclusive province of any single committee in the House of Representatives. It does not belong to the Committee on Appropriations. It does not belong to the Committee on Rules. It does not belong to the Committee on House Administration. It does not belong to the Republican Party. It does not belong to the Democratic Party.

We all use the expression, "This is the people's House." We all understand that we bring divergent points of view to a wide range of issues that we discuss on the floor.

But when it comes to making decisions as to how we staff up, the number of personnel that we have, what we do with our own funding, what we do with our own process, it suddenly becomes the exclusive province of a few people in this body, and that is wrong.

□ 1330

There have been more commissions, bipartisan in nature, more promises of reform, and very, very little action. The 110 new freshmen who, I am sure, were elected on a promise to reform Congress, ought to vote "no" on final passage because this was the only opportunity this year as new Members who wanted to do something differently about how this institution is operating and how it functions. And most of them do not have an opportunity to do that. Many of them are denied by their own party the opportunity to offer amendments dealing with how Congress operates.

It is just wrong for us to walk out of town talking about the people's House, but when we walk back into town say, "It is the exclusive retreat for a few Members in this body to tell the rest of us how business should be conducted."

Madam Chairman, we are not answerable just to ourselves, we are answerable to the American public. And we ought to defeat this measure.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, it is very easy, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

MORAN] talked about, to rail against the Congress, but we are all Members of this body. I would venture to say that every Member of this body has several district offices within his district and when people come into his district and ask for help on Social Security or veterans or passport or whatever, they say, "Yes, ma'am, yes, sir, we will get on that as quickly as we possibly can."

And we did some review on this mailing business, and I am not going to pat myself on the back, but I have turned back hundreds of thousands of dollars on mailings. But somebody spoke in Appropriations the other day about cutting the mailing, the franking, by 25 percent. We did a little research, and I am not going to name names, but this gentleman was on that side of the aisle. It showed this gentleman was one of the biggest frankers in this House, and certainly the biggest franker in the State that he comes from.

Now, it is easy to poke fun at our colleagues, but it is our duty to do the work of our constituents. Let me just add one other thing. When you talk about the gentleman from Indiana—I wish he were here—talking about what it costs to run this body here and what it costs the taxpayers, every time that you call a frivolous vote to adjourn in the middle of the day, it costs several thousand dollars. And when you take special orders or stay here all night and you trash the President or you trash the Congress, you incite a lot of people to write, and they expect to be answered. Every Member in here answers their mail. It is a tremendous workload that we have here. It would be beyond me, even though I do not use all of my frank, I do not use all of my clerk hire, I think it is a cheap shot for me or anybody else to tell another Member from California, Oregon, or Washington, or whatever, how much money it is going to take to do an adequate job for his constituents and for himself. That would be very presumptuous of me. And I think it was very hypocritical; some people that make these statements are so narrowminded that a gnat can sit on the end of their nose and drink water out of both sides at the same time. I think it is ridiculous for us to continue to trash this House when Members are trying to do a good job for their constituents.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a former ranking member on this subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, to my former chairman as well as to my ranking member, let me begin by extending my deep appreciation for the work that they have been through in putting together this bill this year. As my rank-

ing member has indicated, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], I spent approximately a decade doing the job that he is carrying forth so very well as a result of his months of work here.

I must say this is the first time that I have risen on the floor and found myself, first, opposing the rule by voting "no" on the rule that led to this legislative branch bill. I am very disappointed that over 45 Members who went to the Rules Committee with very thoughtful amendments found that their amendments were not allowed. And it will be the first time that I will be supporting a motion for recommitment that would significantly cut more from the legislative branch bill.

There is little question that it is classic action on the House floor for Members to come and rail against the institution, as has been suggested. This is very tough legislation, legislation that involves the funding for the work of the House of Representatives and related agencies.

The public is worried about growth in the cost of Government, the propensity for us to spend more and more, and looks to us first to tighten our belts. I understand that entirely. But to simply demagog this bill is not exactly fair to the process. The Congress does have very serious work to do, work that needs to be carried forward.

Having said that, there is little doubt in the last decade we have expanded the legislative branch. There is little doubt that there is room for tightening of the belt. Indeed, if there comes a time when the majority around here should change, I could see a freeze of a much broader nature than would be proposed today in the motion to recommit.

I would suggest that if a new majority represented the minority party in the House, suddenly the committees would find themselves frozen at the minority staff levels. That would mean a tremendous cut.

What is going to be suggested by way of substitute today will be a freeze to the 1993 levels plus a 5-percent reduction. It seems to me that that is a reasonable step in the direction of suggesting that the House is going to lead, and the desperate need for us to get a handle on Federal spending.

There is little doubt that the legislative branch can carry forward its serious work while it is restraining itself.

Madam Chairman and Members, this is our body, but we are a reflection of the people's will. At this moment the people are suggesting in very clear terms, "It is time to recognize that enough is enough." The legislative branch bill will fund our offices, fund our committee work, and our related agencies at a very adequate level if we just choose a 5-percent reduction. Many would rather have an opportunity to vote on a 25-percent cut.

However, that too was not made in order.

Because of that, Madam Chairman and Members, I wish that we had not only defeated the rule, I would absolutely support further reductions. And in the years ahead I would suggest to my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], let us be very cautious about continuing to expand the legislative branch and gag our Members.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], the leader of the new Members on our side of the aisle.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the chairman for yielding the time to me.

Madam Chairman, new Members on both sides of the aisle came to reform. Many of us came absolutely to say that we should make sacrifices. The reform package was made on both sides of the aisle.

I am pleased to say that the freshmen Democrats also called for reductions in the legislative budget. The legislative appropriations process also included freshmen who were adamant about seeing that their goals which they expressed in the reform package, that over a period of 5 years, 25 percent would indeed be cut.

I am pleased to say that this is a right step in the right direction. There will also be, contrary to what is said, there are indeed amendments on both sides of the aisle. Two of those amendments would indeed substantially reduce the spending; one on the franking side, and the other dealing with limiting former Speakers' expenses for a time indefinite.

Both of those, I think, are fiscally responsible and in fact show that the freshmen on this side of the aisle are taking their commitment to heart. This is a beginning, not the end; this is a beginning and not the end.

I want to commend the leadership in drafting this bill, that they took our reforms to heart and allowed us to present at least three amendments to that legislation.

I urge passage of this legislation.

□ 1340

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Each week the participants on CNN's "Capitol Gang" share what they feel is the outrage of the week. I have got a doozy for them. The Democratic leadership has denied the Members of this House the opportunity to lead by example and cut congressional spending on itself by 25 percent.

Yesterday Republicans made a simple request. We asked the Democrats to

make in order a floor amendment which would have cut the congressional fat, not across the board, but in a careful and reasoned line-by-line way. Our amendment would have cut unnecessary committee staff, but kept 100 percent of the funding for books for the blind.

It would have cut political mail expenses, but left 100 percent of the funding for the handicapped tour service.

It would have preserved 100 percent of the Library of Congress, but cut some of the expense of over 5,000 employees for the General Accounting Office and hold that to one-third of a billion dollars per year, just that one part of our staff.

It would have provided full funding for all important constituent services.

Many analysts have noted that all of the staff on the Hill has actually contributed to legislative problems. The staff prepare bills of over a thousand pages in length which come to the floor without Members having had the opportunity to read them, and bad legislation is the result.

We can save the taxpayers money and do a better job for the country by cutting back some of the staff which now numbers over 30,000 people to serve 535 Members of Congress.

Overall, our amendment would have saved the taxpayers more than \$450 million in fiscal year 1993 alone, yet the Democrat leadership denied us even the opportunity to debate this bill on the floor. This is an outrage.

President Clinton has promised to cut the White House staff by 25 percent, and he has challenged the Congress to do the same.

The American people have been asked by the Democrats in Washington to share in the sacrifice, and yet the leaders of this House will not extend that sacrifice to the Congress itself. The least that we can do here is lead by example.

The Democrats' refusal to do so is without question the outrage of the week.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I rise not to ask for more money in this particular piece of legislation, but to address a great inequity that is taking place before the House of Representatives and that will not be addressed in this legislation.

Let me say that Republicans hold 40 percent of the seats in this House and 40 percent of the seats on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives. The Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives is responsible for the investigations and oversight responsibility of the Congress and the Federal agencies for investigative and again oversight purposes.

It is disgraceful that as I stand here today that the House of Representatives is funding \$3 million for the majority and less than \$300,000 for the minority. That is when the other party controls the Congress of the United States, both Houses and the executive branch of the Government.

When I stood recently and spoke about this inequity, I held up this little sign and I said that it was not the result, 46 to 6, of a badly matched athletic event, it was in fact the staff ratios, the investigative staff ratios of the Government Operations Committee. Today, those numbers have changed to 55 investigative staff for the majority and 7 for the minority.

This is an inequity that must be corrected and is not corrected in this appropriations bill. That is why I will vote against this measure and that is why the American people and this Congress should be cognizant of what is happening with the investigative and oversight responsibilities within this Congress.

The distribution of resources on the Government Operations Committee is an outrage.

While I am concerned about the overall level of funding in this bill, I remain deeply disturbed by the unfair distribution of these resources among the committees of this House.

Republicans hold 40 percent of the seats in this House, and 40 percent of the seats on the Government Operations Committee. And yet the Democrats have proposed to limit the minority to a disgraceful 10 percent of staff and 10 percent of committee resources.

Let us look at the numbers:

There is \$3 million for the majority, less than \$300,000 for the minority.

There are 45 investigative staff for the majority, 7 for the minority.

The staff ratio and allocation of resources on this vital committee seriously undermines the minority's ability to conduct effective oversight. This situation makes a mockery of the electoral will of the American people.

Democrats should be ashamed. And the American people should be outraged at the injustice taking place in the committee responsible for the oversight and investigative review of all Federal Government agencies.

With the Democrats ruling both the House and Senate, and now the White House and the entire executive branch, how can a fair and impartial review of the Democrat-controlled Government be conducted?

Talk about the fox guarding the henhouse—the Democrats will dominate Congress' primary oversight panel with 90 percent of the investigative staff and 90 percent of committee resources.

Madam Chairman, I submit that the Government Operations Committee should be more like the Ethics Committee—balanced and fair in terms of membership, staff, and resources. Oversight of the executive branch is no less important than oversight of the House.

The Government Operations Committee must become more bipartisan in order to maintain its own credibility and guarantee the Government's integrity.

How can the American people regain faith in an institution so grievously handicapping the minority from exercising its congressional responsibilities?

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from Florida and a new member on the Government Operations Committee, is there one request for an investigative staff made by the minority that has ever been rejected?

I yield to the gentleman for a response, and that is yes or no.

Mr. MICA. Well, Madam Chairman, I will not reply on the basis of a yes or no response. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. All right, then the gentleman can tell me any way he wants to tell me, and I yield again.

Mr. MICA. Well, I tell the gentleman, that the inequity is that since I stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and quoted 46 to 6, the numbers have only changed to 54 to 7. I am not asking for more money. I am asking for equity.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I also yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for a total of 2 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I would simply like to make an observation. I understand that it is politically popular to go back home and pose for political holy pictures by beating up on this institution, but the fact is that this institution has a constitutional obligation to produce a legislative product independently of the wishes of the executive branch of government.

We have done so with virtually no staffing increase over the last decade. We have done so by squeezing our budgets much more tightly than the budgets have been squeezed in either the Senate or the executive branch of government.

In fact, if you compare what we pay our own staff in this House versus what the Members of the other body pay their staffs, and I would point out we have to do every bit as much work as has to be done in the other body, except for approving treaties and screwing up the Anita Hill hearings; but outside of those two functions, we perform

every function that the Senate does, and yet the Senate pays their administrative assistants 30 percent more than we pay them in the House.

They pay their legislative directors 50 percent more than we pay them in the House.

They pay their State district directors 40 percent more than we pay in the House.

They pay their press secretaries 50 percent more than we do here.

If there are additional savings to be made, it seems to me they ought to be made in the branch which has demonstrated insufficient attention to cost savings. That is not the House of Representatives.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, we have had a real decline in the purchasing power of the budgets of this House for a long number of years.

I happen to chair a committee, for instance, which had not had a single staff increase for over 10 years.

It seems to me that Members often are tempted to take advantage of the lack of knowledge on the part of the public of the facts about this institution, but the facts are that we have run a very tight budget for the last 10 years and we deserve some credit for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded not to make disparaging remarks about the other body or its membership.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I want to compliment the Members of the House for an invigorating and informative debate.

I would like to say that every Member came here with different guidelines, different directions, different ideas, different determinations, and different requirements.

To give you an example, this gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] geographically has the smallest congressional district in the State of Florida. My colleague, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has a tremendous amount of territory in that congressional district. Because it is a one-Member district for the entire State of Alaska, he requires more financing for his office just to get back and forth to Alaska than I do probably to run my whole office. So each of us have different needs and different requirements in order to serve the people of our districts the way that we believe they ought to be served.

Each of us comes here with a constitutional right to do that, to represent the people the way that we believe they should be represented.

□ 1350

Madam Chairman, I say that to go on to the next part of my comment. In the office that I am privileged to hold for

the people of the 10th District of Florida I am able to function with far less money than is available to me through this Committee on Appropriations. In 1992, last year, I returned 42 percent of my office budget unspent. The year before that I returned 35 percent unspent. And I could make my case with the years prior to that, with similar figures, that we can get by with less, and, when we can get by with less, we ought to. We owe it to the taxpayers who are our bosses.

Somebody mentioned earlier in the debate that this is our House. I say that is not correct. This is the people's House. That is why every one of us has to stand for election every 2 years. If the people of our districts, or the people of our country, want to make a major change in the Congress, they can replace all of us every 2 years. This is the people's House, and we have an obligation to listen to what the people are saying. They are telling us to reduce the cost of our Government, and to "Start here in your own House."

There will be some amendments that will move us further along in that direction, and I believe these are amendments that will not hurt the functioning of the House or any of the Members, although they will be reducing the amounts of money that are appropriated by this bill. We ought to look with favor upon those amendments. It might require a little belt tightening, and it might require a little sacrifice on the performance of a congressional office, but it is something we ought to do.

Madam Chairman, so many of our Members came to this Congress with the commitment to make changes, to make reforms, to do something about the national debt, to do something about the soaring interest payments that we make every year, and I subscribe to all of that. As my colleagues know, for years, before it became the thing to do, to cut the budget, I was one of the lonely group here in the Congress that voted against a lot of programs. Not because we did not like them, but because we were afraid they were going to drive us deeper into debt and that one day we would reach that point of accounting.

Well, Madam Chairman, we have reached that point of accounting now, and we are paying for all of the big spending that we did years ago. I took the flak for voting against many of those good-sounding programs with the knowledge in my own conscience that I did so knowing that my Nation was headed for some serious financial trouble, which we were and to where we have finally arrived.

So, in closing I would like to say that we can make further cuts in this bill. We can make further cuts, and we owe it to the people that we represent to do so. This is their House, and we need to get by with as little of their money being spent as we possible can.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding to me. He observed the constitution of the House of Representatives, that we are only here by sufferance every 2 years. Does the gentleman, my friend, realize that the reason there are more Democrats than Republicans, and have been for many decades, is because of the will of the people?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] by saying that I have always accepted the decisions made by the people of America when they make that decision on election day.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I am glad to know that the gentleman is democratic enough to accept the will of the American people, and now does he realize—

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is a Republican philosophy because we believe in a republican form of government where we, in fact, are representative of the people that have sent us here.

Mr. CONYERS. That is wonderful.

Now I ask the gentleman, Do you realize that the Congress runs by a majority vote, that there is a majority party, and, by virtue of your inability to gain more votes as a minority party, that you are that party?

Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I am not sure that I understand just how what the gentleman is asking, is relevant to this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman does not understand that? OK.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] would state his question again, I would do the best I can to answer it.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman understand that Congress is constituted so that in the two-party system the American people that elect most of the seats to one party, that that constitutes the majority party, and the seats that are allotted to the party that elects the fewer Members constitutes the minority party?

That is what I ask the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I say to the gentleman, Mr. CONYERS, believe me, as one who has been in the minority for my entire public life, believe me I do understand what it means to be a minority.

Mr. CONYERS. So do I.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding to me, and to make such statements in terms

of majority-minority really begs the question of representation. Each Member represents approximately the same number of people, and, if the majority argument is going to be carried out by the gentleman from Michigan, I am sure he would support that all of the support services shared equally, all of the committee assignments shared equally, on the basis of the proportionality of majority and minority. That is not the case. There is not an opportunity for the minority to exercise any of the usual minorities' rights in a democratic concept.

One of the reasons we are protesting about the structure here today, as we do every day, is that the majority has certain rights, but they extend to minority rights, as well, and this closed rule is a good example of the tyranny of the majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has 30 seconds remaining in general debate.

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has completed his time; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of our time in general debate to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], who is the head of the task force of new Members who have looked at this legislative branch bill.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, it was my privilege to chair the task force of Democrat freshmen looking at legislative appropriations. Freshman Democrats understand that government must do with less and that that effort must start with the Congress of the United States.

Madam Chairman, we note that the bill before us this afternoon cuts the budget 6.4 percent. This comes after a 6.5-percent cut last year, representing 13 percent, nearly a 13-percent reduction.

This is on track with our goal, a very tough goal of a 25-percent reduction to be achieved over 5 years.

Madam Chairman, we think the bill before us can be improved with some amendments that will offer further trimming, and I will be sponsoring one myself in a minute or two. But by and large this bill represents a very substantive effort at reducing the budget and appropriately funding the legislative branch.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-118, which may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Debate on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

Is there any point of order against a provision in the bill?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Madam Chairman, today Congress has the chance to set an example for cutting wasteful government spending in the Federal budget by eliminating the wasteful spending in its own budget. Through today's debate, Congress may lead the American public into believing that it has finally cleaned up its own act. Unfortunately, today's floor debate is deceiving. The serious proposals for cutting spending in Congress were left behind by the Democrat-dominated Rules Committee. Although I will vote for these amendments, I will not vote for the final appropriations bill because it does not change the unrestrained spending habits of Congress.

My colleagues in the minority proposed amendments that would bring true fiscal responsibility to the legislative branch of government. These Members proposed that funding for the legislative branch be cut across-the-board by 25 percent. They proposed cutting committee staff appropriations by 25 percent and allocating one-third of staff funds for the under-represented minority party. They also proposed rescinding Federal funding for the House restaurants, the barbershop and beauty salon, and the mail folding room. Taxpayers should not have to pay for these perks.

However, the majority members on the Rules Committee would not allow those amendments to come before the House for a vote. They feared that these amendments would cut into their power to tax and spend with impunity. Instead, the majority chose to allow on the floor only six minor amendments to a bill which includes a 17-percent annual increase in spending. Only one of these amendments would cut spending to any extent at all.

One case of wasteful spending that particularly irks me is the current House policy regarding the offices of former Speakers. The offices of former Speakers have cost the American taxpayers nearly \$4 million in the past 22 years. Right now former Speakers can determine when their official business is concluded. For one former Speaker, official business is still going on 15 years after retirement. Although I will vote for the amendment to limit funding for former Speakers to 5 years after leaving office, I do feel that 1 year is a reasonable time to depart with grace and dignity.

Finally, through conservative budgeting in my office, I have been able to save some of the money Congress allocated to me for my office expenses. Unfortunately, I found out that this saved taxpayer money goes to the Speaker of the House to use at his discretion, rather than to the Treasury as saved taxpayer money for deficit reduction. I have introduced legislation to send money saved from office budgets to the Treasury for deficit reduction or to a fund for small business loans. I hope Congress will consider this proposal in the future as a genuine reform measure for the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 1994 legislative appropriations bill.

During the most recent presidential campaign, many of my constituents who voted for Bill Clinton told me that one of the biggest factors in their vote was his promise to cut White House and congressional staff expenses by 25 percent.

They said that this showed a commitment to real change in Washington and would be a necessary first step in cutting spending. They felt that, if the American people were being asked to sacrifice to reduce the deficit, their representatives should lead the way in making these sacrifices.

Well, just 2 weeks ago, this House tried to force on the American people the largest tax increase in this Nation's history. The majority in this House worked off the assumption that the American people can always tighten their belts a little further and send a few hundred billion more to Washington.

Now, compare that to the bill we're considering today. This House, in spite of the knowledge that the American people want to see us set an example and tighten our belts, is poised to pass a legislative appropriations bill with no significant spending cuts.

And when Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, offered specific cuts that they felt could be made, they were refused the right to offer these amendments.

But, in the past, we have always seen that there are more cuts to be made. Every year, we are told that legislative appropriations have been cut to the bone, and every year we find new cuts to be made.

In 1990, I introduced an amendment to cut an unnecessary 11 percent clerk hire increase that was accepted on the floor of the House. But in the next year, somehow, magically, \$23 million in extra funds were found to fund this increase through the back door.

Last year, I tried to offer an amendment to cut this appropriation by 2 percent across the board, but that amendment was not allowed through rules. It was judged as an unreasonable amendment, yet public opinion later forced Democrats to make this very same cut.

Every year, we are told that democracy will not survive if we cut the legislative branch appropriation by one penny more than the majority on the committee approved. But, the American people know better.

They have expressed their willingness to make sacrifices to reduce our national deficit, and if we refuse to make a significant cut in this bill, we will be breaking faith with them. Vote no on this bill and send it back to committee so that real cuts can be made and Congress can set an example for the American people.

Mr. KYL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 1994 legislative branch appropriations bill. It offers a token 1 percent cut in funding—\$19 million—from the \$1.8 billion appropriated last year, enough to allow House Members to go home and claim they cut the congressional budget, while really just allowing business to continue as usual.

We had a chance here today to make deeper cuts in the congressional budget and to really reform the way the House does business. The Democrat majority said, "no," voting to preclude House Members from both sides of the aisle—Republican and Democrat—from offering meaningful amendments to the bill.

My colleague from Wyoming, CRAIG THOMAS, and I had asked the Rules Committee yesterday for the right to offer an amendment to cut the General Accounting Office [GAO] budget by \$22 million. The committee said "no."

It said, "no" to an amendment that would have terminated the Joint Tax Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, which like the select committees we eliminated earlier this year, duplicate the responsibilities of other offices.

It said "no" to an amendment to cut the congressional budget by 25 percent across-the-board, just as the American people have been demanding.

It said "no" to an amendment to eliminate funding for legislative service organizations [LSO's]. These organizations have \$6 million to \$7 million unaccounted for in their budgets over the last 10 years. Despite serious questions about whether taxpayer dollars have been abused or misappropriated, the committee denied the opportunity to offer amendments on LSO's.

It said "no" to an amendment that would have reduced House mailing expenses by half, essentially prohibiting House Members from sending unsolicited House mailings.

About 50 House Members in all asked for the opportunity to offer reform and cost-cutting amendments, and the committee said "no" to all but six. And, those six offer only token cuts at best.

Madam Chairman, last month, the House passed a recordsetting tax bill, with those supporting the measure claiming to also support Federal spending cuts. We have an opportunity today to lead by example, and clean our own House first.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill so that we can bring a responsible alternative back to the House for consideration.

Mr. ORTON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting the amendments to this legislation cutting appropriated funds for franking and the other cost-cutting amendments being offered today. Cutting Government spending is not easy and Congress must share in the sacrifice that we are asking Americans across the country to make.

I cannot, however, support final passage of this bill as considered. I just do not think we are doing enough in this bill. More substantive reductions are needed.

First, the overall spending reduction in this bill simply does not reflect the mandate we received from the voters to make significant cuts in Federal spending. If we were a business in the private sector facing large losses, would we be cutting expenses by just 1 percent? No. And yet Federal finances are in worse shape than those of many individuals and businesses facing bankruptcy.

Second, we should not simply develop regulations to oversee the financial activities of legislative service organizations [LSO's], we should completely eliminate expenditure of public funds by LSO's. I am supportive of the Democratic study group and its Republican counterpart which provide information and analysis of the legislative issues before the House, but I do not believe that we should expend official funds on special interest LSO's.

Finally, we are not making sufficient cuts in the expenses of committees and House overhead. There is tremendous duplication in committee jurisdiction. Furthermore, committee staffs often work to promote the views of one member, the chairman. In addition to budget

savings, cutting the staffs of committees would result in a committee product which would more directly represent the views of the people who sent us here.

I requested the Rules Committee to allow my amendment cutting committee and House overhead by 10 percent. I believe that we must meet President Clinton's goal of cutting legislative overhead expenses by 25 percent, which goal has been repeated by the House leadership. It will take a very long time to reach that goal by cutting only 1 percent per year.

The American public is ready and willing to do its part in order to cut Federal spending. But are we?

The painful truth is that every penny we appropriate to spend through this legislation will add to the deficit. Therefore, the question we should be asking ourselves for each item of spending is this: Do we need to borrow from our grandchildren to fund this item?

I believe that if we seriously answered this question, we would make more significant cuts in this appropriation bill. That is why I shall vote against final passage.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Chairman, if a Member of Congress does not spend thousands of dollars in unused office budget allowance, the unspent are not dedicated to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

This is wrong.

Under our current system, Members of Congress have two choices—either spend all of your budget allowance or do not. If you do not, someone else will. This process is known in Washington as reprogramming, where the money is transferred to other accounts—sometimes spent on items never intended by the House of Representatives and without its approval.

We must have another option.

Yesterday, I, along with my colleagues Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. TALENT, went before the Rules Committee to offer an amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill that would allow unused office and staff funds to not be reprogrammed. These funds would remain at the Treasury to be dedicated to deficit reduction.

Unfortunately, the amendment was not made in order. That means those of us who run our offices efficiently and want to save taxpayers' dollars on mailing costs, salaries, and expenses—and want to reduce the deficit—will not have the chance to vote on it today.

The President has requested that Congress create a deficit trust fund. What is the point of creating a deficit trust fund if Members of Congress cannot help contribute to it by running their own offices efficiently?

Madam Chairman, I bring this to your attention because I strongly believe Members of Congress should be able to take action against the growing budget deficit.

If Congress is going to ask the American people to live with hard choices we must make in order to balance the budget, then we, as their Representatives, must be able to take the lead.

Mr. POSHARD. Madam Chairman, I rise to express my strong feelings about the need for continued reform of the franking privilege here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have never sent a newsletter to the people in my district, and I have yet to receive the

first complaint. I have left hundreds of thousands of dollars unspent from my mailing allowance and have still managed to correspond with thousands of constituents each year. I have strongly supported the establishment of individual mail accounts, and I believe that has helped us achieve a good measure of reform.

But I think we can and should do better. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1698, to ban newsletters, but the mailing budget by half and apply all of the savings to reducing the deficit. I know that won't amount to a great deal in the face of a \$350 trillion deficit, but I think it's well worth doing.

I would hope that we would continue to provide ourselves the resources to serve our constituents and communicate our views on important issues. But we can surely do this in a more economical fashion. Additionally, I believe this would be an important contribution to the goal of campaign finance reform, which we all recognize must be accomplished.

Madam Chairman, I would continue to urge this House to reduce its mailing costs and provide greater accountability to the American taxpayer.

Mr. MCDADE. Madam Chairman, the legislative branch appropriations bill gives us our first glimpse of the 13 bills we intend to act on in the next few weeks. Under the leadership of Chairman NATCHER our committee is under an ambitious schedule—and one I know we will meet—to bring the fiscal year 1994 appropriation bills before this House.

I'd like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FAZIO and the ranking minority member, Mr. YOUNG—their is not an easy job—it is one that brings little attribution both here and at home. After serving over 20 years on this committee, this is Mr. YOUNG'S first year on the subcommittee. He has done a superb job in juggling the difficult task presented to him. We also have two other new members on the subcommittee, RON PACKARD and CHARLES TAYLOR, both who have played an instrumental role.

This is the only appropriation bill which exclusively funds one of the three branches of the Federal Government. Of the three branches, the legislative branch operates on the smallest budget with total funding for House, Senate, and affiliated functions equal to one-tenth of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

H.R. 2348 totals \$1.8 billion and contains \$1.1 billion for the operations of the Congress, excluding Senate items, and \$723 million, or 41 percent for functions of other agencies such as the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Botanic Garden which are not specifically related to Congress.

While its numbers are relatively small, the interest in this bill is immense. I find it very disheartening that Members of this House, elected by the people back home to make spending decisions, will have no ability to exercise their responsibilities.

The people back home have said "tighten your belts Congress" yet, here we are having to operate under a very limited rule. I share Chairman NATCHER'S desire to see open rules on appropriations bills and I think it is extremely unfortunate we are starting off the

season with a closed rule, just after passing two supplemental bills for fiscal year 1993—both of which were considered under limited rules.

Madam Chairman, this bill does call for a freeze plus cuts. But a 1 percent reduction, or \$19 million cut, to a \$1.8 billion bill must be considered a beginning—it is hardly saying we've tightened the belt. I have the utmost admiration for this institution, as I am sure every Member has. However, it is my view and, the view of the Republicans on the committee, that further reductions can be made without detriment to this institution or the important agencies funded in this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I would like to rise in support of the recommended rule limiting debate on the legislative appropriations bill.

We all want open rules on appropriations legislation. We all want an open and serious debate in which every amendment is fully considered. But the truth is we can not have an open rule on this bill because we do not always have a serious debate on legislative appropriations bills. These bills generate Congress bashing and grandstanding that do not advance the debate, do not serve this institution, and do not serve our constituents.

Many Members of the minority are opposing this rule because it does not allow them to offer their amendments to cut 25 percent across the board, to eliminate LSO's, or eliminate joint committees. These are not serious amendments and they were not meant to improve the legislative branch or to improve this appropriations bill. They were meant to play to the voters back home; to win points by bashing the very institution in which you want so desperately to serve.

We have a responsibility in this body to bring down our deficit. We also have a responsibility to ensure that our Government continues to operate effectively. With this appropriations bill, our responsibility is to fund a separate and equal branch of government and to ensure that it remains a viable part of our federal system. We have met that responsibility in this bill. We have cut spending on the legislative branch while maintaining its viability.

Yesterday, more than 50 Members of Congress went before the Rules Committee with their proposals to reform Congress and to modify this bill. Of their amendments, the Rules Committee chose those amendments that were serious and worthy of being debated in this body. I do not envy the Rules Committee. They have had to make difficult choices, but have come out with a fair and effective rule.

Without this rule, we would debate this bill until next December. Most of the amendments would be struck on a point of order. After all that debate, and all that grandstanding, our bill would be no better than the final bill that will pass today. If every one of the proposed amendments were to be adopted, our deficit would not be reduced, our economy would not be improved, and our constituents would not be better off. The institution, however, and our system of Government would have been destroyed.

We have been elected to serve our constituents and to provide our constituents with the

best Government available. Today, we have an opportunity to ensure that one of the branches of that Government remains strong.

I urge my colleagues to vote with me in support of the rule.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the modified closed rule allowing for the consideration of H.R. 2348, the legislative branch appropriation for fiscal year 1994.

I cannot count how many times I have stated that to reduce our Federal deficit we must have more spending cuts, and those cuts must begin at home here in the legislative branch. I am convinced that a majority of this body has heard exactly that same message from their constituents and that those Members stand ready to make the hard decisions, choosing those priorities which will mean less spending for the Congress and its related agencies.

My sense of that majority sentiment is why it is so disappointing that the rule allowing for consideration of this bill refutes the long-standing tradition of open or modified open rules for appropriations, and instead allows only 6 of the 60 amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee.

I certainly do not know the content of all 60 of those amendments. I assume that some I would have agreed with and others I would have opposed. I do know that the amendments which my friends TIM PENNY and BILL ORTON wanted to offer were good ones and should have had their chance to come before this body, where the will of the House could have been worked.

I was hopeful that with the legislative appropriation bill, we would show the fiscal leadership that our constituents are begging for. I hoped we would show that we recognize only by leading responsibility can we expect our constituents to share responsibility in their portion of the budget cuts. While it is true that the base bill takes the first steps in that direction, we could, and should, do much more. Many of the amendments not allowed today would have given us that opportunity.

Therefore, I regrettably must oppose this rule and urge my colleagues to think seriously about what sort of message we are sending our constituents by this vote today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of H.R. 2348 is as follows:

H.R. 2348

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, namely:*

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES (PRIOR YEAR)  
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993, for the House of Representatives under the heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES", there is rescinded a total of \$1,500,000 in the amounts

specified for the following heading: "STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT".

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$692,118,000, as follows:

##### HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$5,871,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$1,395,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,003,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$1,383,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, \$1,235,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip and not to exceed \$539,600, for the Chief Deputy Majority Whips; and Office of the Minority Whip, \$855,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip and not to exceed \$97,980, for the Chief Deputy Minority Whip.

##### MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

For staff employed by each Member in the discharge of official and representative duties, \$225,004,000.

##### COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical employees of standing committees, including the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget, \$70,445,000.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET (STUDIES)

For salaries, expenses, and studies by the Committee on the Budget, and temporary personal services for such committee to be expended in accordance with sections 101(c), 606, 703, and 901(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, \$389,000.

##### STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by the House, \$52,662,000.

##### COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

###### HOUSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

For salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Systems, under the direction of the Committee on House Administration, \$22,885,000, of which \$14,557,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That House Information Systems is authorized to receive reimbursement for services provided from Members of the House of Representatives and other Governmental entities and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account: *Provided further*, That amounts so credited for fiscal year 1993 and not obligated shall be available for obligation in fiscal year 1994.

##### ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$220,812,000, including: Official Expenses of Members, \$76,545,000; supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$11,328,000; net expenses of purchase, lease and maintenance of office equipment, \$7,196,000; net expenses for telecommunications, \$5,960,000; furniture and furnishings, \$1,720,000; stenographic reporting of committee hearings, \$1,055,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursements, \$933,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement funds, Social Security fund, Medicare fund, health benefits fund, and worker's and unemployment compensation, \$115,314,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair

and operation of House motor vehicles, inter-parliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$761,000.

##### CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

##### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS)

For salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, \$6,431,000.

##### OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs of the House of Representatives, as authorized by law, \$45,800,000.

##### SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$50,147,000, including: Office of the Clerk, including not to exceed \$1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$11,947,000; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including not to exceed \$500 for official representation and reception expenses, \$1,384,000; Office of the Doorkeeper, including overtime, as authorized by law, \$10,101,000; Office of Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services, \$14,402,000; for the salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, \$674,000; Office of the Chaplain, \$123,000; Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$898,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Historian, \$310,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$1,453,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$4,071,000; six minority employees, \$738,000; the House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and the Democratic Caucus, \$1,474,000; the House Republican Conference, \$1,474,000; and other authorized employees, \$1,098,000.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 101. (a) Upon the transfer of any function to the Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services by the authority of the Committee on House Administration pursuant to rule X of the House of Representatives and upon the commencement of operation of the Office of Inspector General, the applicable amounts appropriated by the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992, or by this Act, for the purposes specified in subsection (b) shall be available to the Director and the Office of Inspector General for the carrying out of such function or operation, upon the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. In no case shall the transfer of any function referred to in the preceding sentence include the transfer of any function of the Capitol Guide Service.

(b) The purposes referred to in subsection (a) are salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives under the headings "ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES" and "SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES".

##### JOINT ITEMS

For joint committees, as follows:

##### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$3,980,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$1,377,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$5,701,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

##### OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two assistants and \$400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) \$1,002,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,502,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

##### CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

###### CAPITOL POLICE

###### SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries, including overtime, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds, as authorized by law, of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, \$62,255,000, of which \$29,453,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, and \$32,802,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That of the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1994 for salaries, including overtime, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

##### GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$1,977,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of

basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1994 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 102. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1994 for the Capitol Police Board under the heading "CAPITOL POLICE" may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES", upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

#### CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service, \$1,628,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than thirty-three individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

#### SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Special Services Office, \$363,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

#### OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-484), including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$5,500 from the Trust Fund), and expenses incurred in administering an employee incentive awards program (not to exceed \$2,500), rental of space in the District of Columbia, \$20,815,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Office of Technology Assessment in excess of 143 staff employees: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for assessments or activities not initiated and approved in accordance with section 3(d) of Public Law 92-484: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of employees of the Office of Technology Assessment in connection with any reimbursable study for which funds are provided from sources other than appropriations made under this Act, or shall be available for any other administrative expenses incurred by the Office of Technology Assessment in carrying out such a study.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not to exceed \$2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$22,317,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of 226 staff employees: *Provided further*, That any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease of such property, supplies, or services to the Congress subject to section 903 of Public Law 98-63.

#### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

##### OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol; the Assistant Architect of the Capitol; and other personal services; at rates of pay provided by law, \$8,762,000.

##### TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$20,000.

##### CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, \$100,000, to remain available until expended.

#### CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

##### CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$23,978,000, of which \$4,663,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$5,289,000, of which \$225,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, including the position of Superintendent of Garages as authorized by law, \$32,287,000, of which \$2,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office; and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$32,777,000, of which \$665,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,200,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1994.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$56,718,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

##### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

##### CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semi-monthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$88,404,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) nor for copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1994".

#### TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

##### BOTANIC GARDEN

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$3,008,000.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress, not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library Buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger

motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$201,231,000, of which not more than \$7,500,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1994 under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,500,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,127,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

## COPYRIGHT OFFICE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$26,244,000, of which not more than \$14,500,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1994 under 17 U.S.C. 708(c), and not more than \$2,333,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1994 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$16,833,000: *Provided further*, That \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,250 may be expended on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

## BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 406 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$43,144,000, of which \$10,377,000 shall remain available until expended.

## FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$3,939,000: *Provided*, That of those funds that remain available until expended, up to \$593,000 may be transferred to the Architect of the Capitol appropriation "Library Buildings and Grounds, Structural and Mechanical Care" to complete renovation and restoration work on the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$175,690, of which \$54,800 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 203. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 204. Not to exceed \$5,000 of any funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Library of Congress incentive awards program.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed \$12,000 of funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 206. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, no amount may be disbursed for any activity of the Library of Congress, except to the extent and in the amount provided (1) in the annual regular appropriations Act making appropriations for the legislative branch, or (2) in a supplemental appropriations Act that makes appropriations for the legislative branch.

(b) Subsection (a) applies to disbursement of amounts derived from any source, including (1) amounts from library and bibliographical services performed on a reimbursable basis, under agency agreement or otherwise, for any public or private entity, (2) amounts from grants or similar payments for any purpose, and (3) amounts from gifts, whether such amounts are in the form of trust funds administered by the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board or otherwise.

## ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

## LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

## STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$9,543,000, of which \$1,060,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, subject to approval by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Librarian of Congress may transfer from any appropriation under the heading "Library of Congress" amounts not to exceed in the aggregate \$3,200,000 to the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Library buildings and grounds, Structural and mechanical care, No Year" to complete the

renovation and restoration of the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams buildings.

## COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, \$1,028,000, of which \$900,000 shall be derived by collections from the appropriation "Payments to Copyright Owners" for the reasonable costs incurred in proceedings involving distribution of royalty fees as provided by 17 U.S.C. 807.

## GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

## OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$29,082,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$130,000: *Provided further*, That funds, not to exceed \$2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional Serial Sets and other related Congressional/non-Congressional publications for 1991 and 1992 to depository and other designated libraries.

## GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the "Government Printing Office revolving fund": *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of passenger motor vehicles, not to exceed a fleet of twelve: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316): *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the paragraph entitled "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 4,850 workyears: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for expenses not to exceed \$500,000 for the development of plans and design of a multi-purpose facility: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

SEC. 207. (a) Subsection (b) of section 309 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking out "shall be:" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be—";

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking out "; and" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(4) by striking out paragraph (3).

(b) The first undesignated paragraph of section 1708 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out the third sentence.

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1993.

#### GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not to exceed \$7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315); hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits comparable with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to AID projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—or his designee—under the authority of section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(b)); \$430,815,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,600,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1994: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other depart-

ment or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for a broadbased organizational performance review of the General Accounting Office, focused on agency structure, skills, staffing, systems, and its execution of its statutory and assigned responsibilities.

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to approval by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, amounts may be transferred from the appropriation "Library of Congress, Salaries and expenses" to the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Library buildings and grounds, Structural and mechanical care" for the purpose of purchase, rental, lease, or other agreement, of storage and warehouse space for use by the Library of Congress during fiscal year 1994, and to incur incidental expenses in connection with such use.

SEC. 306. (a) The General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, or the Library of Congress may for such employees as it deems appropriate authorize a payment to employees who voluntarily separate before January 1, 1994, whether by retirement or resignation, which payment shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5597(d) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The number of employee positions authorized for the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, or the Li-

brary of Congress, as the case may be, shall be reduced by one position for each vacancy created by reason of a separation under subsection (a). No funds appropriated by this Act for salaries or expenses of any position that is eliminated under the preceding sentence may be used for any other purpose.

SEC. 307. (a) The number of employee positions, on a full-time equivalent basis, for each covered entity shall be reduced by at least 4 percent from the level as of September 30, 1992, or, with the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as of a later date, but not later than September 30, 1993. At least 10 percent of the positions eliminated shall be positions the pay for which is equal to or greater than the annual rate of basic pay payable for grade GS-14 of the General Schedule.

(b) The reduction required by subsection (a) shall be completed not later than September 30, 1995, with at least 62.5 percent of the reduction for each covered entity to be achieved by September 30, 1994.

(c) The Comptroller General shall carry out compliance reporting under this section.

(d) As used in this section—

(1) the term "covered entity" means an entity of the legislative branch with more than 100 employee positions, on a full-time equivalent basis, as of September 30, 1992; and

(2) the term "entity of the legislative branch" means the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

SEC. 308. (a) For fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997, the submissions in support of the amounts included in the Budget for each entity of the legislative branch shall set forth a separate category for administrative expenses. For fiscal years 1993 and 1994, the administrative expenses for each entity of the legislative branch shall be calculated and submitted in a separate category in the same format as if submitted in support of amounts included in the Budget.

(b) For fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997, the submissions under subsection (a) in the separate category for administrative expenses for each entity of the legislative branch shall include reductions from the amount calculated for administrative expenses for fiscal year 1993, adjusted for inflation, as follows:

(1) Fiscal year 1994, reduction of not less than 3 percent.

(2) Fiscal year 1995, reduction of not less than 6 percent.

(3) Fiscal year 1996, reduction of not less than 9 percent.

(4) Fiscal year 1997, reduction of not less than 14 percent.

(c) The Comptroller General shall carry out compliance reporting under this section.

(d) As used in this section—

(1) the term "administrative expenses" means expenses of contractual services and supplies, other than rental payments, programmatic mission-essential expenses, reimbursable expenses, and expenses required by law;

(2) the term "Budget" means the budget of the United States Government, submitted under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; and

(3) the term "entity of the legislative branch" means the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Office of the Architect

of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

**RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PRIOR SERVICE WITH THE HOUSE CHILD CARE CENTER**

**SEC. 309. (a) DEFINITIONS.**—For the purpose of this section—

(1) the term "House Child Care Center" means the House of Representatives Child Care Center; and

(2) the term "Congressional employee" has the meaning given such term—

(A) in subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent that this section relates to the Civil Service Retirement System; or

(B) in chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent that this section relates to the Federal Employees' Retirement System.

(c) **CSRS.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any individual who is an employee of the House Child Care Center on the date of enactment of this Act shall be allowed credit under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, as a Congressional employee, for any service if—

(A) such service was performed before October 1, 1991, as an employee of the House Child Care Center (as constituted before that date); and

(B) the employee is subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 of such title as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Credit for service described in paragraph (1)(A) shall not be allowed under this section unless there is paid into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, by or on behalf of the employee involved, an amount equal to the deductions from pay which would have been applicable under section 8334(c) of title 5, United States Code, for the period of service involved, if such employee were then a Congressional employee, including interest. Retirement credit may not be allowed under this section for any such service unless the full amount of the deposit required under the preceding sentence has been paid.

(c) **FERS.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any individual who is an employee of the House Child Care Center on the date of enactment of this Act shall be allowed credit under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, as a Congressional employee, for any service if—

(A) such service was performed before October 1, 1991, as an employee of the House Child Care Center (as constituted before that date); and

(B) the employee is subject to chapter 84 of such title as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Credit for service described in paragraph (1)(A) shall not be allowed under this section unless there is paid into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, by or on behalf of the employee involved, an amount equal to the deductions from pay which would have been payable under applicable provisions of law, for the period of service involved, if such employee were then a Congressional employee, including interest (computed in the same way as interest under subsection (b)(2)). Retirement credit may not be allowed under this section for any such service unless the full amount of the deposit required under the preceding sentence has been paid.

(d) **CLARIFICATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be considered to relate to the Thrift Savings Plan.

(e) **OPM FUNCTIONS.**—The Office of Personnel Management shall—

(1) prescribe any regulations which may be necessary to carry out this section; and

(2) with respect to any service for which credit is sought under this section, accept the certification of the Clerk of the House of Representatives concerning the period of such service and the amount of pay which was paid for such service.

**SEC. 310. (a)** Section 17 of the Act entitled "An Act making Appropriations for sundry Civil Expenses of the Government for the Year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven, and for other purposes", approved July 28, 1866 (2 U.S.C. 43), is amended by inserting after "mileage" the first place it appears the following: "for each Senator".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1993.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994".

**POINT OF ORDER**

**Mr. CONYERS.** Madam Chairman, I have a point of order.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman will state his point of order.

**Mr. CONYERS.** Madam Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 306(b), the provisions beginning on page 31, line 20, through page 32, line 2, of the bill because it is legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Is there any Member wishing to be heard on the point of order?

**Mr. FAZIO.** Madam Chairman, I was surprised to learn that the provision was vulnerable, but it is, and I would certainly concede the point of order.

**The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. MINK).** The point of order has been conceded. The point of order is sustained, and subsection (b) will be stricken from the bill.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-118.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK**

**Mr. STUPAK.** Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1991, for the House of Representatives under the heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" there is rescinded a total of \$730,037.41, in the amounts specified for the following headings and accounts:

(1) "HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES", \$24,988.44, as follows: (A) "Office of the Speaker", \$5,245.00; (B) "Office of the Majority Leader", \$4,743.44; (C) "Office of the Minority Leader", \$5,000.00; (D) "Office of the Majority Whip", \$5,000.00; and (E) "Office of the Minority Whip", \$5,000.00.

(2) "MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE", \$686.50.

(3) "COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES", \$44.59.

(4) "STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT", \$138,448.87.

(5) "ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES", \$500,691.91, as follows: (A) "furniture and furnishings", \$624.54; (B) "reemployed annuitants reimbursements", \$67.37; and (C) unspecified, \$500,000.00.

(6) "COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS)", \$2,682.97.

(7) "SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES", \$62,494.13, as follows: (A) "Office of the Clerk", \$2,053.34; (B) "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$352.20; (C) "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$99.08; (D) "Office of the Chaplain", \$255.50; (E) "the House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and the Democratic Caucus", \$9,355.14; (F) "the House Republican Conference", \$1,824.87; and (G) "six minority employees", \$48,554.00.

Of the funds appropriated in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992, for the House of Representatives under the heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES", there is rescinded a total of \$891,717.36, in the amounts specified for the following headings and accounts:

(1) "HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICERS", \$533,169.67, as follows: (A) "Office of the Speaker", \$308,604.60; (B) "Office of the Majority Leader", \$46,970.75; (C) "Office of the Minority Leader", \$154,142.11; (D) "Office of the Majority Whip", \$18,819.23; (E) "Office of the Minority Whip", \$4,632.98.

(2) "MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE", \$7,272.63.

(3) "ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES", \$12,226.40, as follows: (A) "furniture and furnishings", \$4,379.86; (B) "reemployed annuitants reimbursements", \$7,846.54.

(4) "SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES", \$339,048.66, as follows: (A) "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$500.00; (B) "Office of the Chaplain", \$1,886.97; (C) "Office of the Parliamentarian", \$35,969.46; (D) "Office of the Historian", \$62,999.89; (E) "the House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and the Democratic Caucus", \$115,226.11; (F) "six minority employees", \$122,466.23.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

□ 1400

**Mr. STUPAK.** Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise today—along with Congresswoman KAREN ENGLISH—to offer an amendment to rescind over \$1.6 million from the legislative branch appropriations in unused fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992 funding. The rescinded moneys would be held by the Treasury for deficit reduction.

Thirteen days ago we passed a monumental deficit reduction effort that would reduce the deficit by over \$496 billion in the next 5 years.

It was a tough vote for many of us in this body.

We have also passed a line-item veto that will enhance our ability to cut unwarranted spending.

Nevertheless, these successful efforts should not stop us from being vigilant in eliminating unnecessary spending in all appropriations bills—wherever we can find unnecessary spending.

This \$1.6 million rescission—while small—is testament to our commitment that every penny spent by the Congress is important and must be justified.

Madam Chairwoman, the American people have made it clear that they want Congress to cut spending first.

We have heard this message loud and clear. And before we ask Americans to sacrifice, we must make cuts—in the Congress—first.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the English-Stupak amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH].

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise today with my colleague, BART STUPAK, to offer an amendment to H.R. 2348, the fiscal year 1994 legislative appropriations bill. Our amendment rescinds a total of \$1,621,754.77 of House funds which were appropriated in fiscal years 1991 and 1992 but never spent. The funds are currently sitting idle and will remain in the accounts indefinitely unless rescinded because they were appropriated with the proviso that they would remain available until expended.

In these days when we are trying to reduce the budget deficit, there is no room for idle funds. We need to have fiscal accountability and I hope this is but one step toward further rescissions of unused funds. Every penny this Government spends must be justified. In these times of tight fiscal constraints, we have an obligation to the American people to do everything we can to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used wisely and efficiently. If it proves that moneys appropriated are no longer needed, we have an obligation to rescind those funds and apply that money where it is truly needed, in this case, toward reducing our Federal deficit.

The amendment rescinds a total of \$730,037.41 from fiscal year 1991 and a total of \$891,717.36 from fiscal year 1992 from the House leadership offices, Members clerk hire, standing committees and Committee on Appropriations.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I would ask the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] if she could answer a few questions on the mechanics of the rescission so that I can understand the amendment of the freshman Member.

Madam Chairman, would the gentlewoman be willing to enter into a colloquy

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, this amendment is being offered under the auspices of the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH], is that correct?

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I understand that the gentlewoman is asking for a rescission of \$24,988.44 from House leadership offices. How does that money come about being and why?

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. I would like to refer that question to Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. FAZIO. I would be more than happy to assist the gentlewoman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Reclaiming my time, I asked the author to explain a portion of the bill that she has just gotten up and asked all of us to support in terms of clearly understanding what it was that she presented. And I would not yield for that purpose to the subcommittee chairman who has offered an amendment which historically has been known as the Fazio amendment for rescission. Since the name of the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] is on the amendment, I would appreciate the gentlewoman telling us what is in the amendment.

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Madam Chairman, would the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] to answer that question, as he was more involved in the specific respect of the amendment you originally asked about.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], whose name is on the amendment as well.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I would be happy to respond. The \$24,988.44 that the gentleman refers to comes in fiscal year 1991 of unspent moneys that are currently in the legislative branch. It is unspent moneys for the House leadership offices. It is lying there idle. Instead of carrying it over from year to year and allowing the fund to build, we want to cut it out in 1991, the amount of \$24,988, and put a freeze on it, with our intent being that the money would then go to the Treasury, which would then be used for the deficit reduction trust fund, once the reconciliation package is passed in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, in other words this is not a cut in any way. This is simply taking money that was not expended, for whatever reason, from the leadership offices that was under the amount that they had been given. It is lying on the table, and this amendment then simply collects it and offers it as a rescission amendment. There is no cutting of any of the funds that would have otherwise been used. This is what was left on the table, is that correct?

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a rescission.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, for example, under committee employees, the amount of \$44.59 that we are asking to be included in the total amount, is because that is all they left on the table.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that is correct. That is how diligent of a job the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] and I did. We went down to the penny, wherever we could find it.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Reclaiming my time, are the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] members of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. STUPAK. No.

Mr. THOMAS of California. They are not. Are the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] members of the subcommittee that dealt with this issue?

Mr. STUPAK. No, we are not.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], that over and above your ordinary committee meetings, you burned the midnight oil to look for these particular dollar amounts so you could offer this amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HEFNER. Madam Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HEFNER. Madam Chairman, out of comity here, other people have raised potential amendments here and will offer amendments. Is it customary to interrogate Members that offer amendments in an attempt to embarrass them about amendments that they do not know all the details about? Is that customary for us here?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has not stated a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] has not raised a point of order.

Mr. HEFNER. Madam Chairman, I was just asking.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I thought the gentleman gained recognition under a point of order, but I will certainly answer the gentleman's question.

Madam Chairman, the term "embarrassment" is that of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], as is the term "interrogate."

Madam Chairman, these Members have their names on an amendment. I did not understand fully the mechanics of it. I seemed to have asked a question

which is extremely difficult for one of the cosponsors to answer, and that was to explain their own amendment.

If the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] believes that explaining an amendment is interrogation, if the gentleman believes explaining an amendment is something that is beyond the capability of someone who puts their name on an amendment, perhaps the gentleman ought to take a look at the procedures under which we are operating.

Mr. HEFNER. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, the point I was making was the gentleman questioned them whether they were members of the committee or not. Other Members will offer amendments that are not a member of this particular committee or the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, none of the other amendments goes into the specific detail and collects the dollar amounts left on the table in the traditional manner that the chairman of the subcommittee has offered in the past.

This is, I think the gentleman will agree, a thinly veiled attempt to take what is ordinarily the chairman's position and give it to a member to make them look as though they are more active than would otherwise be the case.

I would not have pursued this line of discussion if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] had not decided to go into the well, and say that this Member is interrogating another Member, when this Member has the audacity to ask the sponsor what is in their amendment. If that is now outside the bounds of discussion as well, when we do not get to offer our amendments and we cannot even ask sponsors of the amendments what is in theirs, that is beyond the bounds of a discussion around here, it seems to me that what the gentleman wants is not only a slam-dunk, he not only wants to have the referee, but he also does not want to have us put any points on the scoreboard.

Madam Chairman, that is unacceptable. I think it is clear in terms of the response and request for help that this is a front amendment so that some Members will look good back home. Considering the degree of time that this House has taken up with front amendments, instead of the real substantive amendments that were offered in the Committee on Rules and were denied, and we are going to see a couple more of these, that if this is the kind of majority control that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] said that people of America want, then you folks are badly misinformed.

□ 1410

We should be taking the time to debate the substantive changes that are needed in this House, instead of pro-

forma, flashy amendments offered by Members in order to look good back home when in fact they do not even know what is in them.

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I think it is tragic that we have to have this sort of carryings on here on the floor, when Members who have come and legitimately requested that they be given assistance to find ways to cut spending that remains available in prior fiscal years, the 1991 and 1992 fiscal years, are somehow called into question because they have done what I think a number of Members on both sides of the aisle have wanted to do for many years.

And that is, prevent reprogrammings of funds that were originally provided for other purposes.

Now, these two individuals have heard all about the partisanship regarding the so-called slush funds, which are controlled by the majority in theory. We know they do not exist. We know we do have a reprogramming authority, which is similar to every other subcommittee in the appropriations process.

That reprogramming authority always goes forward only with bipartisan cooperation. But these individuals have done, I think, an appropriate thing, and that is, determine what funds remain that are not currently committed to any other program.

I think it is entirely appropriate that they be rescinded. Last year, when this bill was considered, a similar amendment was offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT]. The chairman, to my knowledge, this individual has never offered such an amendment on the appropriations bill for the legislative branch.

I think, in order to calm the fears of those who believe there were inappropriate reprogrammings, this is an entirely appropriate amendment. They have worked with officials of the Clerk, worked with the officers of the House to be sure that they are taking funds that are not already committed, so that we are not going to be, in effect, unable to pay our bills. Every dime that remains is rescinded and does not remain available for reprogramming.

It is entirely appropriate, and I applaud them on their amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] has 4 minutes remaining on his amendment.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to a fellow Democratic freshman, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of amend-

ment No. 1, sponsored by my two freshmen colleagues, the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK]. This amendment rescinds \$1.6 million of spending for the House of Representative and applies this money directly to deficit reduction.

I was sent here to Washington by the people of Marin and Sonoma counties in California, to reorder our Nation's spending priorities and to get our Nation's economy back on track by getting the budget deficit under control. As a member of the Budget Committee, I am working to do just that. I am pleased that the budget passed by Congress includes \$496 billion of deficit reduction over the next 5 years. This is a good start. Today we have an opportunity to cut an additional \$1.6 million, and I will continue to search for more ways that we can get the deficit under control.

In these tough fiscal times, Madam Chairman, we must all tighten our belts, and I believe that Congress must set an example. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment to promote fiscal responsibility here in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, to conclude debate on the amendment, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH].

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Madam Chairman, it is disappointing to me that some of my Republican colleagues feel that cutting deficits, cutting spending, should be limited to members of a particular committee. I think that speaks directly in opposition to the democratic process.

It is important that no matter how small the cut is, if there are idle funds, they need to be redirected to deficit reduction.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and any other cuts that we can find in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, the gentleman withdraws his point of order.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that she will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period

of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I thought I heard the gentleman withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not entertain that request and announced the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry: Is the cost of this vote any different than the cost of the Burton vote before that that the other side inquired about?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 207]

Abercrombie	Clay	Fingerhut
Ackerman	Clayton	Fish
Allard	Clement	Flake
Andrews (ME)	Clinger	Foglietta
Andrews (NJ)	Coble	Ford (MI)
Andrews (TX)	Coleman	Ford (TN)
Applegate	Collins (GA)	Fowler
Army	Collins (IL)	Franks (CT)
Bacchus (FL)	Collins (MI)	Franks (NJ)
Bachus (AL)	Combust	Furse
Baesler	Conyers	Gallely
Baker (CA)	Cooper	Gallo
Baker (LA)	Coppersmith	Gejdenson
Ballenger	Costello	Gekas
Barca	Cox	Gephardt
Barcia	Coyne	Geren
Barlow	Cramer	Gibbons
Barrett (NE)	Crane	Gillmor
Barrett (WI)	Crapo	Gilman
Bartlett	Cunningham	Gingrich
Barton	Danner	Glickman
Bellenson	Darden	Gonzalez
Bentley	de la Garza	Goodlatte
Bereuter	de Lugo (VI)	Goodling
Berman	Deal	Gordon
Bevill	DeFazio	Goss
Bilbray	DeLauro	Grams
Bilirakis	DeLay	Grandy
Bishop	Dellums	Green
Blackwell	Derrick	Greenwood
Bliley	Deutsch	Gunderson
Blute	Diaz-Balart	Gutierrez
Boehlert	Dickey	Hall (OH)
Boehner	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bonilla	Dingell	Hamburg
Bonior	Dixon	Hamilton
Borski	Dooley	Hancock
Boucher	Doolittle	Hansen
Brewster	Dornan	Harman
Brooks	Dreier	Hastert
Browder	Duncan	Hastings
Brown (FL)	Dunn	Hayes
Brown (OH)	Durbin	Hefley
Bryant	Edwards (CA)	Hefner
Bunning	Edwards (TX)	Heger
Burton	Emerson	Hilliard
Buyer	English (AZ)	Hinchey
Byrne	English (OK)	Hoagland
Callahan	Eshoo	Hobson
Calvert	Evans	Hochbrueckner
Camp	Everett	Hoekstra
Canady	Ewing	Hoke
Cantwell	Fawell	Holden
Cardin	Fazio	Horn
Carr	Fields (LA)	Houghton
Castle	Fields (TX)	Hoyer
Chapman	Filner	Huffington

Hughes	Mfume	Saxton
Hunter	Mica	Schaefer
Hutchinson	Michel	Schenk
Hutto	Miller (CA)	Schiff
Hyde	Miller (FL)	Schroeder
Inglis	Mineta	Schumer
Inhofe	Minge	Sensenbrenner
Insee	Mink	Serrano
Istook	Moakley	Sharp
Jacobs	Molinar	Shaw
Jefferson	Mollohan	Shays
Johnson (CT)	Montgomery	Shepherd
Johnson (GA)	Moorhead	Shuster
Johnson (SD)	Moran	Skeen
Johnson, E.B.	Morella	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Murphy	Slattery
Johnston	Murtha	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Myers	Smith (IA)
Kaptur	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Kasich	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy	Neal (MA)	Smith (OR)
Kennelly	Neal (NC)	Smith (TX)
Kildee	Norton (DC)	Snowe
Kim	Nussle	Solomon
King	Oberstar	Spence
Kingston	Obey	Spratt
Klecza	Oliver	Stearns
Klein	Ortiz	Stenholm
Klink	Orton	Stokes
Klug	Oxley	Strickland
Knollenberg	Packard	Studds
Kolbe	Pallone	Stump
Kopetski	Parker	Stupak
Kreidler	Pastor	Sundquist
Kyl	Paxon	Swett
LaFalce	Payne (NJ)	Swift
Lancaster	Payne (VA)	Synar
Lantos	Pelosi	Talent
LaRocco	Penny	Tanner
Laughlin	Peterson (FL)	Tauzin
Lazio	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Leach	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Lehman	Pickle	Tejeda
Levin	Pombo	Thomas (CA)
Levy	Pomeroy	Thomas (WY)
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Thornton
Lewis (FL)	Portman	Thurman
Lewis (GA)	Poshard	Torkildsen
Lightfoot	Price (NC)	Torres
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Toricelli
Lipinski	Quillen	Traficant
Livingston	Quinn	Tucker
Lloyd	Rahall	Underwood (GU)
Long	Ramstad	Unsoeld
Lowey	Rangel	Upton
Machtley	Ravenel	Velazquez
Maloney	Reed	Vento
Mann	Regula	Viselovsky
Manton	Reynolds	Volkmer
Manzullo	Richardson	Vucanovich
Margolles	Ridge	Walker
Mezvisky	Roberts	Walsh
Markey	Roemer	Washington
Martinez	Rogers	Waters
Mazzoli	Rohrabacher	Watt
McCandless	Romero-Barcelo	Waxman
McCloskey	(PR)	Weldon
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Wheat
McCrery	Rose	Whitten
McCurdy	Rostenkowski	Williams
McDade	Roth	Wilson
McDermott	Roukema	Wise
McHale	Rowland	Wolf
McHugh	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
McInnis	Royce	Wyden
McKinney	Rush	Wynn
McMillan	Sabo	Yates
McNulty	Sanders	Young (AK)
Meehan	Sangmeister	Young (FL)
Meek	Santorum	Zeliff
Menendez	Sarpaluis	Zimmer
Meyers	Sawyer	

□ 1439

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred fourteen Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce, as previously ordered, that this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 2, answered "present" 6, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—415

Ackerman	Deal	Hochbrueckner
Allard	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Andrews (ME)	DeLauro	Hoke
Andrews (NJ)	DeLay	Holden
Andrews (TX)	Dellums	Horn
Applegate	Derrick	Houghton
Archer	Deutsch	Hoyer
Army	Diaz-Balart	Huffington
Bacchus (FL)	Dickey	Hughes
Bachus (AL)	Dicks	Hunter
Baesler	Dingell	Hutchinson
Baker (CA)	Dixon	Hutto
Baker (LA)	Dooley	Hyde
Ballenger	Doolittle	Inglis
Barca	Dornan	Inhofe
Barcia	Dreier	Insee
Barlow	Duncan	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Jacobs
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Jefferson
Bartlett	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Barton	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Bellenson	English (AZ)	Johnson, E.B.
Bentley	English (OK)	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	Eshoo	Johnston
Berman	Evans	Kanjorski
Bevill	Ewing	Kaptur
Bilbray	Fawell	Kasich
Bilirakis	Fazio	Kennedy
Bishop	Fields (LA)	Kennelly
Blackwell	Fields (TX)	Kildee
Bliley	Filner	Kim
Blute	Fingerhut	King
Boehlert	Fish	Kingston
Boehner	Flake	Klecza
Bonilla	Foglietta	Klein
Bonior	Ford (MI)	Klink
Borski	Ford (TN)	Klug
Boucher	Fowler	Knollenberg
Brewster	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Brooks	Franks (CT)	Kopetski
Browder	Franks (NJ)	Kreidler
Brown (FL)	Frost	Kyl
Brown (OH)	Furse	LaFalce
Bryant	Gallely	Lambert
Bunning	Gallo	Lancaster
Burton	Gejdenson	Lantos
Buyer	Gekas	LaRocco
Byrne	Gephardt	Laughlin
Callahan	Geren	Lazio
Calvert	Gibbons	Leach
Camp	Gillmor	Lehman
Canady	Gilman	Levin
Cantwell	Glickman	Levy
Cardin	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Carr	Goodlatte	Lewis (FL)
Castle	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Chapman	Gordon	Lightfoot
Clay	Goss	Linder
Clayton	Grams	Lipinski
Clement	Grandy	Livingston
Clinger	Green	Lloyd
Coble	Greenwood	Long
Coleman	Gunderson	Lowey
Collins (GA)	Gutierrez	Machtley
Collins (IL)	Hall (OH)	Maloney
Collins (MI)	Hall (TX)	Mann
Combust	Hamburg	Manton
Conyers	Hamilton	Manzullo
Cooper	Hancock	Margolles
Coppersmith	Hansen	Mezvisky
Costello	Harman	Markey
Cox	Hastert	Martinez
Coyne	Hastings	Mazzoli
Cramer	Hayes	McCandless
Crane	Hefley	McCloskey
Crapo	Hefner	McCollum
Cunningham	Heger	McCrery
Danner	Hilliard	McCurdy
Darden	Hinchey	McDade
de la Garza	Hoagland	McDermott
de Lugo (VI)	Hobson	McHale

McHugh	Price (NC)	Snowe
McInnis	Pryce (OH)	Solomon
McKinney	Quillen	Spence
McMillan	Quinn	Spratt
McNulty	Rahall	Stearns
Meehan	Ramstad	Stenholm
Meek	Rangel	Stokes
Menendez	Ravenel	Strickland
Meyers	Reed	Studds
Mfume	Regula	Stump
Mica	Reynolds	Stupak
Michel	Richardson	Sundquist
Miller (CA)	Ridge	Swett
Miller (FL)	Roberts	Swift
Mineta	Roemer	Synar
Minge	Rogers	Talent
Mink	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moakley	Romero-Barcelo	Tauzin
Molinari	(PR)	Taylor (MS)
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Montgomery	Rose	Tejeda
Moorhead	Rostenkowski	Thornton
Moran	Roth	Thurman
Morella	Roukema	Torkildsen
Murphy	Rowland	Torres
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Torricelli
Myers	Royce	Towns
Natcher	Rush	Trafficant
Neal (MA)	Sabo	Tucker
Neal (NC)	Sanders	Underwood (GU)
Norton (DC)	Sangmeister	Unsoeld
Nussle	Santorum	Upton
Oberstar	Sarpallius	Valentine
Obey	Sawyer	Velazquez
Oliver	Saxton	Vento
Ortiz	Schaefer	Visclosky
Orton	Schenk	Volkmer
Owens	Schiff	Vucanovich
Oxley	Schroeder	Walsh
Packard	Schumer	Washington
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Parker	Serrano	Watt
Pastor	Sharp	Waxman
Paxon	Shaw	Weldon
Payne (NJ)	Shays	Wheat
Payne (VA)	Shepherd	Whitten
Pelosi	Shuster	Williams
Penny	Skaggs	Wilson
Peterson (FL)	Skeen	Wise
Peterson (MN)	Skelton	Wolf
Petri	Slattery	Woolsey
Pickle	Slaughter	Wyden
Pombo	Smith (IA)	Wynn
Pomeroy	Smith (MD)	Yates
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Portman	Smith (OR)	Zeliff
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Zimmer

NOES—2

Abercrombie Nadler

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Everett Thomas (CA) Walker  
Gingrich Thomas (WY) Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Bateman	Faleomavaega	Pickett
Brown (CA)	(AS)	Scott
Clyburn	Gilchrest	Sisisky
Condit	Henry	Stark
Engel	Matsul	Thompson
	McKeon	

□ 1449

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-118.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMEROY

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POMEROY: Page 2, line 13, strike "\$692,118,000" and insert "\$686,318,000". Page 5, line 21, strike "\$45,800,000" and insert "\$40,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Madam Chairman, I think we can undertake this matter; it is a straightforward amendment.

□ 1450

It is a straightforward amendment. It reduces the franking level to \$40 million. This amendment represents a 12-percent cut in the amount in the bill for franking. The bill proposes a slight cut, but this additional 12-percent cut would mean this year's budget has a 16-percent reduction in spending allowance for mailing. I believe it is directly consistent with the efforts of the freshmen and other Members, Madam Chairman, to reduce the spending in the House, and would ask its favorable consideration.

Madam Chairman, let me sum up as follows: This represents the lowest amount authorized for mailing in an election year in recent memory. I believe it is a meaningful cut, and would urge its adoption.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] rise?

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, though I am not opposing this amendment, I believe I may ask unanimous consent to control the time on our side, and I do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to this amendment?

If not, without objection, the gentleman from Michigan will be recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me.

We have in front of us a cut of \$5.8 million from a \$45.8 million franking account. The questions that I think should be asked are: What is the rationale for a \$5.8 million cut? Why that amount? Why not some other amount? On what is the cut based?

Because if it is based on the changing mailing habits of the Members, then I

think we need to look even more fundamentally at a change in this area. So, although I applaud my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] for the direction in which he is moving, I think he needs to take a look at the kinds of changes that have occurred dramatically in the mailing patterns of Members which support even more drastic reductions.

Let me share a couple of numbers with you: In calendar year 1990, a year which was an election year, and one that fits the classic historic mailing behavior in the first quarter Members spent \$56 million on the mail; in the second quarter they spent \$11 million; in the third quarter, \$7 million; and then after the election, the fourth quarter, \$32 million. That is a typical election year spending pattern.

In 1991, first quarter mail spending was \$5 million; second quarter, \$8 million; third quarter, \$10 million; fourth quarter, \$20 million.

Why such a dramatic reduction in mail expenditure? The answer is simple: In 1991 individual Members became personally accountable for the amount of mail they sent out. And guess what, there has been an enormous change in the amount of mail sent out. As much as 80 percent of the Members' mail is mass mail. I would like to tell the Chairwoman that I am introducing a bill because the Rules Committee did not see fit to make in order an amendment that I offered in the Committee on Rules, which will deny Members the ability to send out unsolicited mass mail.

You could, under my legislation, mail to anybody who writes to you, any number of times, mail to any Government agency, to any media, and send out town hall notices. But you would be prohibited from sending out unsolicited mass mail such as postal patron newsletters.

This would produce about a 50-percent cut in the current franking expenditures.

I know some of the Members will say, "Gee, that sounds radical." I will tell you that this institution will stop Members from sending out unsolicited mass mail in the future.

We will be forced to do it, or we will do it on our own. It seems to me that this kind of tokenism, a \$5 million cut, certainly could be more, if the leadership on the other side of the aisle did what was right, that is. And that is to move my legislation, which will deny Members the ability to send unsolicited mass mail. It seems to me that we should not interfere with the constitutional right of constituents or others to write the Member or for the Member to mail to other Governments or media, but to send out unsolicited mass mail is an unacceptable use of taxpayers' money today and we ought to ban it.

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

Madam Chairman, the gentleman is correct, mail utilization has been dropping, no doubt influenced by the reforms enacted in 1991. It should be emphasized, however, that the cut proposed by my amendment would impose an absolute ceiling at the lowest level in recent memory in an election year and an absolute reduction of 12 percent below what is contained in the bill.

If you take what is contained in the bill, there is a reduction of 16 percent in the franking privilege.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

Ms. SHEPHERD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am here to speak in behalf of the amendment. This is a part of what the freshmen considered, reducing a very vital part of the legislative branch budget by 25 percent. We believe this is a significant cut.

Furthermore, I personally believe that there is a very important principle here and that principle is that we must do what we need to do to communicate honestly and openly with our constituents.

I happen to live in a district that is very tight and contiguous, and I can get around to everybody each time I am home every weekend. The other two Members of my State live in districts that cover hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of miles. They do not have that possibility.

I believe this flexibility needs to be built into this budget, and I absolutely oppose the removal of all unsolicited mail. I think it is a way to encourage cynicism in this country and it is a way to cut off Members of this body from their constituents at a time when they need it most.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the honorable gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], who is a member of the sometimes-powerful House Agriculture Committee, for offering this amendment, and I agree with the gentlelady in what she just said. I think we must do what we need to do, but my point is we are not doing enough.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] and myself had an amendment before the Committee on Rules which would have gone considerably farther than the gentleman's amendment. Let me point out what we are doing here.

In 1991 we authorized and appropriated \$59 million for the official mail account. But we actually spent only \$31.3 million. Now, where does the money go? The money goes to the reprogramming fund, or what some refer to as the Speaker's slush fund, which

obviously the majority says does not exist.

□ 1500

In 1992, we authorized approximately \$71.3 million and we appropriated \$80 million, but again we only spent approximately 50 million and ended up with about \$20 to \$25 million in this so-called reprogramming nonslush fund bank.

In 1993, here we are with \$71 million authorized. We are appropriating now \$47.7 million. I will tell the gentleman what would happen if we appropriated the normal and actual mailing account expense. If the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] had been made in order and we could have done that, we had a 3-percent cushion built in and we would have been right at the cost level that we are actually going to mail, approximately \$35.6 million. We would have had honest budgeting.

But I can tell the gentleman that we will still end up with \$10 to \$15 million in surplus accounts and we will be back here next year with the same legislative appropriations bill trying to eliminate those excess funds.

Now, I am not opposed to reprogramming, if it is done correctly. When we had the Persian Gulf crisis we had to come in with some extra funds to hire more Capitol Hill Police for security reasons. That was necessary funding, but I would remind people that the entire reconstruction of the western front of this building was first started with reprogrammed funds, without a vote.

And where did the money come from? It came from the official mail account.

Now, the Roberts-Upton amendment would have cut it exactly where we need to cut in terms of actual mailing costs.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I compliment my colleagues, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], and others for their work on this measure.

Madam Chairman, after significant reforms in the franking policy a few years ago, we have made dramatic gains in terms of controlling the expense of mass mailings and other mailings here on Capitol Hill.

This bill takes us even further down the road of spending reductions in that category. This will result in next year being the smallest appropriation for franked mailing in modern history.

I compliment the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] and others in this coalition for their leadership

in bringing this amendment to the floor and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Pomeroy amendment to reduce the appropriation for official mail by \$5.8 million, which represents about a 12-percent cut. Coupled with the committee's reduction, appropriations in this bill for franking will decrease over 15 percent from current-year levels. The amendment deserves our support.

I want to commend the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] and our other colleagues, KAREN SHEPHERD of Utah, MARIA CANTWELL of Washington, and ERIC FINGERHUT of Ohio, who join me in bringing this amendment to the floor. These Members, all freshmen, are thoughtful Members, dedicated to budget deficit reduction and reform of many institutional practices of the Congress. If more Members voted like these Members, the budget deficit would be significantly reduced.

All of us here know from our individual experience that too much is appropriated each year for franking. In 1992, I spent 16.8 percent of my franking allocation, and I know a lot of Members spent less than one-third of their franking allowances. So, we know we should be appropriating less funds. We could probably go a little deeper in the cut, but this amendment is a good start.

Madam Chairman, again I commend the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] and the other sponsors of this amendment. I urge a strong vote of support.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chairman, I support this amendment, but at the same time I want to challenge the freshmen on the other side of the aisle to really take a serious look at what you are doing, because when we are talking about swimming in the deep lake of congressional reform, you guys are wading on the shore very safely, 12 percent, \$5.8 million, when we know that two-thirds of the total budget is for unsolicited mailings and the news bulletins and so forth, the newsletters.

We know having come from the campaign trail that that is a campaign device, and what is worse, it is a campaign device on the taxpayers' backs.

So I support this, but I am saying, come on out in the deep water. Support the Thomas amendment that would have cut franking privileges 50 percent, would have eliminated and cut deeply into the unsolicited mailings, and let us have some real reform.

I think the \$5.8 million is a fair token start, but certainly not a serious attempt at reform.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's expression of support for the amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL].

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam Chairman, I also appreciate the support of the gentleman from Georgia in support of this amendment.

We can today demonstrate that the House is willing to step up to serious

deficit reduction by starting with our own budget, by starting with our own personal responsibilities.

This is the first of 13 appropriation bills that Congress will consider, so before we ask the American public to do with less in programs that will affect their lives, we in Congress must step up to this responsibility.

Yes, this is just one part of a larger bill in which we are on track in making 25-percent reductions of the congressional branch budget over a 5-year period of time.

What we are doing here is reducing the franking budget by about \$5.8 million and it is a good start.

I encourage Members who want to do more to start with their own offices, to start with their own personal staff reductions and cut the administrative budget as well.

We can show by example that Congress is willing to step up and cut its own budget.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, but I would not say in strong support.

Let me make it clear that what we are doing here is rather token. We have appropriated \$45.8 million for franking and the fact is we are not even going to spend \$30 million. So we have \$15 million in this appropriation bill that is really not needed. So we are going to take \$5.8 million out of this bill and we are going to cut it and we are going to pound our chests about what we are saving.

The fact is that no Member of Congress will send less mail as a result of this amendment passing. No Member's allowance for mail will be reduced as a result of this amendment.

The fact is, as we all know, the frank, and the abuse of the frank, is the greatest incumbency protection tool there is for Members of this body.

When we talk about campaign reform in several months, this issue will not be allowed to be talked about.

So the fact is, support it, but do not be real proud of it.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I would point out that this amount is \$14 million less than was spent in the last election year of 1992 and does represent a meaningful reduction.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] for his support of the amendment.

I would point out, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] did, that what we are really hearing from the other side is an attempt to distract us from the central point.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] wants to engage us in a debate about the practice of sending a report to our constituents. That is a legislative debate, and I welcome it. Indeed, I challenge anyone who wants to join me here during a special order to debate that point, because I believe it is our responsibility to inform our constituents in a sophisticated, nonpolitical way, and I intend to do that.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] says we are not cutting, but indeed we are, because this is for next year. This is for the election year. This is a real cut of \$5.8 million. It is a 12-percent cut over what is happening, what was in the budget before today. It is a 16-percent cut over what we had last year in the last election year.

It is time that we start cutting our budgets. We are cutting our budgets and it is time that we come together and recognize that and tell the truth to the American people.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Pomeroy-Shepherd-Fingerhut-Cantwell amendment which would cut the official mail costs within the legislative branch appropriations bill by \$5.8 million, thereby reducing the mail appropriation to \$40 million.

This amendment would cut our mail allotment by an additional 12 percent over and above what the committee recommended. This would bring the total reduction in our mail budget for fiscal year 1994 to 16 percent.

This amendment will demonstrate to the American people a willingness on the part of Members of Congress to make real and significant cuts here in our own House. We cannot ask more of the American people than we ask of ourselves. And, now that the annual appropriations process has begun, there is no better place to begin cutting the Federal budget than with our own allocation. The legislative branch appropriations bill allows us the opportunity to show the public that Congress is willing to lead by example, to reduce the Federal deficit.

Members of Congress have a responsibility to respond to the needs of their constituents and to keep their constituents informed of the issues considered by the Congress. This amendment which cuts an additional 12 percent from the mail budget will not inhibit the ability of members to communicate with their constituents. It is a responsible reduction in the allocation for mail.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT].

Mr. SWETT. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this important amendment. When I first ran for Congress in 1990, I promised my constituents that I would not abuse the franking privilege—or their intelligence—with self-promotional mailings. I have kept that promise. In my first year in

Congress, I returned 68 percent of my office franking budget. Last year, I returned 69 percent. My office answers every letter and postcard we receive. I send issue-specific updates to those constituents who request them. I send out individually addressed postcards to constituents alerting them to my town meetings scheduled in their communities. And I have still returned over two-thirds of my franking budget each year. I support an even larger cut—50 percent—in our franking budget. But I strongly support this amendment as a significant step in the right direction, and I commend the amendment's sponsors.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] so he may yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT].

□ 1510

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman is returning two-thirds of his franking budget already, then obviously the franking budget for his office is too high, and that is about 6 percent that the gentleman is giving back to the nonexistent—

Mr. SWETT. Actually 68 percent and 60 percent in the first 2 years in my office.

Mr. KINGSTON. I admire the gentleman for that. My office is trying to do the same thing.

My question is then, Why are we only worrying about a very, very token 12-percent reduction? Why not go for the 50 percent? Why not go for something real, as you have already done in your office? The money is obviously there. Why don't we do in the Congress what is good enough for your office? Why shouldn't it be good enough for 434 other offices?

Mr. SWETT. Because this is a democratic body, and not all of our colleagues agree that something as substantial as 50 percent is appropriate. My example shows that it is. I hope that the gentleman's example shows that as well.

Madam Chairman, I will be happy to work with the gentleman next year to increase this to a larger amount, but for the time being I think we are on the right track with what we have here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield 60 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the mail amendment reduces the recommended mail appropriation for fiscal year 1994 from \$45.8 to \$40 million. That's a \$5.8 million reduction.

That brings us to \$7.711 million below the fiscal year 1993 level. And that will

be \$31 million below the authorized level for the Members' mail allowance.

At this new level for fiscal year 1994, we will have saved over \$173 million in House franked mail since we enacted the reforms in the 1990 appropriations bill.

The amendment to rescind \$1.6 million—\$1,621,754.77—in House funds goes to left over 1991 and 1992 funds that were to remain available until expended. That will leave only a small amount to liquidate any bills that may be presented for payment for goods and services purchased during that period.

For example, we know that there are still some computer equipment bills that will be due as soon as all the acceptance tests and billing discrepancies are ironed out.

Those are normal circumstances—the House is no different than any large and complex institution. The book-keeping and expenditure controls sometimes delay the actual payment.

But the bottom line is that these two amendments will count against the scoring in this bill by \$7.3 million.

That will reduce the BA scoring to a \$26.4 million reduction under 1993—that's now a 1.5 percent BA savings.

These amendments will yield a \$5.7 million outlay savings. Adding that \$5.7 million to the \$122 million we had projected, this bill will now produce a 6.7-percent reduction in total estimated outlays below the 1993 operations level.

Last year, the CBO estimated we were 6.5 percent below the 1992 level—that's 13.2 percent in 2 years.

Now these are only outlay estimates. Outlays projections are subject to fluctuation—certainly the deficit estimates change from month to month, and not just because of policy changes or legislative enactments. They change because actual revenues and expenditures cannot be precisely predicted.

But the fact remains—we have an outlay reduction over a 2-year period that is in the 10-15-percent range based on the budgetary scorekeeping rules.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] for yielding this time to me.

In response to my dear friend from California: The reason that his figure is 50 percent below the figure of 4 years ago is we had no public accounting then. All of a sudden, after there was accountability and quarterly reports, it was amazing how the Members reduced their franking.

The point is that the Upton-Roberts amendment cuts exactly where we have been in the off-years the last 2 years since we have had public accounting.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for having yielded to me.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Con-

gressman POMEROY and others which will result in a reduction of the House franking budget by 16 percent from last year's appropriation, which represents a cost savings of nearly \$8 million.

This amendment is absolutely essential if we are to make real reforms to the list of congressional privileges. My one regret is that it does not cut the franking budget enough.

The blatant abuse of the congressional frank by some Members of Congress is a gross manipulation of the public trust and constitutes the moral equivalent of stealing.

The evidence is clear that the practice of sending unsolicited mass mailings by Congress is a privilege which is exploited by some in order to gain an unfair advantage in their reelections, and we should put a stop to it.

According to a study conducted by the National Taxpayers Union Foundation, there was a huge increase in the mail volume in the House for the first 8 months of the 1992 election year when compared with 1991.

I know firsthand; last fall I was the victim of franking abuse during my campaign against a 12-year incumbent. My opponent spent nearly \$200,000 during the last session of Congress and sent out a mass mailing on the eve of the 60-day cutoff for these pre-election mailings. This congressional perk needs to be done away with.

I am certainly in favor of keeping our constituents informed by responding to their letters and inquiries, but to misuse taxpayer dollars by producing and sending out what amounts to publicly financed campaign material is wrong.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment. It is a step toward real reform of the congressional franking system.

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

Madam Chairman, maybe at this point it would be wise to offer a unanimous-consent agreement to add another \$5 million to the Pomeroy-Shepherd-Fingerhut-Penny cut to go down to the level that the gentleman from Kansas—

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, is the gentleman from Michigan making that request?

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I would at this point like to make a unanimous-consent request to amend the pending amendment and add another \$5 million to the cut.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not accept a motion to modify the pending amendment. The rule prohibits it.

Mr. UPTON. Under a unanimous-consent request I am not allowed to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would recognize such a request only for the proponent of the amendment, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I did want just to say this:

There were some statements earlier that the funds that would not be spent in this appropriation would be allowed to be reprogrammed or somehow fall into the slush fund. I want to make clear that funds in the last 2 fiscal years and in this fiscal year for postage are not allowed to be expended beyond the fiscal year in which they are provided or appropriated.

In other words, Madam Chairman, if they are not reprogrammed within this fiscal year, 1994 coming, they do not remain available. That used to be the case when we had no accountability, when we were not in a position to control our franking as we are today as a result of the Fazio-Frenzel amendment.

So, I want to be certain that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and others understand that this cannot fall into a future reprogramming in any future fiscal year. It is our intent that \$40 million is necessary to provide just what is available and necessary, and not one penny more or less. This is our best estimate.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I just want to clarify what the Chair said a moment ago.

If the unanimous-consent request that was rejected by the Chair which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] made were propounded by the proponent of the amendment, namely, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], then that particular unanimous-consent request would be acceptable on the floor; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would under this rule, entertain that request only from the proponent of the amendment that is now pending.

Mr. WALKER. So, the only person on the floor that could offer an additional \$5 million cut in this particular amendment would be the gentleman from North Dakota who has brought the amendment to the floor; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct. Then it would be a request to modify and not to amend by another Member, which is precluded by the rule in this case in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WALKER. And the Chair would entertain such a unanimous-consent request from that gentleman; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. From the proponent of the amendment, as the Chair has stated.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FAZIO. I would just like to propound a question.

If anyone were to offer that, would I, as chairman of the committee, be in a position to raise an objection?

The CHAIRMAN. Since the request must be a unanimous-consent request, any Member may object.

Mr. FAZIO. Well, I simply would like to make clear for the RECORD that I certainly would object if such a request were made.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, that would be on the basis of his being a Member of the House and not the chairman of the subcommittee, and he would then be thwarting the wishes of the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member may object to the unanimous-consent request.

The Chair informs Members that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] has the right to close the debate, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself that remaining minute and a half.

Madam Chairman, today I rise rather reluctantly in support of this amendment. It is an amendment that we certainly need. We need to cut our own budget here, and this amendment goes much further than the committee does, but I rise reluctantly because I do not think it is enough.

Madam Chairman, we should be looking at \$35 million instead of \$40 million. Today we have had a number of Members come to the House floor telling of their wonderful exploits of not spending what they have been allowed to do, and I have been one of those Members as well, a \$100,000 each in the last 2 years, and, as I look at all the Members that have reached that milestone, I know that we can do more.

Madam Chairman, I was sorry that the Roberts-Upton amendment was not allowed to be offered this afternoon because we could have had another \$5 million in savings. We all like to answer our mail. For many of us it is 800 to 1,000 letters a week these days, and if my colleagues were to multiply that times the first-class stamp, times 52 weeks, times 440 Members, they would get to a figure that is about \$6 million. This bill is five to six times more than what we need to respond to individual inquiries into our offices, and that is one of the many reasons why the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and myself were prepared to offer an amendment like we did in past years to see a greater reduction in this account.

Madam Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment, but I would also ask them that in the future years, as we look continually at these accounts, that we look for great-

er savings, and I hope that next year the Committee on Rules will, in fact, allow us an opportunity to achieve greater savings.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, in conclusion there are several observations that I have.

First, I would note the low regard the American public has for this institution, and in my opinion part of it is because of the language generated by Members of this institution, discredited action, which even in their discrediting comments they recognize as appropriate. Here we have an amendment which will take to \$40 million a level of mail expenditure which 10 years ago was at \$60 million. This in spite of the fact that incoming mail continues in at record levels. This is real, meaningful cuts.

The amendment proposes an additional \$12 million in cuts. It is part of a Democrat freshman initiative to bring funding for this institution down 25 percent over 5 years. I would note that the bill before us, as amended, would represent halfway attainment of that goal, a 13 percent reduction in expenditures to support the appropriation, the legislation branch.

□ 1520

These are real meaningful cuts. When we do something good, it is still not good enough. We still have to discredit it. It is a small wonder we have built a level of cynicism out there among the American public.

Madam Chairman, I would hope that this amendment could be adopted. I would like a very strong vote from both sides of the House in support of this 12-percent cut in the mailing expenses in the bill before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—418

Ackerman	Barca	Billrakis
Allard	Barcia	Bishop
Andrews (ME)	Barlow	Blackwell
Andrews (NJ)	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Andrews (TX)	Barrett (WI)	Blute
Applegate	Bartlett	Boehlert
Archer	Barton	Boehner
Armey	Beocerra	Bonilla
Bacchus (FL)	Bellenson	Bonior
Bacchus (AL)	Bentley	Borski
Baesler	Bereuter	Boucher
Baker (CA)	Berman	Brewster
Baker (LA)	Bevill	Brooks
Ballenger	Bilbray	Browder

Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	Margolies-
Brown (OH)	Goodling	Mezvinsky
Bryant	Gordon	Markey
Bunning	Goss	Martinez
Burton	Grams	Matsui
Buyer	Grandy	Mazzoli
Byrne	Green	McCandless
Callahan	Greenwood	McCloskey
Calvert	Gunderson	McCollum
Camp	Gutierrez	McCrery
Canady	Hall (OH)	McDade
Cantwell	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Cardin	Hamburg	McHale
Carr	Hamilton	McHugh
Castle	Hancock	McInnis
Chapman	Hansen	McKinney
Clay	Harman	McMillan
Clayton	Hastert	McNulty
Clement	Hastings	Meehan
Clinger	Hayes	Meek
Coble	Hefley	Menendez
Coleman	Hefner	Meyers
Collins (GA)	Herger	Mfume
Collins (IL)	Hilliard	Mica
Collins (MI)	Hinchee	Michel
Combest	Hoagland	Miller (CA)
Conyers	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	Mineta
Coppersmith	Hoekstra	Minge
Costello	Hoke	Mink
Cox	Holden	Moakley
Coyne	Horn	Molinari
Cramer	Houghton	Mollohan
Crane	Hoyer	Montgomery
Crapo	Huffington	Moorhead
Cunningham	Hughes	Moran
Danner	Hunter	Morella
Darden	Hutchinson	Murphy
de la Garza	Hutto	Murtha
de Lugo (VI)	Hyde	Myers
Deal	Inglis	Natcher
DeFazio	Inhofe	Neal (MA)
DeLauro	Inslee	Neal (NC)
DeLay	Istook	Norton (DC)
Dellums	Jacobs	Nussle
Derrick	Jefferson	Oberstar
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Obey
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)	Oliver
Dickey	Johnson (SD)	Ortiz
Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Orton
Dingell	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Dixon	Johnston	Oxley
Dooley	Kanjorski	Packard
Doolittle	Kaptur	Pallone
Dornan	Kasich	Parker
Dreier	Kennedy	Pastor
Duncan	Kennelly	Paxon
Dunn	Kildee	Payne (NJ)
Durbin	Kim	Payne (VA)
Edwards (CA)	King	Pelosi
Edwards (TX)	Kingston	Penny
Emerson	Kleczka	Peterson (FL)
English (AZ)	Klein	Peterson (MN)
English (OK)	Klink	Petri
Eshoo	Klug	Pickle
Evans	Knollenberg	Pombo
Ewing	Kolbe	Pomeroy
Fawell	Kopetski	Porter
Fazio	Kreidler	Portman
Fields (LA)	Kyl	Poshard
Fields (TX)	LaFalce	Price (NC)
Filner	Lambert	Pryce (OH)
Fingerhut	Lancaster	Quillen
Fish	Lantos	Quinn
Flake	LaRocco	Rahall
Foglietta	Laughlin	Ramstad
Ford (MI)	Lazio	Rangel
Ford (TN)	Leach	Ravenel
Fowler	Lehman	Reed
Frank (MA)	Levin	Regula
Franks (CT)	Levy	Reynolds
Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)	Richardson
Frost	Lewis (FL)	Ridge
Furse	Lewis (GA)	Roberts
Galleghy	Lightfoot	Roemer
Gallo	Linder	Rogers
Gejdenson	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Gekas	Livingston	Romero-Barcelo
Gephardt	Lloyd	(PR)
Geren	Long	Ros-Lehtinen
Gibbons	Lowe	Rose
Gillmor	Machtley	Rostenkowski
Gilman	Maloney	Roth
Gingrich	Mann	Roukema
Glickman	Manton	Rowland
Gonzalez	Manzullo	Roybal-Allard

Royce	Smith (TX)	Tucker
Rush	Snowe	Underwood (GU)
Sabo	Solomon	Unsoeld
Sanders	Spence	Upton
Sangmeister	Spratt	Valentine
Santorum	Stearns	Velazquez
Sarpalius	Stenholm	Vento
Sawyer	Stokes	Visclosky
Saxton	Strickland	Volkmer
Schaefer	Studds	Vucanovich
Schenk	Stump	Walker
Schiff	Stupak	Walsh
Schroeder	Sundquist	Walters
Schumer	Swett	Watt
Sensenbrenner	Swift	Waxman
Serrano	Talent	Weldon
Sharp	Tanner	Wheat
Shaw	Tauzin	Whitten
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Williams
Shepherd	Taylor (NC)	Wilson
Shuster	Tejeda	Wise
Skaggs	Thomas (CA)	Wolf
Skeen	Thomas (WY)	Woolsey
Skelton	Thornton	Wyden
Slatery	Thurman	Wynn
Slaughter	Torkildsen	Yates
Smith (IA)	Torres	Young (AK)
Smith (MI)	Torricelli	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Zeliff
Smith (OR)	Trafcant	Zimmer

## NOES—4

Abercrombie  
Nadler

Synar  
Washington

## NOT VOTING—16

Bateman  
Brown (CA)  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Engel  
Everett

Faleomavaega  
(AS)  
Gilchrest  
Henry  
McCurdy  
McKeon

Pickett  
Scott  
Sisisky  
Stark  
Thompson

□ 1544

Mr. WASHINGTON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MANN, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mister Chairman, I was detained on a matter concerning jobs for my district during rollcall 209 and was not present to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" to Limit Financing by House Members.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103-118.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SHEPHERD

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SHEPHERD: Page 7, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 101A. (a) House Resolution 1238, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to December 22, 1970 (as enacted into permanent law by chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971, and supplemented by the Act entitled "An Act relating to former Speakers of the House of Representatives" (88 Stat. 1723)) (2 U.S.C. 31b-1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 8. The entitlements of a former Speaker of the House of Representatives under this resolution shall be available—

"(1) in the case of an individual who is a former Speaker on the effective date of this section, for 5 years, commencing on such effective date; and

"(2) in the case of an individual who becomes a former Speaker after such effective date, for 5 years commencing at the expiration of the term of office of an individual as a Representative in Congress."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1993.

Page 6, line 19, strike "PROVISION" and insert "PROVISIONS".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Is the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] opposed to the amendment?

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, though I am not in opposition, I ask unanimous consent to take the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, the new Members of this House, the Democrats and Republicans alike, have included eliminating funds for former Speakers as part of their respective reform proposals. This represents the collective view of more than 100 Members.

We went through on both sides of this House a lengthy process of soliciting views from all Members, debating the merit of the proposals, and voting on the adoption of the recommendations. This is one of the rare, rare bipartisan efforts that we have seen since we have been here, and clearly we believe it is an issue that has bipartisan support in the entire House.

Madam Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], who is co-chair with me on the Democrat side, and the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], who are the Republican co-chairs of their reform effort.

Madam Chairman, we are currently spending over \$620,000 annually for former Speakers, including \$417,000 in Salaries for nine staff members, the official allowance of \$67,000 for each former Speaker, and an unspecified amount of franking funds. All these allowances and benefits are available to a former Speaker, as long as he finds it necessary to provide assistance in matters regarding his work as a Representative and Speaker of the House.

All of us must make sacrifices if we are to get the Federal budget deficit under control. While the expenditure for former Speakers is small in comparison to the deficit, it represents both real savings and the kind of

broad-based commitment to deficit reduction that is essential to control Federal expenditures.

Our amendment would put a 5-year limit on funding for former Speakers. The proposed 5-year limit we believe is a generous allocation and should provide the Speakers with adequate time to conclude their duties. All current former Speakers would be given 5 years from now in order to conclude their functions. In the future, all retiring Speakers would be given a 5-year period in which they would be allowed to conclude their duties.

It is a meaningful, if modest, effort at controlling Federal spending. It is an issue that has attracted extensive support, and we seek this House's support and the Members' support for this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I want to first commend my friend and fellow Floridian, Mr. GOSS, for his work on this issue. It was his legislation that brought this issue to light, and I am honored to join with him today in offering this amendment.

Equally as important as the reform we are offering today that will eliminate an unneeded perk and save taxpayer dollars is the way in which this amendment found its way to the floor.

This amendment represents the bipartisan effort of the new Members of this body. When the American people sent 110 freshmen to Washington last fall, they expected us to work together for reform.

Amidst the partisan bickering that has consumed this body since we arrived, Mr. TORKILDSEN and I sat down with our Democratic friends, Ms. SHEPHERD and Mr. FINGERHUT, and began a dialog that produced this bipartisan reform amendment.

It is our goal as freshmen, not just to enact our reforms, but to set an example for the rest of this body that we can rise above partisanship and do what is right for this country.

□ 1550

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak against this amendment. I have listened almost all day to all of the phony rhetoric that has come rolling out of here about how you are going to cut spending and how this is a charade. The only charade that is going on on this floor is how you are attacking the committee staff, how you are attacking the legislative staff, how you are attacking the Library of Congress people. None of us in

here could exist for 5 minutes without the support of our staffs, without the support of the committees, without the support of the Library of Congress, without the support of the General Accounting Office. We are all dependent on it.

All that is going on here is a whole lot of showing off. I figure there is not a whole lot you can do about it when people want to step up and puff up and try to pretend that they are actually accomplishing something except attacking the people that hold you up every day. Without the folks that are working for us in here we could not do the job.

I know what went on up in the Rules Committee yesterday. One of the members even stood up and said well, I suppose we have more people working for us in our committees because we are providing better service to our constituents. We have millions of more people in the country than we did when these first committee assignments were made. People speak other languages, immigrants are coming in, there are more services needed for our people.

But no, we are going to go home and show up by beating up on the people that make sure we are able to do our jobs.

Well, I was willing to go along and just vote no on a lot of this stuff to register my complaint that we are taking off on, eating our own young, as it were. But now when you come to the point of kicking the ex-Speakers of the House, that is too much.

I will tell Members right now, Tip O'Neill and the other Speakers that we have had, but I have to speak especially about Tip O'Neill is a national treasure of this country, and if you are going to tell me you are going to limit it to 5 years, I am against it. I am against this phony operation that attacks our own people, cuts the salaries of people that work for us, and I sure as hell am against kicking Tip O'Neill and the work that he has done, and what he represents in this country. Tip O'Neill does more to extend the idea of democracy, Tip O'Neill means more to the people of this world in terms of being the best that this country has to offer, in terms of opportunities, and justice than probably anybody on this floor has ever accomplished to this point, and ever will accomplish.

I will not yield. You folks have had the floor for about 2 days now to beat up on our own people here in our national legislature. And I am going to take my 3 full minutes to stand up for them, and particularly on this issue.

Those of you who are going to vote yes on this issue are saying in effect that people like Tip O'Neill do not deserve to have the kind of staff support that they have now, that represents all of us. And I will tell Members, looking at the work that is being done in here

lately, he sure represents it a lot better than we are doing.

I am telling Members to vote no on this, and let's at least take one step, an honest step to back up the people like Speaker O'Neill and the others who represent the very best that this body has to offer.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TORKILDSEN.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Madam Chairman, I just have to comment to my colleague from Hawaii, he is certainly one of the most animated speakers we have here. I too feel that Tip O'Neill is a national treasure. However, we cannot keep funding all of the things we used to do forever and ever and ever.

This bill does not affect anyone who is in this body right now. It is simply to cut spending on former Speakers, and it very generously limits that to 5 years after they leave office.

The other amendments proposed did not affect anything going on here. They proposed to eliminate money that was appropriated but not spent in prior years, and it cut postal money that was never spent or never is going to be spent anyway.

So I do have to just disagree with my colleague from Hawaii.

Madam Chairman, to the point at hand, this issue, this is a very reasonable step. Many new Members were elected on platforms that promised to reform the way Congress does business.

As the chair of the freshman Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform, Congresswoman FOWLER and I met many months with our freshman Republican colleagues, and later on with the chairs of the Democratic freshman task force to work out a package of reforms. We could not agree on every one, but this item is one of the few that we could reach bipartisan agreement on. We helped to bring this issue to the floor in Congress, and I think that is an accomplishment we should be proud of.

The amendment we are debating for a 5-year phaseout is weaker than the original proposal which was for a 3-year phaseout. Once again, items like the line-item veto and the balanced budget amendment, the full House is only being allowed to debate a weakened version, but weakened though this amendment may be, it is far better than doing nothing. That is positive action.

In the spirit of bipartisanship, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this measure as a first step to reform.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Madam Chairman, I thank my friend from Utah, KAREN SHEPHERD, and my friends, PORTER GOSS and TILLIE FOWLER, the co-chairs of the Republican Task Force on Re-

form. I would like to echo the eloquent comments by the gentlewoman from Florida, Mrs. FOWLER, about our efforts to work together. If there is any issue that has surprised me and taken me aback since I have been in this body, it is the extent of the partisan bickering that does occur on this floor at all times.

I recognize there are legitimate differences among us, ideologically and politically. But it seems to me more often we could put ourselves above that and work together, and we do hope today to be setting an example. I gather, Madam Chairman, from the comments of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], that he disagrees with us. And I would like to address very briefly his comments, because we do not come here to the floor today to take a shot at Tip O'Neill, or Carl Albert, or Jim Wright, or any of the other fine people who will serve as Speakers and retire from that position in the future. But rather we come at an extraordinary time in American politics.

We have a deep fiscal crisis. We have demonstrated ourselves unable as yet, as a Nation, as a Congress together to control our Federal budget. And every time we seek to do something in that vein we are told that this is a small amount, this is an insignificant amount, this will not add up, it is not much of anything.

Well, this is a small amount. It is relatively insignificant compared to the Federal budget. But it does amount to something, because when we are able to come here to the floor and to say that yes, even those people who we deeply respect, and who we deeply love, and whose contributions to this country have been remarkable, even to those people we must say that we cannot provide everything that we have provided in the past, do everything that we wish to, or provide all we wish to, with taxpayers' money.

When we are able to say that, then we are able to get a grip on the larger issues that confront this country. I urge support of the amendment.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PORTER GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, for yielding me this time and allowing me this opportunity. I think it is important Members understand how this started.

More than 2 years ago, a constituent, Gordon Adams of Sarasota, FL, complained to me that taxpayers are footing the bill for staff and office expenses for our three former speakers. Frankly, it was hard to believe. I made some inquiries to show Mr. Adams he was mistaken. What I found was that Mr. Adams was correct, that American taxpayers are spending \$600,000 to \$750,000 a year to perpetuate our three former

Speakers in office or perhaps I should say in business. To make things worse, this little-known retirement gift is unlimited. It is only terminated at the discretion of the former Speaker, a judgment that has yet to be made by any of our current former Speakers, even though they have all been out of office for many years. A total of almost three decades. Two years ago, the Goss bill to sunset this perk after 3 years was a lonely little bill, lost in the black hole of committee oblivion. But today, with the enthusiasm of our freshmen members—Democrats and Republicans—we now have the Shepherd-Fingerhut-Fowler-Torkildsen and Goss amendment to get the job finished. It is the beginning of what I hope will be a long line of change and progress toward reform and cutting spending that the 110 new members can help to bring about.

I congratulate the freshmen. While I am satisfied that we are finally debating a firm time limit on the former Speakers' office perks, the bill is not perfect. In my view, 5 years is unnecessarily protracted to wind down the legitimate official business of former Speakers—in fact, I still feel the 3 years in my original bill was overly generous. After all, the purpose of this taxpayer supported giveaway to the former speakers was to help them settle and conclude their official business, not prolong it.

On behalf of the 130 members who co-sponsored my bill for a 3-year limit, I will continue to push to shorten the time frame. But today we are at least making a start. A 5-year limit is certainly better than no limit at all, and I will enthusiastically support this amendment.

□ 1600

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this money-saving measure. I congratulate the Democratic and Republican freshman task forces for including this provision in their reform packages. This amendment is an example of the kind of positive bipartisan reform which can take place when the two parties work together.

The amendment grants the three living former Speakers of the House 5 years from October 1, 1993, to complete their official business. Former Speakers of this House deserve both our sincere appreciation and an appropriate amount of time to complete their official business, and this amendment does that. We should not, however, continue the funding for former Speakers indefinitely as we do now. With this amendment, we can save our Government over \$600,000 per year. Equally impor-

tant is the fact that we are doing the right thing.

Madam Chairman, it is refreshing to stand before the House in support of a positive reform measure. I sincerely hope that the cooperation on this amendment is a sign that both parties can work together to effectuate positive change on this institution. I fully support this amendment and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise to encourage all Members of the House to support this simple yet important amendment, and especially to applaud the efforts of my freshman colleagues who have found common ground on this matter.

The amendment before us represents a good-faith effort to address a very real problem of the U.S. Congress. Taxpayers really are outraged when they find out that former Speakers of the House enjoy a virtually open-ended bank account courtesy of the good old American taxpayer. On this issue, at least, freshman Members on both sides of the aisle agree that this privilege should be limited. Those freshmen, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], and the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] all deserve special commendation for working together, for finding areas of agreement like this, for coalescing our freshman classes on both sides of the aisle, and moving them forward.

I hope that we can find other even bolder reforms upon which our very large freshman class, one-quarter of the U.S. Congress, can enact real change.

So I urge my colleagues in the House to support this amendment. I wish the freshman leaders of this effort the strength, the perseverance to keep working in search of bigger and bolder bipartisan reforms.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Would the Chair be able to tell me how much it has cost us since President Ford left the White House 16 years ago to keep him in an office that costs \$465,000 a year plus at least \$3 million a year in Secret Service expenses?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

[Mr. YOUNG of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Madam Chairman, again, I want to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This really was an example where we could come together and reach some mutual agreement.

I hope this is the first step not only for further reforms but further bipartisan cooperation.

I think that we can do much that is needed to be done in that spirit, and with that, I will just again ask all of my colleagues, regardless of your party affiliation or how long you have been here, please, support this amendment. It is just a first step, but it is an important first step to take.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

This amendment represents real savings and a kind of broad-based commitment to deficit reduction that is essential to our beginning to control Federal expenditures.

I do urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is easily described. It will save us between \$500,000 to \$1 million annually in the coming years, and it recognized at the same time the significant contribution of former Speakers to this country and for their work after they were in this body and while they were in this body.

Furthermore, it is the right thing to do.

But the adoption of this amendment will do more than save us money. It will be a concrete manifestation that the new Members of this body from both sides of the aisle have come here with a strong desire to control Federal spending and to reform the way we do business by solving our problems instead of fighting in a very partisan way. This is one of the few efforts that I have seen since I have been here of bipartisan cooperation. I hope that we will see more.

I ask all of the Members of this body to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 36, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

AYES—383

Allard	English (AZ)	Knollenberg
Andrews (ME)	English (OK)	Kolbe
Andrews (NJ)	Eshoo	Kopetski
Andrews (TX)	Evans	Kreidler
Applegate	Everett	Kyl
Archer	Ewing	LaFalce
Army	Fawell	Lambert
Bacchus (FL)	Fazio	Lancaster
Bachus (AL)	Fields (LA)	Lantos
Baesler	Fields (TX)	LaRocco
Baker (CA)	Filner	Lazio
Baker (LA)	Fingerhut	Leach
Ballenger	Fish	Lehman
Barca	Flake	Levin
Barca	Foglietta	Levy
Barlow	Ford (TN)	Lewis (CA)
Barrett (NE)	Fowler	Lewis (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Bartlett	Franks (CT)	Lightfoot
Barton	Franks (NJ)	Linder
Becerra	Furse	Lipinski
Bellenson	Galleghy	Livingston
Bentley	Gallo	Lloyd
Bereuter	Gejdenson	Long
Bevill	Gekas	Lowey
Bilbray	Gephardt	Machtley
Bilirakis	Geren	Maloney
Bishop	Gibbons	Mann
Blackwell	Gillmor	Manton
Biley	Gilman	Manzullo
Blute	Gingrich	Margolies-
Boehlert	Glickman	Mezvinsky
Boehner	Goodlatte	Matsui
Bonilla	Goodling	Mazzoli
Borski	Gordon	McCandless
Boucher	Goss	McCollum
Brewster	Grams	McCrery
Browder	Grandy	McCurdy
Brown (FL)	Green	McDade
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	McDermott
Bryant	Gunderson	McHale
Bunning	Gutierrez	McHugh
Burton	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Buyer	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Byrne	Hamburg	McMillan
Callahan	Hamilton	McNulty
Calvert	Hancock	Menahan
Camp	Hansen	Menendez
Canady	Harman	Mfume
Cantwell	Hastert	Mica
Cardin	Hayes	Michel
Carr	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Castle	Hefner	Miller (FL)
Clayton	Heger	Mineta
Clement	Hilliard	Minge
Clinger	Hinchev	Mink
Coble	Hoagland	Molinari
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Mollohan
Collins (IL)	Hochbrueckner	Montgomery
Combest	Hoekstra	Moorhead
Cooper	Hoke	Moran
Coppersmith	Holden	Morella
Costello	Horn	Murphy
Cox	Houghton	Murtha
Cramer	Huffington	Myers
Crane	Hughes	Nadler
Crapo	Hunter	Natcher
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Neal (NC)
Danner	Hutto	Norton (DC)
Darden	Hyde	Nussle
de la Garza	Inglis	Oberstar
de Lugo (VI)	Inhofe	Obey
Deal	Inslee	Olver
DeFazio	Istook	Ortiz
DeLauro	Jacobs	Orton
DeLay	Jefferson	Owens
Derrick	Johnson (CT)	Oxley
Deutsch	Johnson (GA)	Packard
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Parker
Dicks	Johnston	Pastor
Dingell	Kanjorski	Paxon
Dixon	Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
Dooley	Kasich	Payne (VA)
Doolittle	Kennedy	Penny
Dorman	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)
Dreier	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Duncan	Kim	Petri
Dunn	Kingston	Pickie
Durbin	Kleczka	Pombo
Edwards (CA)	Klein	Pomeroy
Edwards (TX)	Klink	Porter
Emerson	Klug	Portman

Poshard	Schiff	Thomas (CA)
Price (NC)	Schroeder	Thomas (WY)
Pryce (OH)	Schumer	Thurman
Quillen	Sensenbrenner	Torkildsen
Quinn	Sharp	Torres
Rahall	Shaw	Torricelli
Ramstad	Shays	Traficant
Ravenel	Shepherd	Tucker
Reed	Shuster	Upton
Regula	Skaggs	Valentine
Reynolds	Skeen	Velazquez
Richardson	Skelton	Vento
Ridge	Slattery	Visclosky
Roberts	Slaughter	Volkmer
Roemer	Smith (MI)	Vucanovich
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Walker
Rohrabacher	Smith (OR)	Walsh
Romero-Barcelo	Smith (TX)	Waters
(PR)	Snowe	Watt
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Waxman
Rose	Spence	Weldon
Rostenkowski	Spratt	Wheat
Roth	Stearns	Whitten
Roukema	Stenholm	Williams
Rowland	Strickland	Wise
Roybal-Allard	Stump	Wolf
Royce	Stupak	Woolsey
Rush	Sundquist	Wyden
Sabo	Swett	Wynn
Sanders	Synar	Yates
Sangmeister	Talent	Young (AK)
Santorum	Tanner	Young (FL)
Sawyer	Tauzin	Zeliff
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Zimmer
Schaefer	Taylor (NC)	
Schenk	Tejeda	

NOES—36

Abercrombie	Frost	Rangel
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Sarpaluis
Berman	Hastings	Serrano
Bonior	Hoyer	Smith (IA)
Chapman	Johnson, E. B.	Stokes
Clay	King	Studds
Coleman	Laughlin	Swift
Collins (MI)	Markey	Thornton
Conyers	McCloskey	Towns
Coyne	Moakley	Unsoeld
Dellums	Neal (MA)	Washington
Ford (MI)	Pelosi	Wilson

NOT VOTING—19

Bateman	Faleomavaega	Meyers
Brooks	(AS)	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Gilchrest	Scott
Clyburn	Henry	Sisisky
Condit	Martinez	Stark
Engel	McKeon	Thompson
	Meek	Underwood (GU)

□ 1627

Mr. FROST and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 103-118.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHNER: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . For fiscal year 1994, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall include in the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures submitted to the House information with request to the allowances and expenses of the Architect of the Capitol, which shall

be based on information to be submitted by the Architect under requirements similar to those applicable to Members and committees of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Is there a Member in opposition?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed. I was going to ask unanimous consent to control the time, unless the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] wishes to do so.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed, but I was going to ask the same thing.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be able to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

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

The amendment that we have before us is very simple. It is a whole case about public accountability. The Architect of the Capitol receives funds appropriated under this legislative appropriation bill that we have before us today, but yet the expenditure and use of those funds by the Architect of the Capitol, who is charged with maintaining the buildings and the structures here in the Capitol, those expenditures do not have to be reported in the report of the Clerk of the House. All the other funds that are appropriated and expended under this bill show up in this report.

The fact is that until today I could never find where the funds for the Architect of the Capitol had been expended until just this afternoon this report showed up, where this report comes out every six months about how those funds are used.

All this amendment does is require that the Architect submit quarterly that information for printing in the report of the Clerk under the same conditions as all of us as Members and committees of the House do.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I just simply wanted to essentially question the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] as to his desire to have an additional report beyond the one that is already available. He has a green report, which I believe is the most recent report of the Architect of the Capitol which is a semiannual report which is

made available. This document is printed by the Senate, but it is clear, if my colleagues read the opening pages, it is submitted pursuant to law most recently amended in 1976. These points of detail regarding the Architect of the Capitol's expenditures I think are sufficient, and I question the need for any more frequent report. The gentleman wants a quarterly report, I believe. I gather we simply would be taking this information essentially and appending it to the Clerk of the House's report. I do not know what the cost of that would be. I estimate, if we had appended this report of 164 pages, it probably would cost us something in the neighborhood of \$150,000 perhaps. I question the need for it, and I would be interested to hear the gentleman's justification.

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

Madam Chairman, as I said, until today I have never been able to find this report, and I would suggest to my colleagues that most people are aware of the Clerk's report when they come to look for expenditures of the House, and the point I want to make, and the reason I offer the amendment, is for that information to show up here where people come customarily to look for the expenses of the House. They look in the Clerk's report, and that information really ought to be here.

Believe me. I have been looking for 2 years to figure out how we paid for marble floors and marble elevators as well as other expenses out of here that came out of the Architect's office, and not until today did I find this report was available, and I just believe that it should not be any extra expense, in all honesty, for the Architect or for the Clerk to include that information in this report because the funds are being appropriated by the House.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] for providing this convenience of yielding back and forth.

I am sure that we can make certain that every time the Clerk's report is published, every quarter, that on those occasions when this report is available on a semiannual basis, it can be made available at the same time. There are already 1,500 copies of this report printed. There are 264 detailed pages here.

What I would like the gentleman to agree to is that if we could ensure that this report would be made available at the time the quarterly Clerk's report is available, could we then not go to the trouble of additional printing and additional distribution costs. It may not be more than \$100,000 or so, but, as the gentleman knows, we have had debates on the floor today extensively about

responding to the desire to cut spending that seem to be placing great value in \$100,000.

So, Madam Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] would withdraw his amendment if I could assure him that I would work hard to make sure this would be more public, perhaps available to Members who have not up to today, known of its existence. If the gentleman would entertain that, I would certainly make it my job, along with the gentleman from Florida, to make sure that this becomes even more publicly available. These 1,500 copies that are printed need to be in the hands of Members, such as the gentleman, who want to follow this level of detail.

Mr. BOEHNER. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, I think that under the circumstances I would certainly be willing to work with the gentleman. Maybe down the road we do not need this report at all, and maybe we can put it all in the Clerk's report. But in either case I am not interested in costing the taxpayers of this country any more money.

With that, Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] is withdrawn.

It is in order now to consider Amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 103-118.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MEYERS OF KANSAS

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas: At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . . The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to take such action, whether by regulation or otherwise, to transfer to the Clerk of the House of Representatives responsibility of all financial activities of legislative service organizations, including the establishment and maintenance of revolving accounts to receive their dues and assessments and to make disbursements of their ordinary and necessary business expenses in support of Members' official and representational duties. The transfer referred to in the preceding sentence shall take effect on January 1, 1994.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Is there a Member in opposition?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs.

MEYERS], but I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to manage the time.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I request the 10-minute time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] qualifies, and the gentleman from Kansas will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to control the 10 minutes in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, the amendment Congressman PORTER and I are offering will provide meaningful reform of legislative service organizations, better known as LSO's.

This is what the amendment does. It requires the House Administration Committee to take action to bring LSO's under the control of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and establish finance office accounts for all of them. All LSO expenses will have to be vouchered and pre-approved by the finance office—just as they currently are for congressional offices and committees. These changes will take effect on January 1, 1994.

This amendment is identical to a bill I introduced last year. It provides full disclosure of and sheds sunlight on LSO operations.

I will be the first to admit that expensive gifts, lunches, and flowers are inappropriate uses of taxpayer funds, and I really appreciate the efforts of my Kansas colleague, PAT ROBERTS, in bringing these abuses to our attention. I want these abuses to end too, and they will under this amendment.

Many LSO's use their funds in legitimate ways to pay for staff salaries, office equipment, and publications, and they provide a much-needed service to Members and staff. One such LSO is the environmental and energy study conference, of which I have been the House vice chairman for the past 4 years. Each year the study conference requests and receives an audit of its books by GAO that shows its management is above reproach.

Some have said that LSO's aren't needed because Members can form task forces that use existing congressional staff to do the work. I belong to a number of these task forces, but many of them are informal and do not provide information of the caliber compiled by

LSO's. Why? Because congressional staff does not have the time or resources to compile and print information such as the environmental and energy study conference's Weekly Bulletin, which is provided to over 270 House Members.

In addition, many of the Member-established task forces are partisan or narrowly focused. The environmental and energy study conference, however, is objective and nonpartisan. It is the best resource in Congress for finding out the latest objective information on environmental, energy, and natural resource issues.

If you do not believe me, listen to what others have said about that conference. National Journal described the conference's Weekly Bulletin as indispensable. New York's *Newsday* called the conference's work invaluable.

If you want to end the abuses committed by some LSO's, support this amendment. If you want financial accountability and oversight of LSO's, support this amendment. And, if you want meaningful reform of LSO's, support this amendment.

□ 1640

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

Madam Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment. I certainly do not question the intent of the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] and the gentleman from Illinois, who are two good friends, but the practical effect of this amendment will be to institutionalize what we call LSO's and give them a prospective cloak of respectability. If we do that, we are making a mistake.

Now, for the record, there are 28 LSO's using taxpayer money to further various special interests—everything from human rights to the environment, to the Steel caucus to the Arts caucus, and the list goes on and on.

This is on top of 110 Congressional Member organizations that do not use any taxpayer funds, and about 300 subcommittees and committees. And then people wonder why we cannot really get any work done around here.

What is wrong with the LSO's? Simply put, one in every five dollars that LSO's have raised over the past 10 years is missing, some \$7.7 million. There has been no audit and no accountability.

Second, these expenditures have been for very questionable activities: Travel, social events, gifts, and stipends.

I have a "Dear Colleague" sent to your offices. Here is a chart—if we can get the other chart back up—on some very questionable activities.

We have monthly gifts: Gratuities, travel, social events, and other activities. Basically what has happened here is we have special interest caucuses who have their own bank accounts and

they are comprised of taxpayer funds, and their own checkbooks, and they are really free to spend it any way they like.

Now, the Committee on House Administration has been aware of this for years, since 1982, when the committee appointed two task forces, and I was a member of both, a separate subcommittee investigation and report, and then another subcommittee review. The result of all this was to try to place the LSO's and their employees under the same rules as the House before the train really jumped the track.

I offered a "mercy killing" amendment as of last year. The gentleman from California and the leadership of the Committee on House Administration said not to worry, we will have a GAO audit and study. As a result, I did not ask for a recorded vote.

Well, somehow that audit never took place, and now the GAO tells us it will be September before the first draft is done.

Madam Chairman, the time for reform has past. In keeping with the intent of a GAO audit, my office has completed a 10-year review of the financial reports filed with the Clerk. The big picture—not all LSO's, mind you, I know that—but the big picture is House LSO's, with millions of dollars in Federal tax dollars missing and unaccounted for and questionable relationships with private institutes, are an embarrassment to this House.

Look at the chart. The 10-year review shows that Members of Congress have funneled more than \$34 million in tax funds on LSO operations. Those LSO's in turn report spending \$26.8 million.

The next chart shows the total dollars Members have given to LSO's. However, \$7.7 million is absent. Where have these funds gone? At the very least we should have an outside audit.

Now, what has happened to these funds? Well, first, LSO's are capable of creating budgetary cushions or carry-over funds to guarantee their future. Members cannot do that and committees cannot do that.

We are going to have an ironic situation here where the House Administrator may tell us that due to budget restrictions, we may have to cut 10 percent of our office allowance, only to find out that your contributions to an LSO are sitting in some bank in a carry-over fund.

There are bookkeeping errors and unreported spending. If we can have the chart of the form that is used by LSO's, there is sloppy bookkeeping, and some of the LSO's said, "Wait a minute, there is nothing wrong, we just didn't report the clerk hire here over into the final column."

That is like writing a check and it does not really count in terms of your monthly balance. But we went back to the spreadsheets and found there is \$6 million missing, other than the sloppy bookkeeping, and that is wrong.

Now, I do not want to perjure or single out any LSO or their purpose. I want to stress that some of these caucuses obviously do well-intentioned work. They provide special interest focus and research.

I especially want to thank some of the LSO's for their interest in providing better reporting and full disclosure. So I am not trying to spread a blanket of blame here, by any means.

But these organizations further defuse an already fractured subcommittee and committee structure. They take valuable office space and they do not serve a true legislative purpose on Capitol Hill. Every one of the LSO's could survive and continue their work either as a congressional Member organization, and we have 110, or with the backing of the many institutes and private organizations that they have set up.

Madam Chairman, I know that people work very hard in regard to these separate institutes. The gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] is a member, actually the cochairman, of the Energy Environment Study Committee.

But there are questions here regarding the Energy and Environmental Study Committee and its sister organization, the Energy and Environmental Study Institute. This LSO prepares and makes millions of dollars by reselling a taxpayer-financed publication to select interest groups. They earned \$334,062 in 1991.

That is like the House Committee on Agriculture staff preparing a legislative report, and then giving it to the Farm Bureau so they can in turn sell it on a select basis to raise funds for the Committee on Agriculture and the Farm Bureau.

Maybe the chairman, the honorable gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], and I could think about that.

Madam Chairman, I understand that this activity may be legal, but it is very, very questionable. Let me just show you a tad, just a tad, of the arrogance involved, in that my office has received a "Dear Colleague" from an LSO staffer. This is a "Dear Colleague" from the Environmental and Energy Study Conference. Again, the same work could be financed by their sister institute that has \$1.5 million, and done as a congressional Member organization.

So, here we have a "Dear Colleague" from the LSO director, who shall remain nameless right now, who sent out a "Dear Colleague" under the frank and inside mail. I thought only Members could send out "Dear Colleagues." We have staff members now from the LSO's sending out "Dear Colleagues."

So I would just tell Members, when you vote for this, I certainly hope we achieve real reform and we don't sweep LSO mismanagement under the rug. I certainly hope that the work by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr.

GEJDEJONSON] on yet another subcommittee review, that we have done five times, will result in cleaning up this process.

But, Madam Chairman, I will state again: As you go through the past practices, and in terms of public disclosure and what has gone on here, it is a scandal that has happened, and it should not continue.

We just terminated four select committees. Every reason that was given in regard to the termination of those select committees stands true in regard to LSO's.

We do not need them. The work can be done by congressional Member organizations, and the work can be funded by the many, many institutes that are involved here in terms of private funds.

Madam Chairman, we should get them off Capitol Hill. We should clean this up.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's presentation. I know the gentleman is very serious about this. I am still trying to understand how an LSO would be approved for existence. I gather that the Committee on House Administration would still have the power to certify.

Madam Chairman, I wish to give a hypothetical, if I could. There has been an LSO that has been sort of coming together just today on the floor as we speak. It would be chaired, as I understand it, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], and called the High Decibel Caucus. It is my understanding they would give an annual Silvio Conte Award.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his contribution. I do not think we need to fund that. I think they can operate on their own wind, or, pardon me, on their own funds. I probably qualify for that High Decibel Caucus.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I suggest the gentleman would be very competitive for future leadership in that.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I appreciate that.

□ 1650

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, is the gentleman at all concerned, as I am, about some of the mail that we have recently gotten with regard to the gentleman's amendment and/or other proposed amendments in this regard coming into the offices, signed by

members of staff, basically lobbying Members out of these LSO's? Does that strike the gentleman as being inappropriate activity?

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, as I indicated, I think these has been a tad bit of arrogance and sense of entitlement by the people who are wrapped up in LSO's. They do a good job. But it just seems to me that under the circumstances, it is an induction of how serious the problem has become.

I would also tell the gentleman that we still have \$7.7 million missing. If we go down the laundry list of expenses, I can tell the gentleman, I just urge Members to check the Dear Colleague that I sent them, because this is an accident that has happened.

We will not have an audit. We will not go back and correct some of the things that we need to correct.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, do I understand the gentleman correctly that \$7.7 million is missing and we have not bothered to find out where it is?

Mr. ROBERTS. The excuse that is used by the LSO's is sloppy book-keeping, but there are also misspent funds and hideaway bank accounts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, let me say at the outset that I respect the concerns of the gentleman from Kansas, but I think there is a far better way to handle this matter than killing off the caucuses.

I frankly think that his amendment should have been made in order, and he should have had a chance to bring it to the floor. I am surprised, that it was not done.

Madam Chairman, I am cochairman of the congressional human rights caucus, a caucus that does serve as a special interest representative.

We represent such interests as refuseniks, Chinese students, rape victims in Bosnia, starving Somalis, oppressed Kurds and Bahais and other innocent victims.

Our members, since 1983, have helped over 1,500 prisoners of conscience find their voice in Congress and the executive branch, and thousands of others, to avoid torture, repression, and the lack of an ability to emigrate.

We do get a lot of work down around here, perhaps more than is done in any other way.

We have helped Andrey Sakharov, Desmond Tutu, Aung San Suu Kyi, the Dalai Lama, Rigoberto Menchu, long before any of them received their Nobel prizes and became household names.

I am proud, Madam Chairman, of our caucus. And I am proud of the work that we do. And I am proud of our efforts to ensure that we do not waste or

misappropriate taxpayers funds in any way.

I would not like to see those efforts jeopardized by elimination of LSO's. Rather, I believe that we should adopt the amendment to direct the Committee on House Administration to take action to place the financial affairs of all LSO's under the auspices of the house Finance office and do so not later than January 1.

This will allow us to do the same thing with LSO's that we have to follow in our own expenditures, only official expenses may be paid. They may only be paid retrospectively after proper documentation, all expenditures and receipts will be reconciled and will be made public, and monthly payrolls must be certified.

Total accountability and sound fiscal management will be assured under this amendment.

I commend it to the Members of the House and urge its adoption.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I think there were some misstatements made a moment ago. I did not hear them here on the floor, about the Environmental and Energy Study Conference.

The Environmental and Energy Study Conference and the Environmental and Energy Institute are totally separate. There is absolutely no commingling of funds.

The Environmental and Energy Institute sells the information that is published by the Environmental and Energy Study Conference only because it is not copyrighted. It is a Government document. It is not copyrighted.

Anybody could print it and sell it to any mailing list, but there is absolutely no commingling of funds.

We followed the law absolutely, and there were some changes made in the law not allowing commingling of funds about 10 years ago. And we have been extremely circumspect in that regard.

I just wanted to clear that up.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY  
MRS. MEYERS OF KANSAS

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, and this has been agreed by the other side, that on the amendment, instead of saying this "shall take effect on January 1, 1994," it will say, "shall take effect not later than January 1, 1994."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

In the last sentence of the amendment, strike "shall take effect on January 1, 1994," and insert in lieu thereof "shall take effect not later than January 1, 1994."

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it my understanding that with this amendment, if, in fact, all of the accounting and oversight procedures that the gentlewoman is requesting in this particular amendment can be structured and put in effect prior to January 1, that we could do so?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, that is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Does it make sense to the gentlewoman that any new LSO's that may be formed between this discussion today and the time at which we put into effect any of the accounting and oversight procedures are premature and that we should not allow any new LSO's to be created until we set up accounting and oversight procedures?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my amendment simply would say that as soon as the procedures can be put in place, that the amendment would be able to take effect. And it does not automatically mandate that we have to wait until January 1.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, if I could enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

With this amendment, which I understand was approved by the Committee on Rules and unanimously modified to allow accounting and oversight procedures to go into effect on or before the January 1 deadline, does the gentleman feel that it would make eminent sense that we put into place those accounting and oversight procedures before we go forward in approving any new LSO's that may be created? That is, is it not prudent procedure to put in place the accounting and oversight procedures and then approve new LSO's, if there are any?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Chairman, it would make absolute sense to do that.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Continuing my reservation of objection, Madam Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chairman, the amendment, as I understand it, says to put the regulations in effect January 1, 1994.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The amendment is on or before January 1, 1994. And if we are creating a window

between now and then to put in place accounting and oversight procedures, does not the chairman feel that we should reserve the creation of any new LSO's until we put into place the accounting and oversight procedures?

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, exactly. But the gentleman plans to attempt to mark them up next week and, as soon as he finishes them, I want us to move them in the full committee so we are talking about relatively short period of time.

But the answer to the gentleman's question is, absolutely, yes. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, the defender of the much maligned peanut program, I would ask the gentleman, is it, in fact, a plan that we are going to add more LSO's?

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, only the Lord in heaven knows that, because I do not know who wants to create an LSO.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, if the Lord in heaven wishes that, I suppose, but how about the Speaker?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] has expired. The 10 minutes on both sides has expired.

□ 1700

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me the primary concern about LSO's has been the fact that there has been no accounting procedure and no oversight. If we are in the process of putting into place an accounting and oversight procedure, then the approval of new LSO's after the fact, under the accounting and oversight procedures, should be of much less concern to the body. My concern is that we do not approve new LSO's until those accounting and oversight procedures are in place.

This gentleman feels comfortable that on the statements of the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentlewoman who is sponsoring this amendment, that all of them intend for the accounting and oversight procedures to be in place before any LSO is even considered for recognition.

Madam Chairman, that being the case, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS]?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to take such action, whether by regulation or otherwise, to transfer to the Clerk of the House of Representatives responsibility for all financial activities of legislative service organizations, including the establishment and maintenance of revolving accounts to receive their dues and assessments and to make disbursements of their ordinary and necessary business expenses in support of Members' official and representational duties. The transfer referred to in the preceding sentence shall take effect no later than January 1, 1994.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to know, since all of that happened on a unanimous consent request, did that come out of our time? Is all our time gone?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the time was taken out of the time of the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] until the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] requested time on his reservation of objection.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry: The statement of the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] was simply to ask unanimous consent. I then reserved the right to object, so let us make it clear that about 20 seconds or 15 seconds would be removed from their time when she presented her unanimous consent request, because I reserved the right to object immediately. All of the discussion that transpired was under reserving the right to object, which should not come out of her time.

I would ask the Chairman, does she agree?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, what we are talking about here is 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair made a statement that the time that was taken to discuss the unanimous consent request for modification came out of the time of the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mr. THOMAS of California. However, Madam Chairman, the time on the reservation of objection does not, is that correct?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we have 5 minutes restored to our time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Chairman, whose time is that coming out of?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object I do not intend to object, I think we know where we are going here. I think I would like to try to move it along, for Members

who are waiting for more important votes that will be coming later.

I do understand, and I will not object, that the gentlewoman would like to clarify her position, but we really are getting to a point where we know where we are going.

Madam Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas that the 5 minutes under the reservation of objection not be counted against her time?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes to debate the modified amendment.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I hope we will not need all that time, but I know we have some unanimous consent requests and some additional requests for time.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from, Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter-Meyers amendment. I applaud my colleagues who offered it for putting the House on record of addressing the problems of LSO's and doing so in a somewhat timely manner—at the start of the next session.

However, I do want to point out, as a member of the Committee on House Administration, that this is not an issue that is going unattended.

LSO's are already under the jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee, and its Subcommittee on Office Systems presently has the organization, operations, and finances of LSO's under review.

I realize the authors of the amendment are offering it in an attempt to keep LSO's from being eliminated altogether, and I sympathize with this effort.

As much as I respect my colleagues who are advocating the abolishment of all LSO's I don't agree that simply throwing the whole bag of apples in the garbage is the only way to get rid of any wormy or rotten apples.

There is absolutely no reason why we can't pick out the problems, address them, and let LSO's continue to serve Members of the House. We do that by putting in place stricter accounting requirements, restrictions on the use of funds, staffing rules, limits on their association with private interest groups, and other specific rules to ensure the appropriate use of tax dollars.

I would personally like to require LSO's to file vouchers to clear all expenses as Members must do now for their personal offices. This would put LSO expenditures of tax dollars on an open, public record.

I agree that efforts in this regard in the past have failed or, at least, been very inadequate. But we have in place now the Subcommittee

on Administrative Oversight, which, other than the Ethics Committee is the only true bipartisan subcommittee in the House. And although the reforms are coming slowly, albeit sometimes too slowly, there is progress being made through serious, real, complicated, and comprehensive changes in the administration of House operations.

We've already transferred the operations of the Finance Office, which processes our vouchers, out from under the Clerk of the House and a partisan atmosphere, to the non-partisan director of Financial and Non-Legislative Services.

I am optimistic that if the Committee on House Administration develops regulations for the LSO's and their finances are eventually put under the Director's jurisdiction, with the bipartisan subcommittee's oversight, we can clean up the problems with LSO's.

I understand that this is the eventual intent of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meyers-Porter language, and thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. It is a good amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment sponsored by Representative PORTER. This amendment affirms the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration to proceed with the draft regulations regarding legislative service organizations.

The Subcommittee on Office Systems, which I chair, stands ready to mark up the proposed committee regulations pertaining to legislative service organizations on Wednesday, June 16. These regulations have been developed over a period of more than 1 year in consultation with Members, LSO's, and the Office of Finance. The only reason the subcommittee has not acted to date is that the ranking minority member requested that deliberations concerning this matter be postponed until the General Accounting Office has submitted its final report on accounting standards to the committee, transcript: Committee on House Administration meeting, March 25, 1993. That report, I might add, was authorized by the conference report to accompany the 1993 legislative branch appropriations (H. Rept. 102-1007).

The draft Committee on House Administration regulations, currently under consideration by the subcommittee, represent the farthest reaching reforms ever proposed. Under the draft, the following rules would apply to all LSO's.

First, all financial activities of LSO's would be placed under the Finance Office;

Second, LSO expenditures must conform with regulations that pertain to standing committees;

Third, all LSO employees would be considered House employees subject to the provisions of the 1989 Ethics in Government Act;

Fourth, all financial transactions would be reported in the quarterly report of the clerk;

Fifth, relationships and transactions that a LSO may have with an affiliated outside group would be disclosed; and

Sixth, the criteria and certification for LSO designation would be tightened.

Legislative service organization members are very supportive of this approach. It acknowledges that LSO's provide essential research and legislative services to members in a more cost-effective manner than a member office could support and ensure members' constitutional right to associate by caucus organizations utilizing their official resources in a manner that is not contrary to the letter and spirit of House rules and regulations.

The General Accounting Office released its draft LSO accounting standards and guidance disclosure statements on May 6, 1993. According to the GAO, it has spent 42 staff days dedicated to this product. In short, the GAO proposes that LSO's adopt an accrual basis of accounting based on generally accepted accounting principles which, I believe, would require every LSO to have a full-time CPA on staff to properly record every transaction. Under the GAO approach, LSO's would still have control over their own financial accounts—an authority no other House entity is entitled to—and one that would be removed by the regulations under consideration by the subcommittee.

The regulations under consideration by the subcommittee are currently being discussed by bipartisan staff to identify the final areas of concern. But as a whole, these regulations have been developed in consultation with almost every LSO, members of the committee, the office of the clerk, in countless meetings and discussions. By placing all their financial activities under the Finance Office like all other House entities, any question regarding the propriety of financial transactions by LSO's would be subject to continual finance office oversight and audit.

I include for the RECORD a draft of the regulations referred to:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS—LEGISLATIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

#### INTRODUCTION

Members of the House of Representatives may wish to join together to pursue common legislative and research objectives for reasons of efficiency and effectiveness. A group of similarly interested Members, after certification by the Committee on House Administration, will be recognized as a "Legislative Service Organization." These groups

and their employees, are subject to all applicable statutes and Rules of the House of Representatives and Regulations of the Committee on House Administration. Legislative Service Organizations may utilize the resources of the House and the Members thereof may authorize the use of their Clerk Hire and Official Expense Allowances, only after agreeing to abide by the operational and financial requirements adopted by the Committee on House Administration.

CERTIFICATION, EMPLOYMENT OF STAFF,  
FUNDING OF LSOS

1. Any group of Members seeking certification as a Legislative Service Organization must submit to the Committee on House Administration the organization's statement of its primary purpose, membership roster, by-laws, and annual dues structure.

2. Any group of Members seeking certification as a Legislative Service Organization must meet the criteria set forth below and attest to continual compliance:

(a) A Legislative Service Organization shall consist solely of Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate;

(b) A Legislative Service Organization shall attest in a statement filed with the Committee on House Administration simultaneously with its request for certification that: (i) the organization is to provide bona fide research and/or legislative services or assistance which solely supports the Members thereof in the performance of their official and representational duties; (ii) the primary activity of the organization does not duplicate the work of Standing Committees of the House, or other legislative branch support organizations, nor conducts executive branch oversight hearings or investigations as defined by Clause 2(b)(1) of House Rule X; and (iii) the organization does not directly or indirectly solicit private organizations or persons to influence Members to join or otherwise participate in the organization;

(c) A Legislative Service Organization shall not receive income or contributions, either in cash or in-kind, from any sources other than the Congress or its Members;

(d) A Legislative Service Organization shall not be incorporated or hold separate tax-exempt status under the federal Internal Revenue Code;

(e) A Legislative Service Organization shall be physically located in office space approved by the House Office Building Commission.

(3) If a group meets the above criteria and is otherwise qualified, the Committee may certify the group as a "Legislative Service Organization." Such certification shall remain in effect for so long as the conditions specified in paragraph [2] are met, except that the Committee may revoke the certification of a Legislative Service Organization at any time for good cause shown.

(4) Legislative Service Organization employees shall be appointed by existing Clerk-Hire positions from Members of the Legislative Service Organization. Members thereof may transfer one or more of the permanent, part-time, or shared employee positions allocated to their personal office to the Legislative Service Organization for use by that organization for a period of one or more months. Such transfer shall be accomplished by means of a written letter addressed to the Office of Finance. The Office of Finance shall maintain a record of the number of positions transferred to each Legislative Service Organization and the time period for which they are transferred.

(5) The Committee shall authorize the Office of Finance to establish a revolving ac-

count for each Legislative Service Organization certified by the Committee on House Administration. Receipts and disbursements from such account shall be subject to all applicable statutes and Rules of House of Representatives and Regulations of the Committee on House Administration. Upon receipt of such authorization, the Office of Finance shall establish a revolving account for the use of the organization:

(a) Any Member of the House of the Representatives may allocate on a reimbursable or advance basis a portion of their Clerk Hire and/or Official Expense Allowance to the account of one or more Legislative Service Organizations and may supplement that allocation for services rendered as needed as well as defray administrative expenses incurred by the organization;

(b) The Office of Finance shall maintain such accounts without regard to whether deposits into the accounts were derived from the Clerk-Hire or Official Expense Allowance of contributing Members. The Office of Finance shall make both payroll and non-payroll disbursements from each Legislative Service Organization's designated account in accordance with these regulations.

(c) Any voucher or disbursement from the account of a Legislative Service Organization shall be signed by the Chairman or designated Member officer of such organization;

(d) Following the close of each pay period, the Office of Finance shall forward to each Legislative Service Organization a Payroll Certification listing the names of each individual employed by the Legislative Service Organization and the amount of salary paid to each employee in the previous pay period. These forms shall be completed and signed by the Legislative Service Organization Chairman certifying: (i) That the information provided by the Office of Finance is correct; (ii) that the listed employees have performed their assigned official duties in the offices of the Legislative Service Organization; and (iii), that the listed employees have no relationship to a current Member of Congress, unless otherwise noted.

(e) A Legislative Service Organization shall not submit payroll authorization which would cause the organization to employ more individuals for a greater number of pay periods than have been allocated to the organization by its Members under the provisions of paragraph 4 of this section.

(6) The Office of Finance shall maintain appropriate records of all Member official allowances transferred to one or more Legislative Service Organization. Payroll and disbursements of each Legislative Service Organization shall be published quarterly in the Report of the Clerk of the House.

(7) Legislative Service Organizations may utilize educational intern, fellowship or volunteer programs when the programs are primarily of educational benefit to the participating interns, fellows or volunteers. However, the Legislative Service Organization may not solicit or receive any private contributions for such programs.

(8) A Legislative Service Organization may distribute to Members of Congress any report, analysis, or other research material prepared in whole or in part by persons other than persons employed by said Legislative Service Organization. However, the identity of the person and/or organization which prepared or assisted in the preparation of said research material shall be fully disclosed thereon.

REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE USE OF  
LEGISLATIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATION FUNDS

(1) Ordinary and necessary expenses incurred by the Members or employees of the

Legislative Service Organization in the support of the Legislative Service Organization's official research, legislative, and charter duties shall be paid from the Legislative Service Organization's revolving account on a reimbursable basis. This account shall only be disbursed upon proper certification and documentation of the expenses incurred by the Legislative Service Organization and shall be in the form of reimbursement to Legislative Service Organization Members or employees, or to a specified vendor. To request reimbursement, a completed voucher, with supporting documentation, which has been executed and signed by the Chairman, or designated Member officer of the organization, should be submitted to the Finance Office for processing.

Disbursements by the Legislative Service Organization from this account shall not be used to pay for any goods or services in advance except newspaper, newsletter, periodical subscriptions, electronic data, and postage stamps, and other such items which may be specifically authorized by the Committee on House Administration for good cause shown. The period covered by advance payments may not exceed one year.

(2) The Committee on House Administration Regulations governing the disbursement of funds authorized to Committees of the House shall apply to Legislative Service Organization activities, except that the following are permissible used of the account:

(a) Food or beverage costs relating to Legislative Service Organization meetings with individuals who have a legitimate interest therein, which is not too social in nature. Food and beverage expenses shall not exceed 10 percent of an LSOs calendar year expenditures.

(b) Domestic travel expenses by Legislative Service Organization employees relating to the Legislative Service Organizations charter duties which are approved by the Committee prior to incurring such travel expenses. Travel expenses shall not exceed 5 percent of an LSOs calendar year expenditures.

(c) Materials (such as booklets and binders) distributed to Members at or below cost; and

(d) Maintenance of a petty cash fund pursuant to the regulations established by the Committee on House Administration.

(3) Pursuant to the determination made by the Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards on January 26, 1982, Legislative Service Organizations are not entitled to use of the Frank. Postage stamps required to support a Legislative Service Organization activities may be procured by submitting a completed voucher to the House Post Office. The cost of such postage stamps shall be charged against the organization's finance office account. Legislative Service Organizations may utilize "Inside Mail" and "Dear Colleague" services provided by the U.S. Postal Service in accordance with applicable Committee regulations.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO  
LEGISLATIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

(1) Each Legislative Service Organization shall submit an annual projected operating budget and a statement of Membership dues and/or subscription fees to the Committee within 90 days of the beginning of each session of the Congress. Such budget shall allocate at least 10% of available funds to cover monthly obligations to the House for equipment, telecommunications, office supplies, and other costs which may extend beyond the calendar year in question.

(2) Each Legislative Service Organization shall submit an end-of-the-year Report to the

Committee no later than 30 days after the end of each calendar year period. This report shall be open to public inspection. The report shall include—

(a) The name and address of the organization;

(b) The purpose of the organization;

(c) The names of Members of the House and of the Senate who were members of the organization or paid the organization for service during the preceding year;

(d) Actual personnel and non-personnel expenditures incurred by the organization during the preceding year;

(e) The name of each individual participating in an educational intern, fellowship or volunteer program and the identity of the sponsoring organization, if any;

(f) A description of the research, legislative, and official services provided by the organization during the preceding year; and

(g) Exceptions to the regulations which the Legislative Service Organization received from the Committee during the preceding year.

(3) Each executive staff director or designated employee of a Legislative Service Organization shall file a Financial Disclosure Statement consistent with the provisions of House Rule XLIV with the Clerk of the House. For purposes of reporting, if a Legislative Service Organization has no employee earning at least 120 percent of the GA-15 level, the Chairman must designate at least one "principal assistant" to file.

(4) The Committee may revoke the certification of a Legislative Service Organization for failure to comply with the above reporting requirements and timely filing of all requested information.

#### REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR AFFILIATED RELATIONSHIPS

(1) A Legislative Service Organization must disclose in its end-of-the-year report its relationships with any outside organizations with which it has any relationships or with which a reader may believe it to have relationships. This includes outside organizations with similar sounding names, those that may have been formed as a result of the Committee on House Administration regulations prohibiting LSOs from accepting contributions from any organizations or persons other than the Congress or its Members, or any the LSO may have otherwise assisted in forming. The following activities shall be identified:

(a) Staff shared between an LSO and an outside organization;

(b) LSO research made available for reprinting by an outside organization; and

(c) Payments or reimbursements of travel, convention, briefing, food and lodging, or other expenses of staff of an LSO, or Members acting on the LSOs behalf, made by an outside organization.

#### TRANSITION REGULATIONS

(1) Existing Legislative Services Organizations intending to seek certification under these regulations shall make an irrevocable election to the committee on House Administration by September 30, 1993. The Committee shall provide an expedited review of certification for existing LSOs seeking future certification under these regulations so long as they have submitted all required materials for certification by September 30, 1993. This expedited review shall be completed by November 30, 1993. If the organization is certified by the Committee as a Legislative Service Organization, the provisions of these regulations will be applicable January 1, 1994.

(2) Organizations certified as Legislative Service Organizations by the Committee under paragraph [1] shall terminate their financial accounts at the close of business on December 31st, 1993, except in the event that no certification decision has been reached by the Committee by December 1, 1993. All remaining funds shall be paid to the United States Treasury credited to the Office of Finance who shall credit each Legislative Service organization revolving account with the transferred amount.

Each Chairman of the Legislative Service Organization shall certify to the Committee the amount of funds transferred to the Office of Finance and that all outstanding financial obligations have been paid and that the Legislative Service Organization financial accounts have been closed.

(3) Adopted by the Committee on House Administration on \* \* \*

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment before the House. Madam Chairman, as cochair of the Sun Belt Caucus, I was once somewhat flabbergasted by the lack of accountability for taxpayer funds, funds that come out of the various Members' offices, for the LSO's. Accordingly, my cochair, the gentleman from Oklahoma [DAVE MCCURDY], and I asked for an audit to be made of our particular organization. To my knowledge, the Sun Belt Caucus is the only one that has had such an audit.

It is absolutely vital that we bring these under the Clerk of the House. These are taxpayer dollars. There must be accountability. We can fight the good fight as to whether these LSO's should continue some day later. I think a good argument can be made for the elimination of LSO's, and I would look forward to participating in that debate.

However, the question before us today is accountability of American taxpayer dollars. There is no way to vote except "yes" on this very important and well-thought-out amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished co-chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. I think it is important for use to recognize that these totally bipartisan bodies do some of the most effective and productive work in this House.

I profoundly resent the patronizing and derogatory tone earlier in this debate. At a time of concentration camps, ethnic cleansing, genocide re-emerging in many parts of this world, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus will be proud to continue its work of a decade under total fiscal account-

ability. I think it is important to realize that from the far right to the far left of this body we have united on behalf of people whose rights have been denied, who have been deprived of the most fundamental and elementary considerations of human existence. These caucuses, and I, speak in particular of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, are in the finest tradition of this Nation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment so this noble work in this body may continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Porter-Meyers amendment which will bring all Legislative Service Organizations [LSO's] under the Finance Office. I want to commend the Rules Committee and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the gentlelady from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], for focusing the debate on LSO's where it should be: on reform.

When we debated this issue last year, we were given two choices: eliminate all LSO's or keep things the way they were. I, for one, was unhappy to be denied an opportunity to make some needed changes in the way LSO's operate. I am pleased that we have that opportunity today.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has done a service by calling Members' attention to the lack of accountability by LSO's. However, he does a tremendous disservice to a number of LSO's, like the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, when he paints us all with the same broad brush.

The Women's Caucus provides its more than 150 members with services that are not otherwise available to them: A weekly legislative activity report covering all floor and committee action on women, a monthly newsletter summarizing issues important to women and families, and the opportunity to attend briefings on important women's issues.

Most importantly, Women's Caucus members work together on legislation that has qualitatively improved the lives of American women. This year, we will introduce four separate legislative packages addressing economic equity for women, women's health, gender equity in education, and violence against women.

That's what the Women's Caucus does.

However, either directly or by implication, the gentleman from Kansas has accused us of doing many things that we do not do.

We do not have a relationship with any outside institute or organization.

The gentleman from Kansas recently sent around an article that charged we were connected to an organization that is funded primarily by tobacco and alcohol interests. This is absolutely untrue! We have no connection to any outside organization and we do not mingle public and private funds.

We do not spend money on expensive meals or receptions. In fact, in 1992 we had one expenditure for food: \$251 for the breakfast we held in December to honor the 24 newly elected Congresswomen. There was so little food that midway through breakfast someone asked why knives and forks had been set at the table if there was nothing to eat with them. All we served were muffins and juice!

And, I want to state categorically that all funds received by the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues over the past 10 years are fully accounted for, contrary to what is shown on the chart of the gentleman from Kansas. The process used by the gentleman to obtain these numbers was flawed and he has done a real disservice to many responsible organizations and the people who work for them, to suggest otherwise. I include in the RECORD a letter which accounts for the funds the gentleman from Kansas has questioned, and I urge my colleagues to support the Porter-Meyers amendment.

CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS FOR  
WOMEN'S ISSUES,  
Washington, DC, June 9, 1993.

Hon. PAT ROBERTS,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: We are writing to correct misinformation about the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues contained in materials you have recently sent out urging the elimination of most Legislative Service Organizations.

First, a Dear Colleague letter you sent in May was accompanied by an article published by the Wichita Eagle. The article said that, "Organizations connected to the Black, Hispanic and Women's LSOs get most of their funding from tobacco and alcohol interests." The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues is not connected to any outside organization, and we get absolutely no money from any interest group or business.

Second, testimony you submitted to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress states that the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues has \$163,939 in unaccounted funds over the past ten years. In fact, 100 percent of Caucus funds are accounted for. Eighty-four percent were expended by the Caucus for services to our members and reported in our quarterly reports to the Clerk. Of the remaining 16 percent, nearly one-half came from Members' clerk-hire accounts. While clerk-hire funds are reported by LSOs in their quarterly reports as income received, they are not reported as a disbursement by the Caucus since the funds are actually dispersed by the Finance Office as payroll. The remaining 8 percent of funds are a combination of 1993 dues paid by Members at the end of 1992 and unspent 1992 funds, which constitute a major portion of our 1993 operating budget and will be reported when they are expended. In other words, 100 percent of Caucus funds are present and accounted for.

We actively support LSO reform, however we hope that the debate tomorrow can be fought on the merits and not on the basis of inaccurate information.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA SCHROEDER,  
Co-Chair.  
OLYMPIA SNOWE,  
Co-Chair.

Mr. GALLO. Madam Chairman, as cochairman of the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, I rise in support of the Porter/Myers amendment.

As stated, this amendment will put the LSO accounts under the Clerk of the House.

This will help insure that LSO's are abiding by the same rules as the rest of the House—Members' offices and committees.

As we continue to discuss the issue of LSO operations in the future, I would also strongly recommend to my colleagues that we require annual audits of the LSO's. We have been doing this at the Northeast-Midwest Coalition for some time and it is added assurance to all of our Members that their contributions are spent well and are in keeping with the rules of this House.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of an amendment offered by my colleague, JOHN PORTER, which directs the House Administration Committee to transfer all financial regulation of Legislative Service Organizations [LSO's] to the Clerk of the House, thereby requiring LOS's to operate under the same rules as congressional offices and committees.

Madam Chairman, as cochair of the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition—one of the oldest and largest LSO's—I welcome the increased financial regulations called for in this amendment.

The Northwest-Midwest Congressional Coalition is one of only a handful of LSO's that has voluntarily submitted to annual audits by the General Accounting Office [GAO]. The GAO has audited the Coalition annually and has found it regularly conforms to accepted accounting principles. The Coalition also submits full disclosure of its accounts quarterly to the Clerk of the House. Financial accountability is welcomed by the Coalition.

I would also like to commend the House Administration Committee for its hard work in seeking a bipartisan package of LSO financial reforms and I understand the Subcommittee on Office Systems is scheduled to mark up its reform package on June 16.

Therefore, Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Porter amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 103-118.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAMS

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAMS: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

Sec. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the relocation of the office of any Member of the House of Representatives within the House office buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does any Member rise in opposition to this amendment?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed, but I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to manage the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

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

Madam Chairman, this amendment would simply prohibit Members from relocating from one office to another during fiscal 1994. This amendment is a combination of common sense, fiscal responsibility, and congressional reform.

Currently when a Member leaves, a series of office moves is set off. So far this year four Members have left the House. This has resulted in 13 current Members moving to new offices, in addition to the four new Members moving in. Each move cost the taxpayers about \$3,000. This includes moving furniture, hooking up phones and computers, reprinting stationery, and other costs.

Typically there are nine vacancies in each Congress. Each vacancy triggers five additional moves.

□ 1710

Now, that results in about \$135,000 in moving expenses each year. Already we have spent about \$40,000 in moving this year alone, and that does not count the 110 new freshmen that came in that triggered 312 moves of offices for nearly \$1 million.

These moves, I believe, are a waste of money. At a time when the American people are called on to sacrifice through higher taxes, it makes no sense to waste thousands of tax dollars to simply give Members a few more

square feet of office space or a better view of the Capitol or a shorter walk to the House floor.

This amendment also gets at the mentality of privilege that has caused the House to fall in disfavor by the American people. By allowing Members to take over the office of their predecessors it reminds Members that their offices belong to the people of their district and not to them personally.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chairman, I simply wanted to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota. My understanding is that his purpose is to prevent the moving of Members during this one term of Congress, and that this is for 1 fiscal year, so it would be from October to October? At the moment, of course, we have no individual in mind, but if anyone were to terminate their service during that time, the successor to that person elected in a special election would complete the term utilizing the existing office, no matter how senior that Member may have been, is that correct?

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, it would be something if we had a freshman in Rayburn, is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. FAZIO. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GRAMS. And the furniture and the equipment and all would stay.

Mr. FAZIO. I am not at all opposed to what I think is a modest savings, because there are dollars spent over time for Members to move phones and move furniture and et cetera. I do think we need to make clear that there is a responsibility which resides in the House Office Building Commission, and they would have to revise the regulations, if they were so inclined, to ensure that this person did not have permanent access to that office.

Mr. GRAMS. No. My intent would be, the rule would be if it was going to be modified, it would have to be changed by the next appropriation.

Mr. FAZIO. Hopefully not this Committee, but the Commission. So the intent would be then that any Member who had the privilege of filling out the term of another Member they succeeded would then fall back into line in terms of seniority when at the beginning of the next Congress we did make one additional movement around the building for purposes of changing offices, is that correct?

Mr. GRAMS. That is if the rule were examined and changed to make that exception. Otherwise, right now you have the privilege of protecting your office space, so it would force some review of this procedure.

Mr. FAZIO. I have no objection, and because this is only applying to the next fiscal year, I have no objection to allowing the Commission to take this as an expression of the will of the House and look at the regulations in this regard. It seems to me that we ought to move once in every Congress, at the beginning, and all of the Members who are required to move at that time would do so. In the future, if this is not acceptable to the Commission, we could take this up again in the next Congress.

But what would happen is, very simply, that is typically when senior Members depart, shuffle off their mortal coil, as some say, those who succeed them would be in the very offices in the Rayburn instead of say starting at the bottom in the tiger cages, as we call them, over in the Cannon, for the remainder of the term, and that is the intent, and there is no intent that they have permanent occupation of those offices?

Mr. GRAMS. That is my intent. Of course, the privilege remains, so that would have to be examined and the rule would have to be changed to accommodate that.

Mr. FAZIO. I wanted to bring those issues out because I thought maybe some other Members, or maybe even some members of the Commission might want to comment on it.

Mr. GRAMS. I think the Members have to realize that the district belongs to the district people and the American taxpayers, and it should be respected in that regard.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Chairman, my colleague from California mentioned sloughing off our mortal coil. But every 4 years some Presidents select senior Members. I think they should do this more so that they understand how both of these Chambers work. The Senators believe they are superior to the White House, so very few of them ever get selected. Mr. Bentsen was an exception. But in this last go-round, Les Aspin was chosen, and it gives us a certain access to him. We are all proud of that. Mr. Panetta of California was chosen. Now both of them had senior offices in the Rayburn.

There is something to be said about a full 2-year term, that a brandnew freshman, fighting his way into a senior office with, yes, a wonderful view of the Capitol, which in 18 years I probably never will see, ever, and have somebody stuck up in the tiger cages where Mr. Nixon spent his whole 4 years, and where John F. Kennedy spent his 6, I think there has got to be a break, maybe that this would start to take effect in the spring of the first year, after that cycle of appointees has been selected of highly senior Members, be-

cause there is very little left here for any seniority anyway. And of course, all of this will be solved by term limits, 6, 8, 10 years. Everybody gets to come to Congress.

Term limits is the answer, maybe, not the gentleman's wonderful suggestion.

Mr. FAZIO. I am looking for additional contributors to this debate. I thought the gentleman from California added greatly, and I am looking for others. Are there others who wish to comment?

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I was following this in the Cloakroom and wanted to ask a couple of questions.

What happens if the senior Member has an office in the Rayburn that overlooks the Capitol and he leaves Congress. A freshman comes in. Does that freshman, as I understand it, get that office? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman from California will yield, that is what I am saying. The office was chosen say to represent a district. That Congressman represents that district. If he decides to leave, or if he leaves under some circumstances, rather than paying all of the money and start a domino effect of all of these office moves because it is not just one move, but everybody wanting to move up, so as to save the dollars. If we cannot save dollars, we are not going to save billions, and that is what we have to do. But the gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEARNS. I understand that if we had four Members and they had four Members, they would all just keep those offices. Would be furniture remain, everything remain the same, just move the books out?

Mr. GRAMS. If the gentleman will yield, that is what I intend.

Mr. STEARNS. If that is what the gentleman intends, then maybe we could just take this one step further and say that none of us should move ever. I mean, presumably we would never move at all, we would just keep the same offices, and save tons of money.

Mr. GRAMS. If the Rules Committee would like to do that, and if it would go by a lottery, that would be fine with me. Would the gentleman like to amend it to go that far?

Mr. STEARNS. No, because what happens is that a person then gets up on the sixth floor of the Longworth or the fifth floor of the Cannon Building, then he or she wants to get out of there.

Mr. GRAMS. Or the seventh floor of the Longworth like I am.

Mr. STEARNS. Yes. I had the opportunity in 4 years to have four offices.

So I just wanted to bring this to Members' attention, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for asking.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the decimal caucus.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much. It is very nice to be the chairman of that very august body.

Let me say that it is very interesting to me that we are talking about moving around from office to office, and the Democrat majority would not allow us an amendment to cut the overall expenditures by 25 percent. This is kind of a ludicrous argument, in my opinion, compared to the 25-percent cut that could have been made that would have saved the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. FAZIO. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows that the minority has the right to offer a motion to recommit, and that certainly could be the amendment they chose to offer.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Chairman, it just strikes me as a member of the majority party, I think we should support this amendment because if the projection of the future on the minority side that they are going to take the 1994 election and defeat us, since we are the majority party now, and have most of the good offices, and have been here the longest, maybe we should help this and preserve our offices.

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman makes an interesting point.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1720

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I would like to just ask the question, because what has happened around here this afternoon has been all types of ways to get into the legislative part of this, the authorization part of this, but because this is an appropriation bill, you cannot really. You cannot legislate under the rules.

I understood in the gentleman's comments earlier there has not been an authorization bill on this legislative appropriation bill for 6 years. Could the gentleman explain?

Mr. FAZIO. Reclaiming my time, that is not correct. The Committee on House Administration and several committees have authorized jurisdiction for this subcommittee. That is not the only one. But they bring legislation to the floor frequently during each Congress.

Mr. BOEHNER. If the gentleman will yield further, under the action of most other committees, annually we have an authorization bill, and I would suggest that a lot of the discussion that is going on this afternoon should occur during a discussion on the authorization bill, and I would look for the opportunity next year hopefully to have an authorization bill on the floor that we can discuss these issues.

Mr. FAZIO. I know that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] have talked about having hearings on the Swett-Shays bill which talks about making sure that Members of Congress are treated like all Americans when we enact legislation.

I am always convinced that this bill motivates additional authorizing committee activity and legislation, and I am sure it will.

But I wanted to give the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] an opportunity to bring his idea to the floor, because I do not think we have thought this through or discussed it in any form, and I thought perhaps it would be a stimulating issue for the Members to debate this afternoon.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, this amendment deserves our support as a gesture of our desire to say we are not going to waste money playing musical chairs with our office assignments during the next fiscal year.

I urge all Members to support this amendment, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

However, as the sponsor of this amendment will agree, it is a shame that other amendments that would have saved millions and millions of taxpayer dollars are not going to be debated today. Indeed, this amendment's sponsor has played a key role in the attempt to roll back the funding for committees by 25 percent, a meaningful and substantial cut that would lessen the role of staff and increase the amount of true deliberation among the elected Members of the House.

Just as the taxpayers would prefer that we not spend dollars on unnecessary moving from one office to another, they also would prefer that Members of Congress take the time and the thought to deliberate legislation. The American people want a more effective Congress with smaller committee staff. The American people want a more effective Congress with smaller committee staff, and they want fairness in the process, fairness in the staffing, and they want more quality in legislation.

But as the sponsor of this amendment knows, we are not going to be allowed today to debate that motion. I went to the Committee on Rules yes-

terday with the support of the sponsor of this amendment to ask for permission to offer a 25-percent reduction in the committee staffing. That is what I wanted to debate, a 25-percent cutback, coupled with providing for fairness in staffing by allowing the minority party ranking member to control one-third of the committee budget. We were denied the right to debate that motion, and I think that is a shame, Madam Chairman.

Thankfully this amendment offered by my colleague and my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], was allowed. Small as it may be compared to a 25-percent cut in committee budgets, it still is a symbol that we are listening to what the American taxpayers are saying.

For that reason, I support this amendment. I urge its adoption by my colleagues.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, for the purposes of debate, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I appreciate his amendment here to bring some accountability to this body and strongly support his effort to prevent us from playing musical chairs. I think that it is the least we can do.

Recently I was in my district, and a constituent said to me, "Run the Congress as though you are bankrupt." And I think that makes a whole lot of sense. We are very close to the point of bankruptcy in this country, and I would submit to the Members that if a company were bankrupt, it surely would not be spending money to move offices and to play musical chairs.

Unfortunately, the Congress is not responding to that message, because as the gentlewoman from Washington State was just saying, there are situations where yesterday many reformers in this body pleaded with the Committee on Rules to be able to come to this floor and offer other amendments, and I frankly was astounded by the reaction in the Committee on Rules.

For example, I suggested that we eliminated or had an amendment made in order that would eliminate the House physician, imagine, eliminating the House physician. It was greeted with shock and horror at the Committee on Rules. Well, it should not be greeted with shock and horror, because companies across this country long ago got rid of their physicians, long ago cut that expense in their budget, but not here in the Congress.

This Congress 2 weeks ago today on the floor of this House voted for the largest tax increase in the history of the United States. Yesterday the Committee on Rules refused to even let us consider cutting \$2 million so that

Members, just like every other American, can go find health care somewhere just like every other American does.

So today the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] comes with a very reasonable amendment. Let us at least stop the game of musical chairs.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, many Members have asked me why I chose the legislative appropriations bill to offer this amendment. This amendment only affects any moves that might take place during fiscal year 1994, a small number in comparison to the moves that take place at the beginning of a new Congress.

I chose this bill because it was the only opportunity available for those of us who want to change the way things are done in Congress. Many of us ran on and called for a comprehensive congressional reform bill where this and other issues can be addressed. But as far as I know, no such bill seems to be on the horizon.

The time has come for significant congressional reform, not in bits and pieces on appropriations bills, but a real comprehensive package that changes the way things are done in the House. Until that time, we will have to do what we can with the bills the leadership sends before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 340, noes 76, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—340

Allard	Boniior	Crapo
Andrews (NJ)	Borski	Cunningham
Andrews (TX)	Boucher	Danner
Archer	Brewster	de la Garza
Armey	Browder	Deal
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (OH)	DeLauro
Bachus (AL)	Bryant	DeLay
Baessler	Bunning	Derrick
Baker (CA)	Burton	Deutsch
Baker (LA)	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Ballenger	Calvert	Dickey
Barca	Camp	Dixon
Barcia	Canady	Dooley
Barlow	Cantwell	Doolittle
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Dornan
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Dreier
Bartlett	Castle	Duncan
Becerra	Clinger	Dunn
Bereuter	Coble	Durbin
Berman	Collins (GA)	Edwards (CA)
Bevill	Collins (IL)	Edwards (TX)
Bilbray	Collins (MI)	Emerson
Bilbrakis	Combest	English (AZ)
Bishop	Cooper	English (OK)
Blackwell	Coppersmith	Eshoo
Bliley	Costello	Everett
Blute	Cox	Ewing
Boehner	Cramer	Fawell
Bonilla	Crane	Fazio

Fields (LA)	Levin	Roemer	Flake	Lipinski	Serrano
Fields (TX)	Levy	Rogers	Geren	Long	Shaw
Fingerhut	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher	Gonzalez	Manton	Shaw
Fish	Lewis (FL)	Romero-Barcelo	Green	McDermott	Stearns
Foglietta	Lewis (GA)	(PR)	Hall (OH)	McKinney	Swift
Ford (MI)	Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen	Harman	Mfume	Synar
Ford (TN)	Linder	Rose	Hastings	Mollohan	Tanner
Fowler	Livingston	Rostenkowski	Hefley	Moran	Towns
Frank (MA)	Lloyd	Roth	Houghton	Murtha	Unsoeld
Franks (CT)	Lowey	Roukema	Hoyer	Nadler	Velazquez
Franks (NJ)	Machtley	Rowland	Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Walsh
Frost	Maloney	Royce	Johnston	Oberstar	Washington
Furse	Mann	Rush	Kanjorski	Obey	Watt
Gallely	Manzullo	Sabo	Kennedy	Pastor	Whitten
Gallo	Margolles-	Sanders	Klink	Pelosi	Williams
Gedjenson	Mezvinsky	Sangmeister	Kopetski	Rangel	Yates
Gekas	Markey	Santorum	LaRocco	Roberts	Young (AK)
Gephardt	Matsui	Sawyer	LaRocco	Roybal-Allard	
Gibbons	Mazzoli	Saxton	Laughlin	Sarpalius	
Gillmor	McCandless	Schaefer			
Gilman	McCloskey	Schenck			
Glickman	McCollum	Schiff			
Goodlatte	McCrary	Schroeder			
Goodling	McCurdy	Schumer			
Gordon	McDade	Sensenbrenner			
Goss	McHale	Sharp			
Grams	McHugh	Shays			
Grandy	McInnis	Shepherd			
Greenwood	McMillan	Shuster			
Gunderson	McNulty	Skaggs			
Gutierrez	Meehan	Skeen			
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Skelton			
Hamburg	Meyers	Slatery			
Hamilton	Mica	Slaughter			
Hancock	Michel	Smith (IA)			
Hansen	Miller (CA)	Smith (MI)			
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)			
Hayes	Mineta	Smith (OR)			
Hefner	Minge	Smith (TX)			
Heger	Mink	Snowe			
Hilliard	Moakley	Solomon			
Hinchey	Molinari	Spence			
Hoagland	Montgomery	Spratt			
Hobson	Moorhead	Stenholm			
Hochbrueckner	Moorella	Stokes			
Hoekstra	Murphy	Strickland			
Hoke	Myers	Studds			
Holden	Natcher	Stump			
Horn	Neal (MA)	Stupak			
Huffington	Neal (NC)	Sundquist			
Hughes	Norton (DC)	Swett			
Hunter	Nussle	Talent			
Hutchinson	Olver	Tauzin			
Hutto	Ortiz	Taylor (MS)			
Hyde	Orton	Taylor (NC)			
Ingalls	Owens	Tejeda			
Inhofe	Oxley	Thomas (CA)			
Inslee	Packard	Thomas (WY)			
Istook	Pallone	Thornton			
Jacobs	Parker	Thurman			
Jefferson	Paxon	Torkildsen			
Johnson (CT)	Payne (NJ)	Torres			
Johnson (GA)	Payne (VA)	Torricelli			
Johnson (SD)	Penny	Trafcant			
Johnson, E.B.	Peterson (FL)	Tucker			
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Underwood (GU)			
Kasich	Petri	Upton			
Kennelly	Pickle	Valentine			
Kildee	Pombo	Vento			
Kim	Pomeroy	Visclosky			
King	Porter	Volkmer			
Kingston	Portman	Vucanovich			
Kleccka	Poshard	Walker			
Klein	Price (NC)	Walters			
Klug	Price (OH)	Weldon			
Knollenberg	Quillen	Wheat			
Kolbe	Quinn	Wilson			
Kreidler	Rahall	Wise			
Kyl	Ramstad	Wolf			
LaFalce	Ravenel	Woolsey			
Lambert	Reed	Wyden			
Lancaster	Regula	Wynn			
Lantos	Reynolds	Young (FL)			
Lazio	Richardson	Zeliff			
Leach	Ridge	Zimmer			

## NOES—76

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	Darden
Ackerman	Byrne	de Lugo (VI)
Applegate	Callahan	DeFazio
Barton	Chapman	Dellums
Bellenson	Clement	Dicks
Bentley	Coleman	Dingell
Boehliert	Conyers	Evans
Brooks	Coyne	Filner

Lipinski	Serrano
Long	Shaw
Manton	Shaw
McDermott	Stearns
McKinney	Swift
Mfume	Synar
Mollohan	Tanner
Moran	Towns
Murtha	Unsoeld
Nadler	Velazquez
Nadler	Walsh
Oberstar	Washington
Obey	Watt
Pastor	Whitten
Pelosi	Williams
Rangel	Yates
Roberts	Young (AK)
Roybal-Allard	
Sarpalius	

## NOT VOTING—22

Andrews (ME)	Faleomavaega	Meek
Bateman	(AS)	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Gilchrest	Scott
Clay	Gingrich	Slisisky
Clayton	Henry	Stark
Clyburn	Lehman	Thompson
Condit	Martinez	Waxman
Engel	McKeon	

## □ 1750

Messrs. LAUGHLIN, GREEN, and COLEMAN of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. EMERSON, MATSUI, and GALLO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

## □ 1750

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MINK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 192, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Stupak, Pomeroy, Shepherd and Grams amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first put the vote on the remaining amendment on which a separate vote is not demanded.

The Clerk will report amendment No. 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to take such action, whether by regulation or otherwise, to transfer to the Clerk of the House of Representatives responsibility or all financial activities

of legislative service organizations, including the establishment and maintenance of revolving accounts to receive their dues and assessments and to make disbursements of their ordinary and necessary business expenses in support of Members' official and representational duties. The transfer referred to in the preceding sentence shall take effect not later than January 1, 1994.

Mr. FAZIO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will now report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1991, for the House of Representatives under the heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES", there is rescinded a total of \$730,037.41, in the amounts specified for the following headings and accounts:

- (1) "HOUSE OF LEADERSHIP OFFICES", \$24,988.44, as follows: (A) "Office of the Speaker", \$5,245.00; (B) "Office of the Majority Leader", \$4,743.44; (C) "Office of the Minority Leader", \$5,000.00; (D) "Office of the Majority Whip", \$5,000.00; and (E) "Office of the Minority Whip", \$5,000.00.
- (2) "MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE", \$686.50.
- (3) "COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES", \$44.59.
- (4) "STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT", \$138,448.87.
- (5) "ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES", \$500,691.91, as follows: (A) "furniture and furnishings", \$624.54; (B) "reemployed annuitants reimbursements", \$67.37; and (C) unspecified, \$500,000.00.
- (6) "COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS)", \$2,682.97.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, can we cluster the other three votes then so that we get 5-minute votes on those?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(b)2 of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on subsequent amendments to the bill reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The first vote is on amendment No. 1.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 3, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—398

Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Applegate  
Archer  
Armey  
Bacchus (FL)  
Bachus (AL)  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barca  
Barcia  
Barlow  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Becerra  
Bellenson  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Billrakis  
Bishop  
Blackwell  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Brooks  
Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer  
Byrne  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carr  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Darden  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart

Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
English (AZ)  
English (OK)  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Fingerhut  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gedjenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Heger  
Hilliard  
Hincheley  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ingalls  
Inhofe  
Insee  
Istook

Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Levy  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Liptinski  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowey  
Machtley  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Margolies  
Mezvinsky  
Markey  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKinney  
McMillan  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinar  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)

Neal (NC)  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickle  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose

Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Sarpalius  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schenk  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Shuster  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak

Sundquist  
Swift  
Swift  
Synar  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Unsoeld  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmere  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watt  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOES—3

Abercrombie  
Washington

NOT VOTING—32

Bateman  
Brown (CA)  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Dorman  
Engel  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Gilchrist

Gingrich  
Gutierrez  
Hefner  
Henry  
Johnston  
Lehman  
Lewis (CA)  
Livingston  
Martinez  
McKeon  
Meek

Mfume  
Myers  
Pickett  
Scott  
Serrano  
Siskiy  
Stark  
Thompson  
Velazquez  
Waxman

□ 1812

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report amendment No. 2 on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

Page 2, line 13, strike "692,118,000" and insert "\$686,318,000".

Page 5, line 21, strike "\$45,800,000" and insert "\$40,000,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote, and it will be followed by two more 5-minute votes. Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 388, noes 12, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

AYES—388

Ackerman	de la Garza	Hobson
Allard	Deal	Hochbrueckner
Andrews (ME)	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Andrews (NJ)	DeLauro	Hoke
Andrews (TX)	DeLay	Holden
Applegate	Derrick	Horn
Archer	Deutsch	Houghton
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Huffington
Bacchus (FL)	Dickey	Hughes
Bacchus (AL)	Dicks	Hunter
Baessler	Dingell	Hutchinson
Baker (CA)	Dixon	Hutto
Baker (LA)	Dooley	Hyde
Ballenger	Doolittle	Inglis
Barca	Dreier	Inhofe
Barcia	Duncan	Inslee
Barlow	Dunn	Jacobs
Barrett (NE)	Durbin	Jefferson
Barrett (WI)	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Bartlett	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (GA)
Barton	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Becerra	English (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Beilenson	English (OK)	Kanjorski
Bentley	Eshoo	Kaptur
Bereuter	Evans	Kasich
Berman	Everett	Kennedy
Bevill	Ewing	Kennelly
Bilbray	Fawell	Kildee
Bilirakis	Fazio	Kim
Bishop	Fields (LA)	King
Blackwell	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Billey	Filner	Kleczka
Blute	Fingerhut	Klein
Boehlert	Fish	Klink
Boehner	Foglietta	Klug
Bonilla	Ford (MI)	Knollenberg
Bonior	Ford (TN)	Kolbe
Borski	Fowler	Kopetski
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Kreidler
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Kyl
Brooks	Franks (NJ)	LaFalce
Browder	Frost	Lambert
Brown (FL)	Furse	Lancaster
Brown (OH)	Galleghy	Lantos
Bryant	Gallo	LaFocco
Bunning	Gejdenson	Laughlin
Burton	Gekas	Lazio
Buyer	Gephardt	Leach
Byrne	Geren	Levin
Callahan	Gibbons	Levy
Calvert	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Camp	Gilman	Lightfoot
Canady	Glickman	Linder
Cardin	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Carr	Goodling	Lloyd
Castle	Gordon	Long
Chapman	Goss	Lowe
Clement	Grams	Machtley
Clinger	Grandy	Maloney
Coble	Green	Mann
Coleman	Greenwood	Manzullo
Collins (GA)	Gunderson	Margolies-
Collins (IL)	Hall (OH)	Mezvinsky
Collins (MI)	Hall (TX)	Markey
Combust	Hamburg	Matsui
Conyers	Hamilton	Mazzoli
Cooper	Hancock	McCandless
Coppersmith	Hansen	McCloskey
Costello	Harman	McCollum
Cox	Hastert	McCrary
Coyne	Hayes	McCurdy
Cramer	Hefley	McDade
Crane	Hefner	McDermott
Crapo	Herger	McHale
Cunningham	Hilliard	McHugh
Danner	Hinchey	McInnis
Darden	Hoagland	McMillan

McNulty	Rahall	Stearns
Meehan	Ramstad	Stenholm
Menendez	Ravenel	Stokes
Meyers	Reed	Strickland
Mica	Regula	Studds
Michel	Reynolds	Stump
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Stupak
Miller (FL)	Ridge	Sundquist
Mineta	Roberts	Swett
Minge	Roemer	Swift
Mink	Rogers	Talent
Moakley	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Molinari	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Mollohan	Rose	Taylor (MS)
Montgomery	Rostenkowski	Taylor (NC)
Moorhead	Roth	Tejeda
Moran	Roukema	Thomas (CA)
Morella	Rowland	Thomas (WY)
Murphy	Roybal-Allard	Thornton
Murtha	Royce	Thurman
Myers	Rush	Torkildsen
Natcher	Sabo	Torres
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Torricelli
Neal (NC)	Sangmeister	Trafficant
Nussle	Santorum	Tucker
Oberstar	Sarpalus	Unsoeld
Obey	Sawyer	Upton
Oliver	Saxton	Valentine
Ortiz	Schaefer	Vento
Orton	Schenk	Visclosky
Owens	Schiff	Volkmer
Oxley	Schroeder	Vucanovich
Packard	Schumer	Walker
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Parker	Sharp	Waters
Pastor	Shaw	Watt
Paxon	Shays	Waxman
Payne (NJ)	Shepherd	Weldon
Payne (VA)	Shuster	Wheat
Pelosi	Skaggs	Whitten
Penny	Skeen	Williams
Peterson (FL)	Skelton	Wilson
Peterson (MN)	Slattery	Wise
Petri	Slaughter	Wolf
Pickle	Smith (IA)	Woolsey
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Wyden
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Porter	Smith (OR)	Yates
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Price (NC)	Snowe	Young (FL)
Pryce (OH)	Solomon	Zeliff
Quillen	Spence	Zimmer
Quinn	Spratt	

NOES—12

Abercrombie	Hastings	Rangel
Dellums	Johnson, E.B.	Synar
Flake	McKinney	Towns
Gonzalez	Nadler	Washington

NOT VOTING—33

Bateman	Gutierrez	McKeon
Brown (CA)	Henry	Meek
Cantwell	Hoyer	Mfume
Clay	Istook	Pickett
Clayton	Johnston	Portman
Clyburn	Lehman	Scott
Condit	Lewis (CA)	Serrano
Dornan	Lewis (FL)	Sisisky
Engel	Livingston	Stark
Gilchrest	Manton	Thompson
Gingrich	Martinez	Velázquez

□ 1819

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report amendment No. 3 on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

Page 7, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 101A. (a) House Resolution 1238, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to December 22, 1970 (as enacted into permanent law by chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971, and supplemented by the Act entitled "An Act relating to former Speakers of the House of Representatives" (88 Stat. 1732))

(2 U.S.C. 31b-1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 8. The entitlements of a former Speaker of the House of Representatives under this resolution shall be available—

"(1) in the case of an individual who is a former Speaker on the effective date of this section, for 5 years, commencing on such effective date; and

"(2) in the case of an individual who becomes a former Speaker after such effective date, for 5 years, commencing at the expiration of the term of office of an individual as a Representative in Congress."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1993.

Page 6, line 19, strike "PROVISION" and insert "PROVISIONS".

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote, to be followed by another 5-minute vote and 2 more recorded votes. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 372, noes 31, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—372

Allard	Burton	Dornan
Andrews (ME)	Buyer	Dreier
Andrews (NJ)	Byrne	Duncan
Andrews (TX)	Callahan	Dunn
Applegate	Calvert	Durbin
Archer	Camp	Edwards (CA)
Armey	Canady	Edwards (TX)
Bacchus (FL)	Cantwell	Emerson
Bacchus (AL)	Cardin	English (AZ)
Baessler	Carr	English (OK)
Baker (CA)	Castle	Eshoo
Baker (LA)	Chapman	Evans
Ballenger	Clement	Everett
Barca	Clinger	Ewing
Barcia	Coble	Fawell
Barlow	Collins (GA)	Fazio
Barrett (NE)	Collins (IL)	Fields (LA)
Barrett (WI)	Combust	Fields (TX)
Bartlett	Cooper	Filner
Barton	Coppersmith	Fingerhut
Becerra	Costello	Fish
Beilenson	Cox	Foglietta
Bentley	Cramer	Ford (MI)
Bereuter	Crane	Ford (TN)
Bevill	Crapo	Fowler
Bilbray	Cunningham	Frank (MA)
Bilirakis	Danner	Franks (CT)
Bishop	Darden	Franks (NJ)
Blackwell	de la Garza	Furse
Billey	Deal	Galleghy
Blute	DeFazio	Gallo
Boehlert	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Boehner	DeLay	Gekas
Bonilla	Derrick	Gephardt
Borski	Deutsch	Geren
Boucher	Diaz-Balart	Gibbons
Brewster	Dickey	Gillmor
Browder	Dicks	Gilman
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Glickman
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Goodlatte
Bryant	Dooley	Goodling
Bunning	Doolittle	Gordon

Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hilliard  
Hinchee  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Inhofe  
Inslee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Levy  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowey  
Machtley  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Margolles-  
Mezvinsky

Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKinney  
McMillan  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler  
Natcher  
Neal (NC)  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickle  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema

Rowland  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Sarpalius  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schenk  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Shuster  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snow  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sundquist  
Sweet  
Synar  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Swift  
Thornton  
Bateman  
Berman  
Brown (CA)  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Engel  
Gilchrest  
Gingrich  
Allard  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Archer  
Army  
Bacchus (FL)  
Bachus (AL)  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barca  
Barlow  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Becerra  
Beruter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray

Torres  
Towns  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Henry  
Hoyer  
Istook  
Johnston  
Lehman  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Martinez  
Billrakis  
Bishop  
Blackwell  
Billey  
Blute  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carr

Unsoeld  
Washington  
McKeon  
Pickett  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Slattery  
Stark  
Thompson  
Velazquez  
Yates  
Castle  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Danner  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Derrick  
Deutsch

Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
English (AZ)  
English (OK)  
Eshoo  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Fingerhut  
Fish  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Glickman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (TX)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hilliard  
Hinchee  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Horn  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Inhofe  
Inslee  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston

Klecza  
Klein  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kreidler  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Levy  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lloyd  
Lowey  
Machtley  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Margolles-  
Mezvinsky  
Marky  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McMillan  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Murphy  
Myers  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nussle  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickle  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad

Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Sarpalius  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schenk  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Shuster  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snow  
Solomon  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sundquist  
Sweet  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—30

□ 1826

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report amendment No. 6 on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the relocation of the office of any Member of the House of Representatives within the House office buildings.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote, and further votes are expected. Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 332, noes 71, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—332

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Bonior  
Brooks  
Coleman  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Dellums

Flake  
Frost  
Gonzalez  
Hastings  
Johnson, E.B.  
King  
Laughlin  
Markey  
McCloskey

Meek  
Moakley  
Neal (MA)  
Pelosi  
Rangel  
Smith (IA)  
Stokes

NOES—71

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Applegate  
Barton  
Bellenson

Bentley  
Boehert  
Brooks  
Brown (FL)  
Byrne

Callahan  
Chapman  
Coleman  
Conyers  
Coyne

Darden	Kennelly	Rangel
DeFazio	Klink	Roberts
Dellums	Kopetski	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	LaRocco	Shaw
Evans	Laughlin	Stokes
Filner	Lipinski	Swift
Flake	Long	Synar
Geren	McDermott	Tanner
Gonzalez	McKinney	Torres
Green	Meek	Towns
Hall (OH)	Mfume	Unsoeld
Harman	Mollohan	Walsh
Hastings	Moran	Washington
Hefley	Murtha	Waters
Houghton	Nadler	Watt
Hoyer	Oberstar	Waxman
Johnson, Sam	Obey	Yates
Kanjorski	Pastor	Young (AK)
Kennedy	Pelosi	

## NOT VOTING—30

Bateman	Henry	McKeon
Brown (CA)	Hoke	Owens
Clay	Istook	Pickett
Clayton	Jefferson	Scott
Clyburn	Johnston	Serrano
Condit	Lehman	Sisisky
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Gilchrest	Lewis (FL)	Stark
Gingrich	Livingston	Thompson
Gutierrez	Martinez	Velazquez

## □ 1834

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY.) The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2348 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

Section . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by five percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are at that point where we are going to either do it or we are not going to do it.

I want to compliment the House, and I want to compliment especially the first-term Members of the House for the yeoman work they did on this bill. But I have to tell Members that after 8 hours of work on this bill in this Chamber today, and including what we did in committee, we have reduced this bill only \$26.4 million below 1993.

The truth of the matter is that all of the work we did today in the House only reduced the bill by an additional \$7.4 million.

I have looked at this green sheet that is being handed out around the floor that says we have already cut it 6.4 percent. That is not true. This applies to outlays. The amendment I have offered relates to budget authority. We are trying to make a 5-percent across-the-board reduction in budget authority.

I would rather have done this by specific amendments, because I prefer that to across-the-board amendments. But the Rules Committee would not allow nearly 50 of our colleagues who wanted to offer those amendments to do so. So we are at the point where we are either going to cut or we are not going to cut.

The President challenged us if we had more ways to cut spending to do it, and we are here to meet that challenge. A mere 5 percent in budget authority, not what this green paper says. Then Members can go home today and for the weekend and tell their constituents that I really bellied up to the bar and I made a substantial cut, they can say I just played the game and I went for a measly \$7.4 million reduction.

If Members are serious, it is going to hurt. They are going to have to find ways to get along with less money. But that is what they said they came here to do. We came here to reduce this budget.

All this motion to recommit asks for is 5 percent. We really ought to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have now been here since 10 o'clock this morning, and as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] correctly pointed out, we have now managed to save a great total of \$7 million through amendments on a bill that is worth \$1.785 billion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and I yesterday both approached the Rules Committee about an amendment to cut 5 percent out of the legislative branch appropriations this year, and in a minute Members are going to hear how this is going to make us starve to death, and go bankrupt in this place. If this passes we are going to be left with broken-down manual typewriters and an old stand somewhere in the corner of our offices, and a fan, if it works, and a dead plant.

## □ 1840

Let us get serious about this. Since 1973, expenses in this House, adjusted for inflation, have increased by 40 percent.

Now, we do not necessarily have to cut across the board by 5 percent. My colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and the gentleman

from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], managed to figure out specific targeted cuts accounting for 25 percent of the budget.

As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] pointed out in his statement, if we can afford \$4,000 for pastries ordered from the Watergate under LSO, or as the General Accounting Office pointed out in a 1990 audit, if the Government Printing Office spends \$150 million to get work done costing \$75 million in the private sector, surely we can figure out where to save 5 percent in this.

A 5-percent amendment supported by myself and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] on the other side would save \$100 million over the next couple of years. It would be a great victory for the American taxpayers.

What we are talking about is a nickel on a dollar, and if you cannot vote for a nickel on the dollar, I suggest to everybody in this room you are going to have an awfully difficult time going home to tell folks how you are going to cut billions of dollars.

That is what it is, folks, a nickel on the dollar.

It is time to pony up and get serious.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I just wanted to remind my colleagues that this is the vote that will cut this budget.

What we did today cut merely a little over \$7 million. This is the real amendment to reduce this bill.

You can go home and say, "I voted for a 1.4-percent reduction," or, "I voted for a 6.4-percent reduction." That is the decision you will make now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit, and I am putting into the RECORD at this point five trenchant points that make this the reformer's vote.

Mr. Speaker, in closing and in support of the motion to recommit, let me hit five points on H.R. 2348 and why my colleagues should vote no.

First, this appropriations bill calls for \$1.8 billion in new budget authority. This is \$19 million less than 1993—a decrease of only about 1 percent.

Second, overall, this bill should be cut further than it is. Further reductions could be made in committee funding, official mail appropriations, money paid out to former Speakers of the House, and cutting out waste in Legislative Service Organization finances.

Third, of particular concern as well, is the \$430.8 million appropriated for the GAO. GAO detailees being assigned to Democrat offices to do partisan research continues as one of the bolder abuses of authority by the majority. It smacks of the situation I wrote to Speaker FOLEY about, where legislative counsel personnel are working for the White House

Health Care Task Force on the taxpayer funded congressional payroll.

Fourth, last year, provisions to require reimbursement of GAO detailees assigned to committees, and ordering an independent audit and peer review of GAO's work, were cut in conference. Clearly, these are only fair requests, and should be considered on their merits.

Fifth, we shouldn't just wait for the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress to solve all of our legislative reform issues. Some should be addressed now, and the House should lead the way, setting the standard for congressional reform. Please vote down H.R. 2348, and work for more comprehensive fiscal reform of the way Congress conducts its business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has expired.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, we spent a good deal of time today working on a bill that represents one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget, and I would hope we would give the same kind of scrutiny to all the other bills that come to this floor.

I think certainly the scrutiny we give this bill exceeds what is reasonable. This is a reduction from the request in the President's budget of some 14.3 percent. The committee has done its job. We have reduced from the baseline by some \$100 million, or 5.6 percent, and we are 6.7 percent below last year's funding and outlays.

No other committee will come to the floor with a reduction from the baseline. No other committee will come from the position of a reduction in outlays on this level.

This committee has done its job.

Mr. Speaker, if I could retain the attention of my colleagues, this committee has done its job. Now, if you add what we cut last year, which was 6.5 percent, to the 6.7 percent in outlays, the money we actually spend, the way we have always been evaluated on every deficit-reduction package, from Gramm-Rudman on down, we will have reached 13.2 percent in 2 years. That, by the way, is halfway to the 25 percent that many said we ought to get to in 4 or 5 years. We are doing our job.

If you want to look at how we have done in the past, this budget, going back to the base year of 1978, not 1973 that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] mentioned, because that was the year before we provided for a Budget Act, created a Committee on the Budget and CBO, if you go back to 1978, the legislative budget has declined in real dollars by 6.6 percent.

The judicial budget in that time frame has gone up 197 percent, and the executive office, the branch managed most of that time by our friends on the other side of aisle, went up 37 percent.

We have been doing our job. We have exceeded the record in this year that we have accomplished in the past.

I ask for a defeat of this motion to recommit and support for the committee position.

A 5 percent cut across-the-board will be deeply felt. This is not the hard freeze being proposed in the minority views. We are already at 6.7 percent below 1993 spending.

Not just below the baseline—not just below the 1994 request. We have reduced below last year.

And last year we made a similar reduction under 1992. The CBO scoring said last year we were 6.5 percent below 1992—in outlays.

That's over 13 percent in 2 years.

This amendment is just piling on what we have already done.

This amendment is faceless—it says across-the-board.

We have already gone into this bill account by account.

We have made reductions in staff—we have made reductions in administrative costs—and we have reduced and, in some cases, even eliminated programs.

We will have to eliminate 1,000 more House staff; this will have a direct effect on your constituent services.

Where would the gentleman want this across-the-board cut to be applied?

We won't even have the money to pay the \$7.5 million in unemployment insurance due to the 1,000 staff layoff.

It will be applied to the Federal depositories. That is the program that puts copies of Government documents in each of the 1,400 libraries in every congressional district. That is where our constituents go to find out what the Government is doing with their dollars. We have heard from hundreds of these librarians that we are cutting them too much.

This cut will be applied to the reading rooms at the Library of Congress. They have already cut back reading room hours by 12 percent—this will force further reductions in the time allotted for the public to use the collections at the Library.

This cut will severely reduce the cataloging of new books coming into the Library. At this time, over 30 percent of the Library's collections have not been cataloged. This cataloging is needed by the 13,000 libraries all over the country who rely on the Library to do their cataloging bibliographies.

This cut will affect the ability of our committees who have health care jurisdiction—and the study agencies such as CBO, CRS, GAO, and OTA—to develop and enact health care reform.

This cut may affect our ability to obtain the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or the printing of congressional hearings, or the printing of the work of the Congress—bills, reports, et cetera.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, nos 209, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

AYES—202

Allard	Goss	Packard
Andrews (ME)	Grams	Parker
Andrews (NJ)	Grandy	Paxon
Andrews (TX)	Greenwood	Penny
Archer	Gunderson	Peterson (MN)
Army	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bacchus (FL)	Hancock	Pombo
Bacchus (AL)	Hansen	Porter
Baker (CA)	Harman	Portman
Baker (LA)	Hastert	Poshard
Ballenger	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Barrett (NE)	Hefley	Quillen
Bartlett	Heger	Quinn
Barton	Hobson	Ramstad
Bentley	Hoekstra	Ravenel
Bereuter	Hoke	Regula
Bilirakis	Horn	Ridge
Bliley	Houghton	Roberts
Blute	Huffington	Roemer
Boehlert	Hunter	Rogers
Boehner	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Hutto	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hyde	Roth
Burton	Inglis	Roukema
Buyer	Inhofe	Royce
Callahan	Insole	Santorum
Calvert	Istook	Saxton
Camp	Jacobs	Schaefer
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Schenck
Castle	Johnson (GA)	Schiff
Clinger	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kasich	Sharp
Collins (GA)	Kildee	Shaw
Combest	Kim	Shays
Cooper	King	Shuster
Costello	Kingston	Skeen
Cox	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cramer	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Lazio	Snowe
Deal	Leach	Solomon
DeLay	Levy	Spence
Deutsch	Lightfoot	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Stenholm
Dickey	Livingston	Stump
Doolittle	Lloyd	Sundquist
Dornan	Machtley	Talent
Dreier	Mann	Tanner
Duncan	Manzullo	Tauzin
Dunn	McCandless	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Everett	McCrery	Thomas (CA)
Ewing	McDade	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	McHugh	Thurman
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Torkildsen
Fingerhut	McMillan	Upton
Fish	Meehan	Vucanovich
Fowler	Meyers	Walker
Franks (CT)	Mica	Walsh
Franks (NJ)	Michel	Weldon
Gallely	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Gallo	Minge	Young (AK)
Gekas	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Morella	Zeliff
Gilman	Myers	Zimmer
Goodlatte	Nussle	
Goodling	Oxley	

NOES—209

Abercrombie	Bellenson	Brewster
Ackerman	Berman	Brooks
Applegate	Bevill	Browder
Baessler	Bilbray	Brown (FL)
Barca	Bishop	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Blackwell	Bryant
Barlow	Bonior	Byrne
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Cantwell
Becerra	Boucher	Cardin

Carr	Kanjorski	Pickle
Chapman	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Clement	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Coleman	Kennelly	Rahall
Collins (IL)	Klecicka	Rangel
Collins (MI)	Klein	Reed
Conyers	Klink	Reynolds
Coppersmith	Kopetski	Richardson
Coyne	Kreidler	Rose
Danner	LaFalce	Rostenkowski
Darden	Lambert	Rowland
de la Garza	Lancaster	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Lantos	Rush
DeLauro	LaRocco	Sabo
Dellums	Laughlin	Sanders
Derrick	Levin	Sangmeister
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sarpalius
Dingell	Lipinski	Sawyer
Dixon	Long	Schroeder
Dooley	Lowey	Schumer
Durbin	Maloney	Serrano
Edwards (CA)	Manton	Shepherd
Edwards (TX)	Margolies-	Skaggs
English (AZ)	Mezvinsky	Skelton
English (OK)	Markey	Slattery
Eshoo	Matsui	Slaughter
Evans	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)
Fazio	McCloskey	Spratt
Fields (LA)	McCurdy	Stokes
Filner	McDermott	Strickland
Flake	McHale	Studds
Foglietta	McKinney	Stupak
Foley	McNulty	Swett
Ford (MI)	Meek	Swift
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Synar
Frost	Mfume	Tejeda
Furse	Miller (CA)	Thornton
Gejdenson	Mineta	Torres
Gephardt	Mink	Torricelli
Geran	Moakley	Towns
Gibbons	Mollohan	Trafficant
Glickman	Montgomery	Tucker
Gonzalez	Moran	Unsoeld
Gordon	Murphy	Valentine
Green	Murtha	Velazquez
Gutierrez	Nadler	Vento
Hall (OH)	Natcher	Visclosky
Hamburg	Neal (MA)	Volkmer
Hamilton	Neal (NC)	Washington
Hastings	Oberstar	Waters
Hefner	Obey	Watt
Hilliard	Oliver	Waxman
Hinchee	Ortiz	Wheat
Hoagland	Orton	Whitten
Hochbrueckner	Owens	Williams
Holden	Pallone	Wilson
Hoyer	Pastor	Wise
Hughes	Payne (NJ)	Woolsey
Jefferson	Payne (VA)	Wyden
Johnson (SD)	Pelosi	Wynn
Johnson, E.B.	Peterson (FL)	Yates

## NOT VOTING—23

Bateman	Gilchrest	McKeon
Brown (CA)	Gingrich	Molinari
Clay	Henry	Pickett
Clayton	Johnston	Scott
Clyburn	Lehman	Sisisky
Condit	Lewis (CA)	Stark
Engel	Lewis (FL)	Thompson
Ford (TN)	Martinez	

## □ 1900

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McKeon for, with Mr. Martinez against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mrs. Clayton against.

Mr. HEFNER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to reject was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 187, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

## AYES—224

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Obey
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Oliver
Andrews (NJ)	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Andrews (TX)	Hamburg	Owens
Applegate	Hamilton	Pallone
Baesler	Hastings	Pastor
Barca	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Barlow	Hilliard	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hinchee	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Hoagland	Pickle
Bellenson	Hochbrueckner	Pomeroy
Berman	Holden	Price (NC)
Bevill	Houghton	Rahall
Bilbray	Hoyer	Rangel
Bishop	Hughes	Reed
Blackwell	Inslee	Reynolds
Bonior	Jefferson	Richardson
Borski	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rostenkowski
Brewster	Johnson, Sam	Rowland
Brooks	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kennedy	Sabo
Bryant	Kennelly	Sanders
Byrne	Kildee	Sangmeister
Cantwell	Klecicka	Sarpalius
Cardin	Klein	Sawyer
Carr	Klink	Schenck
Chapman	Kopetski	Schroeder
Clement	Kreidler	Serrano
Coleman	LaFalce	Shepherd
Collins (IL)	Lambert	Skaggs
Collins (MI)	Lancaster	Skelton
Conyers	Lantos	Slaughter
Coppersmith	LaRocco	Smith (IA)
Costello	Laughlin	Spratt
Coyne	Levin	Stokes
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
Darden	Lipinski	Studds
de la Garza	Lloyd	Stupak
DeFazio	Long	Swett
DeLauro	Lowey	Swift
Dellums	Maloney	Synar
Derrick	Mann	Tanner
Dicks	Manton	Tauzin
Dingell	Margolies-	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	Mezvinsky	Tejeda
Dooley	Markey	Thornton
Durbin	Matsui	Thurman
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Torres
Edwards (TX)	McCloskey	Torricelli
English (AZ)	McCurdy	Towns
English (OK)	McDermott	Trafficant
Eshoo	McHale	Tucker
Evans	McKinney	Unsoeld
Fawell	McNulty	Valentine
Fazio	Meek	Velazquez
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Vento
Filner	Mfume	Visclosky
Flake	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Foglietta	Mineta	Washington
Ford (MI)	Mink	Waters
Ford (TN)	Moakley	Watt
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Waxman
Frost	Montgomery	Wheat
Furse	Moran	Whitten
Gejdenson	Morella	Williams
Gephardt	Murphy	Wilson
Geran	Murtha	Wise
Gibbons	Nadler	Woolsey
Gilman	Natcher	Wyden
Gonzalez	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Gordon	Neal (NC)	Yates
Green	Oberstar	Young (AK)

## NOES—187

Allard	Baker (CA)	Bentley
Andrews (ME)	Baker (LA)	Bereuter
Archer	Ballenger	Billrakis
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Bacchus (FL)	Bartlett	Blute
Bachus (AL)	Barton	Boehler

Boehner	Herger	Pombo
Bonilla	Hobson	Porter
Browder	Hoekstra	Portman
Bunning	Hoke	Poshard
Burton	Horn	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Huffington	Quillen
Callahan	Hunter	Quinn
Calvert	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Camp	Hutto	Ravenel
Canady	Hyde	Regula
Castle	Inglis	Ridge
Clinger	Inhofe	Roberts
Coble	Istook	Roemer
Collins (GA)	Jacobs	Rogers
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Kasich	Roth
Cramer	Kim	Roukema
Crane	King	Royce
Crapo	Kingston	Santorum
Cunningham	Klug	Saxton
Deal	Knollenberg	Schaefer
DeLay	Kolbe	Schiff
Deutsch	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Sharp
Dickey	Leach	Shaw
Doolittle	Levy	Shays
Dornan	Lightfoot	Shuster
Dreier	Linder	Skeen
Duncan	Livingston	Slattery
Dunn	Machtley	Smith (MI)
Emerson	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Everett	McCandless	Smith (OR)
Ewing	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Fields (TX)	McCrary	Snowe
Fingerhut	McDade	Solomon
Fish	McHugh	Spence
Fowler	McInnis	Stearns
Franks (CT)	McMillan	Stenholm
Franks (NJ)	Meehan	Stump
Gallely	Meyers	Sundquist
Gallo	Mica	Talent
Gekas	Michel	Taylor (NC)
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Thomas (CA)
Glickman	Minge	Thomas (WY)
Goodlatte	Molinar	Torkildsen
Goodling	Moorhead	Upton
Goss	Myers	Vucanovich
Grams	Nussle	Walker
Grandy	Orton	Walsh
Greenwood	Oxley	Weldon
Gunderson	Packard	Wolf
Hancock	Parker	Young (FL)
Hansen	Paxon	Zeliff
Harman	Penny	Zimmer
Hastert	Peterson (MN)	
Hefley	Petri	

## NOT VOTING—22

Bateman	Gingrich	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Henry	Schumer
Clay	Johnston	Scott
Clayton	Lehman	Sisisky
Clyburn	Lewis (CA)	Stark
Condit	Lewis (FL)	Thompson
Engel	Martinez	
Gilchrest	McKeon	

## □ 1919

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnston for, with Mr. McKeon against.

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Lewis of California against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an explanation for my absence.

At the request of the minority leader of the House, Mr. MICHEL, I was granted a leave of

absence by the House on account of my having to participate in important meetings at Ft. Monroe with a member of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Ft. Monroe, located in Hampton, VA, in my district, was recently placed on the list of military facilities being considered for possible closure.

As I was in my district, I regrettably was prevented from casting my votes on the rule for, various amendments to, and final passage of, H.R. 2348, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1994. Had I been present, I would have voted on rollcall votes 203–206 and 208–217 as follows:

Rollcall No. 203, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 204, "no".  
 Rollcall No. 205, "no".  
 Rollcall No. 206, "no".  
 Rollcall No. 208, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 209, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 210, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 211, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 212, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 213, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 214, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 215, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 216, "yes".  
 Rollcall No. 217, "no".

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an explanatory statement in the RECORD following the vote on the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1994. I inadvertently voted in favor of final passage of this bill and would like the RECORD to show that this was not my intention. I voted in favor of every amendment to reduce spending in the bill as well as against the rule in order to allow for consideration of further cuts in spending and supported the motion to recommit to cut funding across the board by 5 percent. I believe that these votes demonstrate my commitment to reducing Government overhead and regret that I inadvertently voted for final passage of this bill.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to convey my stance on H.R. 2348, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994, which was approved by the House of Representatives. While the House of Representatives was considering the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, I was attending my daughter Cadee's high school graduation ceremony in California. I regret that I was not able to participate in the debate. The RECORD should reflect that had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the following Rollcall Nos. 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, and 216. In addition, the RECORD should reflect that I would have voted "no" on Rollcall Nos. 206 and 217.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote which was unrecorded when the House considered H.R. 2348, the fiscal year 1994 legislative branch appropriations bill.

Although I was present and voted "yes" on Rollcall No. 210, an amendment offered by

Representative SHEPHERD to limit future spending for former Speakers of the House, apparently my voting card did not record that vote. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I was present and voting, and voted "yes" on that amendment.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, due to commitments in my congressional district, I was unable to make a number of votes. Please let the RECORD show how I would have cast my votes had I been present:

Vote No. 203, procedural motion to approve the House Journal of Wednesday, June 9, 1993, "nay".

Vote No. 204, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, previous question, "nay".

Vote No. 205, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, rule, "nay".

Vote No. 206, procedural motion, Mr. Burton on motion to adjourn, "nay".

Vote No. 208, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, Rescissions to rescind \$1.6 million in unused funds from fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992, "yea".

Vote No. 209, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, official mail to cut \$5.8 million from the \$45.8 million appropriation for House official mail costs, "yea".

Vote No. 210, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, former speakers to limit future spending for former Speakers to 5 years of staffing and office expenses after they leave the House and to cutoff current spending for the three former Speakers' offices October 1, 1998, "yea".

Vote No. 211, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, office moves to prohibit funds in the bill from going to relocate members' House office, "yea".

Vote No. 212, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, rescissions separate vote at the request of Mr. Walker on the Stupak amendment, "yes".

Vote No. 213, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, official mail separate vote at the request of Mr. Walker on the Pomery amendment, "yea".

Vote No. 214, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, former Speakers separate vote at the request of Mr. Walker on the Shepherd amendment, "yes".

Vote No. 215, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, office moves separate vote at the request of Mr. Walker on the Grams amendment, "yea".

Vote No. 216, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, motion to recommit the bill to the House Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment reducing various accounts in the bill by 5 percent, "yes".

Vote No. 217, H.R. 2348. Fiscal 1994 legislative branch appropriations, passage to provide approximately \$1.78 billion in new budget authority for the operations of Congress and legislative branch agencies in fiscal 1994, "nay".

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to prior commitments in my congressional district, I was unable to cast my vote on H.R. 2348, the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1994.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay." While the bill made strides in cutting

the operational budget for the House of Representatives, I believe much more could be done to bring our own expenses in order. For instance, I support much greater cuts in Member's franking budgets and believe we must undergo further cuts in committee funding for employees.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2200, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–124) on the resolution (H. Res. 193) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1920

#### REPORT ON H.R. 2295, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1994

Mr. OBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–125) on the bill (H.R. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LIVINGSTON reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to proceed for 1 minute for the

purpose of ascertaining the schedule for the upcoming week.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the majority leader.

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

Obviously votes are finished and completed for today. There will be no votes on tomorrow.

On Monday, June 14, the House will meet at noon and take up five bills on suspension. Recorded votes on suspensions will be postponed until the end of legislative business.

We will consider the following bills:

H.R. 2343, to amend the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act;

H.R. 2201, Injury Prevention and Control Amendments of 1993;

H.R. 2202, Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention Amendments of 1993;

H.R. 2204, Silvio Conte Disabilities Prevention Act; and

H.R. 2205, trauma care programs reauthorization.

We will also be considering the rule and general debate on H.R. 2200, the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994.

I would believe that votes on suspensions would begin about 3 or 4 o'clock.

On Tuesday, June 15, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at noon on Tuesday and at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

Beginning Tuesday we will consider the following bills:

H.R. 5, striker replacement, subject to a rule;

H.R. 2333, fiscal year 1994-95 foreign aid authorization bill, subject to a rule;

H.R. 2295, foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1994, subject to a rule;

H.R. 2348, Treasury, Postal Service appropriations for fiscal year 1994, subject to a rule;

H.R. 1876, Extension of fast-track procedure for the Uruguay round agreement, subject to a rule; and

H.R. 2200, NASA Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994, complete consideration on the bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions, if I may, for the majority leader on the amendments to the NASA authorization; does the gentleman have any idea what day we can expect those?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendments on the bill will be taken up on the week following next week.

Mr. WALKER. So that will probably not come up next week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is my belief.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on the foreign aid authorization bill, do we expect the authorization bill on the floor before the appropriations bill?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. Is the State Department authorization going to be

stripped out of the foreign aid authorization bill?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the present plan is to have it be part of the authorization bill so that the work can be completed on those matters before the appropriations.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that on this side of the aisle that raises some problems. I know the ranking Republican on that particular subcommittee that handles State Department authorization is vehemently opposed to handling it that way. It will, it seems to me, create some problems in getting votes on this side for that authorization bill if those two are left in combination.

Mr. Speaker, we hope the majority leader will take that into consideration, because that is a matter of some concern.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying. We will try to consult with the minority on the amendments that will be allowed on these bills.

Mr. WALKER. Further, do we know yet which bill we expect to act on on Friday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I believe it will be the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill, and possibly the extension of fast track procedure for the Uruguay round.

#### TRIBUTE TO PAGE CLASS OF 1993

(Mr. EMERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the last day of service of our current class of pages. We have a system here by which most pages serve for the school year, commencing their activities in September and ending in June, and then from June until September we have what we call summer pages. But the pages who are here with us for the school year are all juniors, and tomorrow they will have their going away ceremony.

When we return from this weekend recess, the pages who have served us since last September will no longer be here, so I want to take this time as a member of the Page Board and as one who is himself a former page to extend the thanks, I hope on behalf of all the House, to the pages who are with us and wish them well in all of their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this experience has been for them everything that we would hope that it would be for them. I personally know that it has to have been a great learning experience, one which I hope they will remember all of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to wish each and every page a long life, a successful life, and a happy life.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished chairman of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], who has served with such distinction on the Page Board.

Mr. Speaker, I was not a former page. However, I did, as I have observed in the past, have the opportunity as a member of the Maryland State Senate and president to run the page program in the Maryland General Assembly, along with the Speaker, and it gave me the opportunity to interface very closely with young people, 16 and 17 years of age, as they were exposed to government, as they got the opportunity to learn about how the legislative process worked, and how they got to know those who were elected to office and observe them exercising the responsibility of being representatives in a democracy.

First of all, let me say that from a Member's standpoint, interfacing with the pages reestablishes your confidence, if you ever lost it, in the young people of this country. They are outstanding young people, committed to success, committed to their peers, committed to their community, and committed to their country. It makes one feel very, very confident about the future to talk to these young people and to see how hard they work and see their commitment, and, frankly, to see their patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wish each one of the pages who have worked with us over the last few months the best of luck as they go forth from here.

The importance of this page program is that they have had an opportunity to do what few Americans have had the opportunity to do: they have seen firsthand, up close, their Representatives at work.

There is a cynicism abroad in this land that believes that representative democracy is not working as well as we would like. These pages will be able to be ambassadors, to go back to their communities and say to their classmates, to their colleagues, to their friends, family, neighbors, future employers, fellow workers, and perhaps students in college, or whatever they may go, that they have had the opportunity to see this first hand.

Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be subject to somebody having told you, as far too often happens, that the work of Representatives in this body is misrepresentative. These young people will have the opportunity to say what they think. I hope for the most part that this has been a very positive experience, that they believe that democracy does work, and that in fact the Representatives overwhelmingly in

this body, and I would say in other legislative bodies, are committed to representing their constituents in the very best way possible.

Mr. Speaker, so this page program that we have not only serves to educate the pages, but, very frankly, it serves to educate the public as well.

So, on behalf of all of us, this is certainly not a partisan issue in any sense, these young men and women will serve their country in whatever endeavor they pursue. So let me on behalf of all of us join my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], in wishing our pages the very best in the future, and thanking them for service in this body.

□ 1930

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his eloquent comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

I should say, for the record, I did not ask. He pointed to me and when I am pointed to, I never cease the opportunity to say something, especially at a time like this.

I want to congratulate this former page, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], who has regularly stood here on the last day of the pages' service and recognized their work and their efforts here. I want to join in extending my appreciation.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] has regularly told me, and I know many of our colleagues, of his experiences as a page. He has told more than a few very interesting stories.

The reason I mention that is that I know that the pages, who are lined up along the back here and are throughout the Capitol, will, like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], go home and have some wonderful stories to tell here.

I should say that I hope they do not repeat every detail of every experience that they have had, witnessing some of the behavior of some of us as Members of Congress.

But on balance, I think that they have some very good and positive things that they can go back and report to. I simply want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for mentioning this and his great service here as a former page.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

In conclusion, to each and every page, as they depart, I want to thank them for their service and ask God's blessing on them and wish them good speed in all of their future endeavors.

#### HONORING THE SISTERS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Sisters of the Holy Spirit who, on June 9, 1893, began their order and their service in education to many thousands of Texans. One hundred years ago yesterday in my hometown of San Antonio, Margaret Mary Healy Murphy and two other dedicated women took their first vows and thereby marked the beginning of the Sisters of the Holy Spirit and Mary Immaculate. Over the last 100 years, Sister Margaret Mary Healy Murphy and the members of her order have played an important role in the education of many Texans and, in addition, have served outside of Texas as well as outside of the country, maintaining a mission in Mexico.

This order's original objective was to provide an education for the young black children of Texas. Although the Civil War had ended almost 30 years prior to the establishment of their order, few people in Texas were willing to teach the black children. Over the years, the sisters of the Holy Spirit have maintained schools in areas of low economic income. Many of these sisters left their families in Ireland to serve in Texas—an Irish heritage I, in fact, share. Their tireless dedication so far from their homeland is admirable, and they deserve the highest of honors for their sacrifice as well as for their accomplishments.

For many years, the sisters have operated schools for poor minority children in areas where the public schools have been substandard. They still maintain a school in San Antonio in my congressional district, and they maintain other schools elsewhere in the State. Until redistricting which took effect this past January, their motherhouse and the day care center they operate were also located in the congressional district I have represented for over 30 years. Inequities in public school educational facilities and opportunities still exist in Texas, particularly in San Antonio, and were it not for efforts such as those made by this dedicated order a number of poor and minority students would have been denied, still, the kind of opportunities all children should have.

I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Sisters of the Holy Spirit and to honor the dedicated women who have served San Antonio and other communities so well for so many years. These dedicated Sisters exemplify all that is right and good in the world, and I am privileged to be able to rise today to pay tribute to those who continue to sacrifice their own interests for the betterment of others and of their community.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business

in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1993

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### RENEWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with good news for our colleagues in the House of Representatives. I bring a report back about the executive order that was issued by President Clinton over the break which related to most-favored-nation status for China.

As Members may have seen in the press, the President issued renewal of MFN on condition that the People's Republic of China abide by certain conditions which will be enumerated in this special order and which I want to call to the attention of my colleagues.

We were able to achieve this victory because for the past few years, since the massacre in Tiananmen Square, hundreds of Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, over and over again, voted in favor of a freer China. This will increase our leverage with the Chinese.

President Clinton, as he promised in his campaign to condition renewal of MFN on condition of improvement of human rights in China and Tibet, lived up that commitment. He also lived up to his commitment to say that his foreign policy would be based on pillars which would include improvement of human rights and the spread of democratic principles, stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons and building a stronger position for U.S. exports as far as trade was concerned.

So I am very pleased to read the Executive order to our colleagues, and I will be sending it around to those who are interested.

The President said in his Executive order:

CONDITIONS FOR RENEWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN 1994

Whereas, the Congress and the American people have expressed deep concern about

the appropriations of unconditional most-favored nation (MFN) trading status for the People's Republic of China (China);

Whereas, I share the concerns of the Congress and the American people regarding this important issue, particularly with respect to China's record on human rights, nuclear non-proliferation, and trade;

Whereas, I have carefully weighted the advisability of conditioning China's MFN status as a means of achieving progress in these areas;

Whereas, I have concluded that the public interest would be served by a continuation of the waiver of the application of sections 402 (a) and (b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2432(a) and 2432(b)) (Act) on China's MFN status for an additional 12 months with renewal thereafter subject to the conditions below:

Now, therefore, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. The Secretary of State (Secretary) shall make a recommendation to the President to extend or not to extend MFN status to China for the 12-month period beginning July 3, 1994.

(a) In making this recommendation the Secretary shall not recommend extension unless he determines that:

Extension will substantially promote the freedom of emigration objectives of section 402 of the Act; and

China is complying with the 1992 bilateral agreement between the United States and China concerning prison labor.

(b) In making this recommendation the Secretary shall also determine whether China has made overall, significant progress with respect to the following:

Taking steps to begin adhering to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Releasing and providing an acceptable accounting for Chinese citizens imprisoned or detained for the nonviolent expression of their political and religious beliefs, including such expression of beliefs in connection with the Democracy Wall and Tiananmen Square movements;

Ensuring human treatment of prisoners, such as by allowing access to prisons by international humanitarian and human rights organizations;

Protecting Tibet's distinctive religious and cultural heritage; and

Permitting international radio and television broadcasts into China.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall submit his recommendation to the President before June 3, 1994.

SEC. 3. The Secretary, and other appropriate officials of the United States, shall pursue resolutely all legislative and executive actions to ensure that China abides by its commitments to follow fair, nondiscriminatory trade practices in dealing with U.S. businesses, and adheres to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Missile Technology Control Regime guidelines and parameters, and other nonproliferation commitments.

SEC. 4. This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any person or entity against the United States, its officers, or employees.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased because the President has issued this Executive order without waiver. That is to say, next year, unless the People's Republic of China meets these conditions, the President will not request a waiver for MFN for China. But in prais-

ing the President's Executive order, that does not by any means mean that Congress relinquishes its right to refuse a request by the President for a waiver should we arrive at a different conclusion from the President in terms of China's MFN.

I was very, very pleased about this, Mr. Speaker, because, as you know, we have a congressional work group on China. We have worked on these three areas, human rights, proliferation, and trade.

I believe the President's Executive order is a victory for the American worker. Because of China's unfair trade practices, China has enjoyed a \$50 billion trade surplus since the Tiananmen Square massacre, with \$6 billion in 1989, \$9 billion in 1990, \$12 billion in 1991, and over \$18 billion in 1992. At the rate it is going this year, it is projected to be even higher in 1993, this because China has barriers to United States products going into China and other violations that are not even figured into the trade deficit that we suffer which include transshipments, that is, labeling products as coming from other countries to bypass our quotas as well as use of prison labor for export which is forbidden by our law.

In doing so, I believe the President deserves great credit. He will make the trade fairer, the political climate freer, and the world a safer place. I believe he is to be commended for this, and I urge my colleagues to support the President's Executive order.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will begin debate and deliberation over the fate of the space station.

Members know that I am from a district in Florida that includes the Kennedy Space Center. I am, perhaps, the strongest of the supporters of the space station and the space program in this House. I certainly want to be.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not support the space program because I come from a district that includes the Kennedy Space Center. I came to this Congress because I support the space program. I believe in it. I believe it is very important. Indeed, it is vital to build the space station.

Many of my colleagues have said, and are saying now, and will say next week, that we simply cannot support it. Well, I join with them in wanting to cut spending. I voted for the balanced budget amendment.

□ 1940

I have voted for even the pure form of the line-item veto. I voted for the

President's economic plan because it includes real spending cuts, and I believe it will help bring down the budget deficit. I voted today against the legislative appropriations bill because it did not cut spending enough. I believe we must cut spending, but I do not believe we should cut off our nose to spite our face. I do not believe that we can afford to kill the space station. The truth is we cannot afford not to build it.

Consider the consequences of killing the space station. Domestically, if we kill the space station, there would be no ongoing mission for the space shuttle. If there is no ongoing mission for the space shuttle, then they will be back next year to kill the shuttle, too. The shuttle is our manned space program. Without the shuttle there will be no manned space program.

Some say that we do not need a manned space program, that we ought to invest all of our efforts into robotic exploration of space. I certainly support nonmanned efforts to explore space, but the truth is that without a manned space program we will not have any space program at all. The money will simply slip away into entitlement spending, as so much other money seems to slip away. Killing the space station will kill the American space program.

Internationally, the consequences will be this. We will miss an unprecedented opportunity to lead the world in an international joint scientific venture to explore space, to put a permanent human presence in space. If we do not lead that venture, who will? Will the world wait for another decade while America finds the will and the way to build a space station? No, that will not happen.

What will happen is simply this. Our current partners in the joint venture that is space station *Freedom*, having been abandoned by us, will then abandon us. The Japanese, the Canadians, the Europeans together will go to Russia, they will finance the building with the Russians of *Mir II*, a Russian space station. Maybe they will let us visit once in a while.

Mr. Speaker, we will have lost our edge competitively and technologically in one of the few sectors in which we continue to lead the world. We will have undermined the basis for the aerospace industry that already is in precarious decline, and we will have fallen further and further behind in the race for our fair share of the future on this planet.

We must invest in the future. We must invest in technology. I support the President's technology initiative, but look at many of these technologies that I support and in which we ought to invest. They are untried.

The space program is not untried. Not a single one of the opponents of the space station has ever said that we cannot build one. They simply argue

about which one and when we should build it and whether we should build it. They all acknowledge that we can build it.

We know from the past 30 years that every dollar we invest in space, we generate \$7 in additional gross national product. That is a real return. Every dollar that is spent on the space program is spent right here on Earth. It creates jobs and futures for the American people. It creates a future for our children.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford not to build a space station.

#### BEUENIA M. BROWN, COMMUNITY LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 85th annual convention of the Empire State Federation of Women's Clubs and the 60th session of the Empire State Association of Youth Clubs.

The Women's and Youth Clubs make a profound contribution to the quality of life in New York State, and help us to recognize the remarkable strength of a diverse society while emphasizing the importance of shared values in giving stability to our lives.

This year's convention honors Beuenia M. Brown, a New Rochelle resident who, through a lifetime of devotion and service to community needs, has encouraged the very best qualities in her friends and neighbors.

Bea has literally lived her faith and, through an extraordinary zest for life, served others with intensity and commitment. Her many positions include: Past president of the F. Willa Davis Women's Club, chairperson of the Ways and Means Committee [ESFWC] for 13 years, membership chairperson of the New Rochelle Chapter of the NAACP, president of the New Rochelle Beauticians Unit #35, former member of the New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, and member of the New Rochelle Democratic City Committee.

Bea has understood that each of us has important responsibilities to others and she inspires us to make the most of every opportunity to make a difference.

It is an honor to congratulate her and all the members of the Empire State Women's and Youth Clubs on the occasion of their anniversary convention.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order follow that of my dear friend and Shakespearean scholar, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

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

There was no objection.

#### WOMEN AND AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding me his position in special orders.

The gentleman from California calls me a Shakespearean scholar, I guess from Twelfth Night. I can no other answer make but thanks and thanks and ever thanks.

Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my legislation to address the urgent need for effective HIV prevention and outreach efforts for women, and increased research on HIV/AIDS in women. I am pleased that 25 of my colleagues have joined me as original cosponsors of the bills. Senator PAUL SIMON will be introducing the bills in the Senate next week.

Women are the fastest growing group of people with HIV, with an estimated 80,000 women between the ages of 15 and 44 currently infected. The incidence of HIV is now nearly equal among men and women in several tested populations in the United States. In fact, AIDS will be the leading cause of death in young African-American women by 1996.

Worldwide, there will be as many or more women with HIV than men by the year 2000. And yet, there is still inadequate attention given to HIV prevention programs targeted to women and adolescent girls, and insufficient research on HIV disease in women.

A major focus of our research and prevention efforts is funding for research on barrier and chemical methods of protection from sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, that women can use with or without their sexual partner's cooperation or knowledge. The development of chemical methods, either a "microbicide"—an intravaginal compound capable of preventing the transmission of a range of STD's which increase women's susceptibility to HIV infection—or the development of a "virucide"—a type of microbicide that would specifically prevent HIV transmission—are the critically needed compounds that can revolutionize our U.S. and global HIV and STD prevention programs. With Federal funding to stimulate this research, microbicides and virucides can begin to save the lives of women and men within a few years. In fact, the Population Council recently released a report on microbicidal research that contends that the development of such a compound is feasible within 3 to 10 years, and potentially cost-effective.

This priority for our research and prevention agendas was identified by international AIDS officials at the

International AIDS Conference in Berlin this week, as well as at the NIH-sponsored meeting on the development of topical microbicides held last month. In addition, two groups of international scientists in meetings sponsored by the United Kingdom's Medical Research Council, New York's Population Council, and the Center for Women's Global Leadership, endorsed the development of a microbicide as an essential component of the global AIDS prevention effort.

Current HIV prevention methods rely on the cooperation of male partners. Many women lack the power within relationships to insist on condom use, as well as the resources to leave situations that place them at risk. It is critical that we acknowledge and respond to the issues of low self-esteem, economic dependency, fear of domestic violence, and other factors which are barriers to empowering women to negotiate safer sex practices. The development of contraceptive and non-contraceptive compounds for intravaginal use in preventing the sexual transmission of HIV and STD's, as well as further evaluation of existing spermicidal compounds, must become an immediate high priority.

Our AIDS research bill also provides new funding to expand the Women's Interagency HIV Study and to conduct other research to determine the impact of potential risk factors for HIV transmission to women, such as infection with other sexually transmitted diseases, the use of various contraceptive devices and the use of tampons.

Other provisions include funding for support services, such as child care, in order to facilitate increased enrollment of women in clinical trials. Because of the absence of large-scale studies on conditions experienced by women with HIV and the small number of women enrolled in clinical trials, the bill also includes provisions to increase women-specific data through expanded gynecological examinations of women at trial sites and the inclusion of nested studies of gynecological conditions of women enrolled in all NIH studies. It is critical that the full range of questions important to understanding HIV in women are answered.

The prevention bill provides funding to family planning providers, community health centers, and other providers who already serve low-income women, to provide community-based HIV prevention programs. Many of them already provide unfunded prevention programs; this funding would allow them to expand their services and provided outreach to women who are not currently using family planning clinics or other community health services for women.

The legislation also includes funding for a program of grants to community-based providers serving women to develop, produce, and disseminate prototype HIV prevention messages targeted

specifically to women in a range of formats.

Funding is provided for early intervention grants under the Ryan White Care Act for programs targeting HIV testing and counseling, diagnostic and therapeutic services to women, and support services to women to ensure access to early intervention services.

Our women and AIDS legislation targets funds to programs and initiatives that respond to the unique needs of women confronting HIV and AIDS. Without leadership from Congress, women's needs in the HIV epidemic will continue to be given less priority, and women's programs will continue to be underfunded. Unless this Congress recognizes the realities faced by women and specifically provides a lifeline to the programs that struggle to meet women's needs, we will see no slowing of the tragic escalation of the HIV epidemic among women in this country. We are running out of time for a generation of young women—we cannot afford to wait. I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

I want to also mention that tomorrow, Congressman TONY BIELENSON and I will introduce the International Population Stabilization and Reproductive Health Act, a comprehensive bill establishing population growth as high priority in U.S. foreign policy. The bill includes a provision authorizing support to United States and foreign research institutions for biomedical research to develop and evaluate improved disease prevention methods, including microbicidal research. I hope that we will make microbicidal research a priority both within our own AIDS research agenda and our foreign assistance programs.

□ 1950

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of stir on Capitol Hill today as it relates to this pending measure which we will be addressing in

the coming weeks, that being the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Former independent presidential candidate and business leader, Ross Perot, was here in the Capitol and attended a meeting, and I should say that I have had a great deal of respect for much of Mr. Perot's work. During the 1980's I had the opportunity to work with him on the plight of those 2,259 Americans still classified as missing in action in Southeast Asia. I have respected the fact that he has focused a great deal of attention on the problem of the Federal deficit and the lack of a business-like approach here in the Government. And there are many things which he has pointed out with which I agree. In fact, I would argue that a majority of the items which he has raised many of us here, especially on this side of the aisle, would be in agreement on.

But Mr. Speaker, on the issue of his opposition to the expansion of a North American Free-Trade Agreement he is dead wrong. Mr. Perot has taken out these television infomercials, they call them, and bought time, and trashed the concept of a North American Free Trade Agreement. And frankly, he has done so without realizing the tremendous benefits that diminishing trade barriers will produce here in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, implementation of NAFTA means jobs in the United States of America. We have seen time and time again great examples of our utilization of export markets.

There are many people who have decried, and Ross Perot is among them, the flight of United States businesses to Mexico. The fact of the matter is there is nothing today which prevents the flow of United States businesses to Mexico. Nothing today prevents that. But implementation of the NAFTA provides us with the vehicle to counter it.

Why? The reason is very simple. The average tariff on United States-manufactured goods going to Mexico is 10 percent. The average tariff on Mexican goods coming into the United States is only 4 percent. So it stands to reason that if we decrease that barrier we increase the opportunity for us to sell United States-manufactured goods to Mexico.

What benefits is there to the United States for us to have a poor southern neighbor? None whatsoever. We all know that. Frankly, there has to be a realization that a rising tide lifts all ships.

We have seen over the past 7 years an amazing turnaround in the economic climate in Mexico. I mentioned at a news conference that we had earlier today that when I went to my first meeting of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference, then-Mexican President Jose Lopez Portillo bragged about the fact that he was

going to begin nationalizing the banking system in Mexico. We all know when that took place in the early 1980's that it created a tremendous debt burden for the Mexican people, and economic problems which have been devastating.

In 1986, President Miguel de la Madrid began, and now President Salinas has moved ahead dramatically toward privatization and recognition that the free market is the way to go. What has happened since that time? We have seen tremendous improvement in the standard of living in Mexico. We have seen a tremendous improvement in the economic climate, and we have seen tremendous improvement in the ability of the 88 million strong Mexican populace to purchase United States-manufactured goods.

In 1986, the trade deficit that we had with Mexico was \$5.9 billion. As privatization took place, as we saw privatization of the banking system, privatization of the telephone system in Mexico, as we saw movements toward a free market, we have had a turnaround which today has provided us with a \$6 billion trade surplus with Mexico. We are selling \$6 billion more in goods to Mexico than we are purchasing from Mexico.

Many people have argued that what we see is the flow of capital goods to Mexico. The fact of the matter is there have been some capital goods to Mexico, but not nearly as great as they are in other developed countries.

We need to recognize that there are people in Mexico who desperately want the opportunity to purchase U.S.-manufactured goods. As we look at this challenge, there are tremendous examples. Over the past several weeks I have been pointing to them.

One is a company called RJM International which is an international management and environmental firm in my home area of Los Angeles. It is a Hispanic-owned company that does half a million dollars in business serving American and Mexican companies that operate in our two countries.

NAFTA will spur, improve environmental management in Mexico. We all know of the problems. I represent Los Angeles. We have very serious air pollution problems, though we know how serious the air pollution problems are in Mexico City. Obviously, companies like RJM International are going to have an improved opportunity to sell their technology to an improved economy in Mexico. After all, where you have a great deal of poverty they cannot expect an improvement in ground-water, drinking water, in air quality and other environmental issues. We have to see an improved economic standing there.

Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that the wave of the future is by reducing rather than establishing barriers. It is very important that we do everything

possible to implement a North American Free Trade Agreement.

#### DAVIS-BACON REPEAL LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on a subject that is very important to me—real Davis-Bacon reform. It is the obvious lack of legislative concern and attention this Congress has given to this important issue that I introduce this bill today. Real Davis-Bacon reform is not an issue that can merely be swept under the rug—nor is it a Democrat or Republican issue. It is an issue that, as taxpayers, affects each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to review some of the solid facts regarding Davis-Bacon, and then move to an old but often neglected and more important concern—discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, Davis-Bacon has lost its mission and is a regulation that benefits few at the cost of many. Union membership is down again this year, as it has been for the last 20 years in a row. In fact, in 1970, 70 percent of the work force was union and 30 percent open shop. Today, it is, in fact, more than opposite—some suggesting that union membership is as little as 20 percent of the construction work force.

As it has been stated in the past, and for the record, the CBO—1983 has concluded that Davis-Bacon requirements raise the cost of Federal construction an average of 5 to 15 percent. This is a conservative estimate. Davis-Bacon raises the cost of Federal construction in rural areas by as much as 26 to 38 percent—Oregon State University study, 1982.

With regard to jobs, it is estimated that a \$1 billion investment in infrastructure yields approximately 46,000 jobs—Data Resources, Inc. 1980's study. In the supplemental stimulus bill the House passed but the Senate GOP wisely defeated, I estimated that an additional 45,000 jobs could have been created if my amendment saving an additional \$900 million from suspending Davis-Bacon on other infrastructure projects had passed.

But I'm not here to argue the same old arguments and talk about the same old numbers. We all know that we can make numbers say anything we want them to. I have a new statement Mr. Speaker. I have a new message—one that is sweeping the Nation.

Davis-Bacon requirements are discriminatory in the true sense of the word. Discrimination has followed Davis-Bacon since its inception. In fact, in 1930, Representative Allgood, supporting Davis-Bacon on this very floor complained of "cheap colored

labor" that "is in competition with white labor throughout the country." The problem at that time was this cheap labor was stealing jobs from white contractors that employed white workers. They were white workers, Mr. Speaker, because unions traditionally did not and do not hire minorities.

Think times have changed? Think again. A Comptroller General report in 1979 stated that Davis-Bacon requirements discouraged nonunion contractors from bidding on Federal work. What is the significance of this? This discouragement harms minority and young workers who are more likely to work in the nonunionized sector of the construction industry. In short, these minorities, younger workers, and women will not get jobs. They will remain unemployed—an unemployment directly caused by the Davis-Bacon regulations this House vehemently defends.

In 1982, former NAACP general counsel Herbert Hill noted that even when the number of black union apprentices increased because of Government pressure, many of those apprentices never graduated to journeyman status. He concluded that "the pattern of racial exclusion in the building trades remained intact." Economist William Keyes stated that the low percentage of skilled black construction workers "is due primarily to Davis-Bacon."

Ralph C. Thomas III, executive director of the National Association of Minority Contractors, which represents over 60,000 minority contractors, more than 90 percent of which are nonunion, believes that Davis-Bacon prevents minority contractors from successfully training workers.

He states further than a minority contractor who successfully bids for a Davis-Bacon covered contract has "no choice but to hire skilled tradesmen, the majority of which are the majority. This defeats a major purpose in the encouragement of minority enterprise development—the creating of jobs for minorities. David-Bacon closes the door on such activity in an industry most capable of employing the largest numbers of minorities."

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would state that the discrimination problem Davis-Bacon requirements create far outweighs the dollars saved and the number of jobs created. Discrimination is the No. 1 problem associated with these requirements. Davis-Bacon requirements, by inflating the cost of construction and increasing the paperwork burden, simply do not allow for the small contractor, traditionally where women and minorities are employed because of skill level, to bid on contracts.

Today, I am offering legislation that repeals the Davis-Bacon Act—an act which requires that the locally prevailing wage rate be paid to various classes of laborers and mechanics working

under federally financed or federally assisted contracts for construction, alteration, and repair of public buildings or public works. Suspending these outdated discriminatory rules and regulations will give a much-needed lift to our economy and provide equal opportunities for all.

The bottom line is that the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 will provide new job opportunities, effect significant cost savings on Federal construction contracts, promote small business participation in Federal contracting, reduce unnecessary paperwork and reporting requirements, and, yes, reduce the discrimination against minorities that so often occurs within the construction union ranks. I encourage all Members to take a serious look at the facts regarding Davis-Bacon and understand, as I have, that the time has come to ride the Government of these costly, burdensome, and discriminatory rules.

□ 2000

#### MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to continue what I had promised this last Tuesday in the special order in which I referred to the general negligence or lack of information disseminated to our American citizens with respect to the banks' and financial institutions' activities in our country.

What you read today, and I have reference to a story that came from my hometown newspaper in San Antonio, alleging and showing that the banks had earned the greatest amount of profit in many, many years; I had reported once before and, in fact, had issued within the last 7 months four releases indicating that some of these interpretations of profitmaking were to a certain extent mischievous, and that they tended to obscure the fact of the continuing debility and shakiness of our financial system in the United States.

Part of it is that, particularly among our largest banks, they are not in the banking business any longer, really. They are in the speculative or what I would say in the gambling business.

But at the bottom of it are the notions that have given rise because of very, very faulty and, in fact, almost criminal obfuscation through the past shoddy accounting principles involved. In fact, I think one of the most nauseating feelings I have had since the great travail of 1988-1989 and the so-called S&L debacle, but which also included banks.

For instance, in my home State of Texas, the big ballyhoo had to do with

the sorry scheme of things with respect to the savings-and-loan industry, but in effect and in fact, there were more banks that failed in Texas than S&L's.

Yes, there have been traditionally many more banks than S&L's, but still and all, the basic, basic factors are what I call, one, the underlying contributing factors about which I have been speaking out to my colleagues in this House for more than 20 years, but particularly since August of 1979, and all in the RECORD.

It is not what I am saying now but what I said then, and explaining what now I defined as the underlying causes, and then the immediate causes which have given rise to these precipitous, alarming, and at times, as of just 3 years ago, the critical situation which has caused the American taxpayer to be gouged of billions and hundreds of billions of dollars, because at the bottom of all of this speculative fever and gambling is the American taxpayer's guarantee of the insured deposited funds.

#### □ 2010

But at this point I would like to stress, first, the more immediate ongoing activities that inevitably are going to cause a crisis. You do not have to be an expert, you do not have to be even a very learned individual in this business to know that this is inevitable. What has been happening is that for years, and particularly since the 1950's and the 1960's and, more particularly, the middle 1970's, we in America have seen what I call not one but at least four money manias agitating our country. And at the bottom of it, the main underlying cause is interest rates and the fact that our country and our people have been flagellated and have been punished with high, usurious, extortionist interest rates.

Now, interest rates, by definition, are the mechanism or is the mechanism, by virtue of which from time immemorial, since time has given us memory of man's activities, by virtue of which wealth is transferred within a society. You can have the money changers try to define "interest" in so many ways, as when I recall in Texas we were trying to stop the loan sharks in the State senate and seeing how the poorest usually are the ones that pay the most. And when it came to the small loans, the banks, of course, have never gotten much into that, so it made it a ripe picking for the usurers and the loan sharks. There were cases in my own hometown in which those who had the greatest need, maybe just \$5 a week, would be paying back at the rate of over 398 percent in real interest terms. Then, of course, the legislature struggled with what was first called the Small Loan Banking Act, and it could not be negotiated during the time I was there. I understand that one was finally passed, a year after I left and

came up here, and the fact is that then it legitimized usury by allowing up to more than 300 percent interest rates in some small loan cases.

All history shows that no society has been able to endure usury. This is why, even going back to several thousand years before Christ, we read the words of Hammurabi, who gave us the penalties then for what would be the equivalent of interest. Even at the time that the Lord Jesus Christ was preaching, usury was punishable by death in some cases and in some instances. And in fact, at the time of some of the Hebrew judges, we saw the rise of the word, "jubilee." "Jubilee" has its roots in the 50-year forgiveness of all debts that the ancient Hebrews permitted. At the end of 50 years, all debts were forgiven. But usury was certainly a punishable offense.

When I first began to speak on this subject matter was in the turbulent 1970's, because it was obvious that even my colleagues and most of the American citizens with whom I held discussions were not aware that we have had no national law controlling usury since 1865. The National Currency Act of 1865 did away with the interest rate or anti-usury law that had been on the books since the beginning of our Nation. As a matter of fact, that was at issue at the time of the founding of our Nation, at the time that the First and the Second Continental Congresses were meeting.

If you want to hear or read about real harsh words about this profession known as banking, you want to read what Thomas Jefferson said and predicted. He said that if they indeed took over as they wanted to even then from the beginning, it would not be long before Americans would be homeless in their own land and would be tantamount to or would have the equivalent of a standing army of occupation, which is exactly what we are seeing today.

So in 1979, the first week in August, I had gathered the statistics that I had been pouring over for several years with the Federal Reserve, and then I had been reading into the great history of banking activities in other nations, particularly having to do with the historical experiences, and knowing full well that no control of interest would sooner or later give rise to great aberrations and fluctuations, which would be most harmful. And today, as they have been, we saw that since the first time that the prime interest rate was jacked up one whole percentage point overnight, which was June 1966. We have not had stability since, and for that reason we can say that was the cause.

The more immediate past cause was when the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board decided on the only policy that would save and would retain some measure of control in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board or the forces

that up to then had control, but with the advent of a restored Europe and a totally industrialized Japan, we no longer could, any more than we can today, control those external forces that impact on us, no matter what we do domestically. So he then proceeded on the highest interest rate program in the history of this country, where by 1980 we had the so-called prime interest rate, as it was defined then. That prime interest rate can meet one of four definitions. It has no real significance today, just like short-term interest rates or long-term interest rates. It is a lot of jargon, to do nothing else but to obfuscate the rapacity and the greed of these great but nefarious forces and what I called Tuesday the malefactors of great wealth, and the tragic consequences are that our country continues to suffer.

So in 1979 I rose here on this House floor and made a speech and said, in essence, that all of the factors were back on that equation which had not been in since 1932, which potentially meant that all those variables and factors were back in this equation that could cause not only great national, but worldwide debacle.

At this point I would like to just kind of summarize the reason I speak. All of this has led to this very tragic situation which is confronting us. We were able to do something that, in effect, was a miracle in the recent legislation of 1991 and 1992 to improve and demand improvement in the accounting standards that should govern banks. So it is continuing today, and in fact it is continuing yet—and I will tell you why—because the law that we passed, the law which somehow by a miracle we were able to get out, is being evaded because the regulators are not carrying out the mandate of our 1992 act.

#### □ 2020

As a result, you had pretty much the same thing that was happening in 1929. In 1929 in the late spring, President Hoover had appointed a Commission who reported and said, "We see nothing for the great foreseeable future but continuing and rising prosperity." That was in May 1929.

At that point the U.S. banks could borrow money from the Fed at 5 percent and then turn around and loan it at 12 percent to the highly speculative market on Wall Street which was floating bonds from the Imperial Government of Japan, the rising and restoring German Government that was trying to raise money by floating these bonds at high interest yields; so that the banks were sending that money that they were borrowing from the Fed and getting a spread of 7 percent because they were lending it out at 12 percent to the speculators on Wall Street.

Today the only difference is that the Federal Reserve Board lends the banks,

or the banks can borrow money at 3 percent. Maybe now and then even under 3 percent. With that, they buy U.S. Government guaranteed securities which pay at this point not less than 7 percent and on average more than that.

Now, that is a subsidy by the taxpayer. They do not want to call it that. But how are the people going to know unless those of us who happen to be in the position to know and evaluate do not report? That is the reason I have never hesitated to speak out since the first week 32 years ago after I have been sworn in. I have been using what we call special orders since then.

There was no TV, and that is not the reason. The reason is that you speak to the record. This is in what we call the permanent record of the Journal. That is where I wanted it, because I did not want my children and grandchildren years later to say, "Well, he was there. And what did he do, or at least what did he say; being one out of 435 there was not much he could do, but what did he say, and did he say it?"

I am proud of that fact that I have said it and I will continue to speak and I will speak forth as I said Tuesday, without fear or favor, and as I said at the height of the controversy when the great pressure was on to try to stifle what I wanted to lead in order to eradicate the malefactors from these great failed and corrupt institutions.

I said and I quoted William Lloyd Garrison, the great reformer. I borrowed his words when I said, "I will be as harsh as truth and as uncompromising as justice."

So here we have these banks, subsidized by the taxpayer, born from the Fed, investing in Government guaranteed securities, having this spread, having that money, turning around, and where are they putting it?

Well, that plus other subsidies that they get through the Fed has led to what I consider to be the most dangerous situation confronting us today as far as soundness, stability and equity in our system.

The United States principal banks and their notional principal holdings, or what are known as derivatives, derivatives is a fancy name for a written contract between two parties; derivatives cover a multitude, a plethora of different arrangements, but basically they are a contract in which two parties agree that they will bet on the future value of some market activity, futures, all the way from some commodity to such things as the currency futures which are volatile, which are highly speculative and which today in this modern day of electronic instantaneous communication, and even as I am speaking you will have a trillion or more of these speculative clicks chasing from London to New York to Frankfurt to Paris to Tokyo.

Is it money out there in these international markets for the procurement

of goods, for firing the engines of manufacturing and production? No. It is paper chasing paper, reduced to highly speculative and instantaneous transactions of billions of dollars in an instant in an electronic blip.

So that the holdings of our principal banks in these derivatives rose from \$2.3 trillion in 1986 to \$8.3 trillion in 1989 and \$15.3 trillion in 1991.

Now, here are some of our top corporate banks. First, Citicorp. It has a total of \$1,426 billion in derivatives. Now, that is about seven times what it has in its capitalization or its \$213 billion in assets. Remember, these are what they call technically off balance sheet activities for which they do not have to have reserves.

Now, let us take No. 2, Chemical Banking Corp., \$1,296 billion in these national derivatives, nine times its \$103 billion asset value.

Then Chase Manhattan, \$837 billion in these derivatives, in this speculation, in this gambling. It is gambling. It is nothing else. Nine times its \$96 billion in assets.

Then you have Bankers Trust, \$958 billion in gambling, 13 times its \$72 billion assets.

Then you have First Chicago, \$378 billion, or eight times its \$49 billion assets.

Then Continental Banking, \$136 billion in derivatives, which is 10 times its \$14 billion in asset value.

Then the Bank of America—and by these figures it seems conservative—\$795 billion in derivatives or speculative enterprises, or activities I should say, or four times its \$181 billion in assets.

Now, the thing that disturbs me the most, and I am going to place in the RECORD as this point a news story in the Wall Street Journal, byline Kenneth H. Bacon. It says, "FDIC"—the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—"Softens Proposed Audit Rules for Banks and Draws Fire From GAO."

So it turns out that the GAO and I are the only ones, and we are being hit by the National Banking Association and by others. So I would like to place that in the RECORD now.

#### FDIC SOFTENS PROPOSED AUDIT RULES FOR BANKS AND DRAWS FIRE FROM GAO

(By Kenneth H. Bacon)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. significantly scaled back proposed audit regulations for banks and thrifts, drawing General Accounting Office criticism for "diluting the effectiveness" of a 1991 banking law.

Separately, the FDIC board of directors adopted a rule that reduces to \$100,000 from a maximum of \$400,000 the federal insurance coverage an individual depositor can receive for self-directed retirement accounts in one bank. The rule, which takes effect Dec. 19, applies only to certain retirement plans and doesn't affect coverage on other accounts.

The audit and deposit rules were required by a 1991 law that tightened bank regulation and limited deposit insurance coverage in an effort to reduce the number and cost of bank

failures. Bankers and regulators complain, however, that the law imposes costly requirements that have discouraged banks from making loans. The revised audit regulations are the latest effort by regulators to keep the burden of rules as light as possible.

#### ANNUAL AUDITS

Under the 1991 law, banks and thrifts must have annual independent audits that review their financial condition, internal management controls and compliance with banking laws and regulations. The law exempted banks with assets of less than \$150 million, but gave the FDIC authority to set a higher threshold.

The FDIC said the rules will apply to all banks and thrifts with assets of more than \$500 million—a group that includes about 1,000 out of nearly 14,000 federally insured banks and thrifts. These 1,000 institutions, however, hold about 75% of the banking system's total assets.

The agency said 96% of the institutions in this group already have annual independent audits of their financial statements and 90% already have audit committees on their boards of directors. The new rule requires that the audit committees be composed of board members who aren't part of the bank's management. The FDIC said about 240 banks and thrifts with assets of more than \$3 billion will face stiffer requirements governing the composition of their audit committees.

The audit standards have emerged as a microcosm of a political battle to shape bank regulations. To reduce the burden of new regulation, the FDIC significantly trimmed the scope of the audit rules it proposed in September. It also issued many of the definitions, instructions and explanations as guidelines rather than formal rules.

#### SERIOUS WEAKENING

But the GAO, which campaigned hard for tough bank rules when Congress was writing the 1991 law, called the changes "a serious weakening of the act's reforms that were intended to prevent a recurrence of the breakdowns in internal controls and flawed systems of corporate governance that directly contributed to the savings and loan crisis and bank failures." Some members of Congress and academics also accuse the regulators of watering down the rules.

The health of the banking industry has improved markedly since Congress passed the 1991 banking law. Last year, banks enjoyed their most profitable year in history. As banks and thrifts have increased their capital and built their reserves against bad loans, regulators have become more aggressive in their efforts to make dozens of required regulations as flexible as possible.

"The agencies have been trying to meet the intent of the Congress, while minimizing the burden on banks and the deleterious effects on the supply of credit," Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan explained in a speech last week.

Eugene Ludwig, the Comptroller of the Currency and the only bank regulator President Clinton has appointed so far, is playing a leading role in looking for ways to reduce the burden of bank regulation without compromising safety and soundness rules or prohibitions against discriminatory lending.

For many bank customers, the most significant changes in the 1991 law concerned deposit insurance. It reduced the number of insured retirement accounts a depositor can have in one bank.

Currently, a person can have as much as \$100,000 of FDIC insurance on each of four self-directed retirement accounts in one

bank—an Individual Retirement Account, a Keogh plan for business owners, a 457 plan for employees of state and local governments and nonprofit organizations, and a defined contribution plan. Under the new rule, aggregate coverage can't exceed \$100,000 in one bank.

Though the regulation takes effect Dec. 19, coverage on multiple retirement accounts won't end then. Existing accounts will continue to be federally insured until they expire. Many retirement accounts are held in the form of certificates of deposit, which pay a set rate of interest over a multiyear term.

Banks must notify customers with retirement accounts of the change in law. In addition, the FDIC is preparing pamphlets, video tapes, a newsletter and training programs to publicize the changes.

The most important change for customers of banks that fail is that the FDIC no longer protects the full amount of accounts above \$100,000, as it routinely did in the past. Thousands of depositors lost some of their money beyond the \$100,000 ceiling when their banks failed this year and last year.

Alan Naisuler, a depositor who lost \$14,000 when a Massachusetts bank failed last year, contends that the FDIC and banks have been slow to inform depositors of the increased risk they face because of the 1991 law.

Also an article by Stephen Pizzo, who wrote admirably and who was one of those writing at the time it was happening and trying to call attention to the scams known as the S&L scandals.

The title of that article in the Mother Jones publication is entitled, "The Banker's Hour."

The subtitle is, "Remember Those 'Character' Loans the S&L scoundrels handed out to their friends? Now the banks want the same privilege—and effectively lobbied Clinton to get it." That is the thrust of this other article from the Wall Street Journal.

[From Mother Jones, May-June 1993]

#### THE BANKER'S HOUR

REMEMBER THOSE "CHARACTER" LOANS THE S&L SCOUNDRELS HANDED OUT TO THEIR FRIENDS? NOW THE BANKS WANT THE SAME PRIVILEGE—AND EFFECTIVELY LOBBIED CLINTON TO GET IT

(By Stephen Pizzo)

It's time to drag the bankers out for their semiannual public flogging. The last time we visited this subject, banking lobbyists were trying to sweet-talk Congress into deregulating the banks a la savings and loans. They wanted all kinds of changes: the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act (which bars them from speculating on Wall Street), the right to branch nationwide and to sell their own insurance products, and laws allowing corporations like IBM and Exxon to own their own banks. All very bad ideas.

These measures, backed by the Bush administration, were stopped cold by two members of Congress who knew better, Texas Democrat Henry Gonzalez, head of the House Banking Committee, and Michigan Democrat John Dingell, Jr., chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and son of the guy who pushed Glass-Steagall into law.

#### BANKING ON CHANGE

But as Little Orphan Annie and any Washington lobbyist will tell you, there's always tomorrow. And tomorrow has arrived. Having lost in Congress the last time around, bankers have turned to the new president for

help. No sooner were the election results official last November than the American Bankers Association began making key changes to its lobbyist lineup.

William Brandon, Jr., an Arkansas banker with close ties to Clinton, became the ABA's new president;

Curt Bradbury, head of Worthen National Bank in Little Rock, was appointed to the ABA's board of directors. Worthen Bank extended a \$3.5 million line of credit to the Clinton campaign. More than a third of the bank's shares are held by the family of Jackson Stephens, who is chairman of the board of Stephens Inc., Arkansas's grant financial holding company;

Charles Manatt, a former banker who served as Democratic Party chairman and cochaired the Clinton campaign, was hired. His law partner, Mickey Kantor, is the U.S. trade negotiator;

Finally, the ABA brought on board Tommy Boggs, an influential Washington lobbyist whose law partner is Commerce Secretary Ron Brown.

They didn't even wait for the inauguration to begin lobbying. At the preinaugural Little Rock economic summit, ABA president Brandon assured Clinton that bankers would selflessly provide at least \$86 billion in new loans if he first would loosen their regulatory straitjacket.

Following the inauguration, the ABA and other banking organizations sent the White House a formal set of proposals, impressively titled "Job-Creating Regulatory Relief," which recommended that President Clinton enact regulatory changes through administrative action without bothering Congress. In particular they suggested that the president "encourage regulators to recognize that banking involves calculated risks and that character loans do not warrant blanket criticism."

Bankers make character loans to people they know or have reason to believe are of sound character, and whom they figure won't run off without paying up. Such borrowers often lack the tangible trappings of net worth regulators prefer to see in a borrower—like strong financial statements, steady income, and/or real assets that could be attached or repossessed. If a borrower defaults on a character loan, all the bank gets is a "sorry 'bout that." (The S&L barons were big on character loans and loaned to a lot of real characters.)

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan waded in on the side of the bankers last January. "Recent legislation and supervision has virtually eliminated the so-called character loan," he told Congress. "If regulations require that loans be based solely on collateral or always documented by full accounting detail, an important part of the credit-granting process that calls for the banker's special expertise will be lost, to the detriment of the economy." (I don't like to harp on people's past mistakes, but please recall that in 1985 Greenspan assured Congress that high flyers like Charlie Keating's Lincoln Savings and Loan represented the only hope for the S&L industry. Oops.)

A bank examiner friend of mine observed that character loans have not disappeared, just evolved. "We have character loans," he said. "They're called credit cards, and the hefty interest rates of 14 percent to 21 percent charged for those kinds of loans accurately reflect the significant risks involved in making them."

But bankers complain that, in a gross overreaction to the S&L mess, Congress has tightened lending policies so much that

banks are afraid to make loans to small businesses. To listen to them whine about bank examinations, one would think they were being subjected to physical torture. But in February, the General Accounting Office completed a study of fifty-eight randomly selected bank and thrift examinations to see if, in fact, regulators were unduly hassling banks. What they found was just the opposite.

The GAO reported that:

In 94 percent of the cases, regulators engaged in "less than adequate" examinations; In 70 percent of the cases, the regulators' examination of the banks' loan quality was slipshod and seriously lacking; and,

In general, the regulators' review of bank-holding companies was too cursory to ensure that the banks' owners were not milking their own banks.

So much for regulatory overkill.

#### STUCK WITH THE TAB

Character loans and calculated risks sound logical enough, if you ignore one thing: the "calculated risks" bankers want regulators to sanctify are not their calculated risks—they're ours. If they calculate correctly they reap the profits. If they're wrong we pay off their debts. We already have. More than 100 banks failed last year, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation estimates another 120 will topple this year, forcing the FDIC to cough up \$76 billion. In 1991 Congress voted to allow the FDIC to "borrow" up to \$70 billion from the U.S. Treasury to cover losses. So much for "calculated risks."

Still, by February the Friends of Bill at the ABA had already scored. Clinton announced that, in order "to deal with the credit crunch," the administration would ask regulators to shift their focus. Bank examiners would be instructed to stop enforcing rules that require bankers to gather proper paperwork, disclosures, and verifications for underwriting purposes. Instead examiners would concentrate on enforcing consumer protection laws and making sure that bankers are not speculating on interest-rate fluctuations.

The administration made its move against the advice of wiser and more experienced voices in its own party. Both House Banking Committee Chairman Gonzalez and Senate Banking Committee Chairman Don Riegle, a Democrat from Michigan, warned that bankers shouldn't be allowed to throw around figures (like the promised \$86 billion in new lending) without providing some evidence that deregulation would produce the result in question. But the administration didn't listen.

Now, with a foothold in the White House, bankers have turned their sights back on Congress. Rewriting regulations and shifting priorities are important changes, acknowledged Kenneth Guenther, executive vice president of the Independent Bankers Association of America, but "examiners are bound by the law, not what the President of the United States wants." Guenther said the bankers' primary goal would continue to be the reversal of laws that strengthen bank regulation.

One thing bankers want from Congress is lower capital standards. Capital is the amount of money that must be set aside to cushion losses if the bank fails. It's like the deductible on an auto insurance policy. The higher the deductible, the less the insurance company pays in the event of an accident. Likewise, the more capital banks have to hold, the less it costs taxpayers when they fail. Bankers want their deductible lowered—and therefore ours raised.

Bankers are also trying to sidetrack a move toward real-world accounting for banks. Until now banks have used accounting methods so phony that if you or I or General Motors used them we would land in the slammer for fraud. In recent months Congress and the Financial Accounting Standards Board have begun plans to move banks away from illusory accounting methods, forcing them to account for their assets at market values. Without such accounting gimmicks, many banks that now meet regulatory capital requirements would flunk. (It was some of these same gimmicks that created the S&L fools' paradise of the 1980s.)

But for now the front lines of the banking battle are at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Whose advice will President Clinton heed—his Arkansas banking friends cum ABA lobbyists, or those veteran legislators in his own party who are still cleaning up after the bankers who breezed through Washington a decade ago with a mouthful of give-me and handful of nothing?

We'll be watching.

#### □ 2030

Then, from one of the most senior, and elderly, and experienced banking, and particularly bank stock, experts, Mr. M.A. Schapiro & Co. in New York, May 18:

Market Value Accounting—Catching Up With the Technology of Banking.

He says how it is inevitable that we have market value accounting. Well, we went a long way in getting GAO's many-year study and evaluation, and, as I said before, incorporating it into the bill, an amendment that I placed on myself, and I just made several silent offerings which I found out that we had managed to put them in our statutes, only to find that President Clinton, under the pressure from the National Banking Association, was saying, "We promise that, if you will order your regulators to go easy on us, we will be handing out 76 billion dollars' worth of loans," because the President in good conscience was trying to see what he could do about quote, unquote, the credit crunch. Well, our statistics show right now they have loaned hardly nothing, but in the meanwhile those regulators, as the Wall Street Journal article points out, have really gone to bat for him.

But now comes Mr. Schapiro. There is nobody more expert than this man, and particularly when it comes to true value of banking stock. And he says:

Banking customers, regulators and investors need to have measures of the risk banks are incurring and the means of monitoring their success in managing those risks while generating profits. Note that under this definition regulators need to concern themselves as much with profit as safety and soundness. The subject of our Banking Issues publication of April 20, 1993, brings this out. In order to accurately measure and monitor, the banking industry needs an accounting system that is as closely as possible abreast of the latest techniques and technology of bank interest rate risk management.

Mr. Speaker, I offer that publication for the RECORD at this point.

[From the Bank Stock Quarterly, May 18, 1993]

#### MARKET VALUE ACCOUNTING—CATCHING UP WITH THE TECHNOLOGY OF BANKING SUMMARY

The technology of banking has evolved dramatically. Bankers now employ a panoply of risk transference vehicles and manage their entire balance sheets so as to control their risks. Yet, the system of financial reporting remains rooted in accounting standards established in an earlier era. In our view, the reporting system needs to catch up. Bankers, bank customers, stockholders and regulators need to have a better understanding of the true financial position of the bank.

That new system is likely to include market value accounting. We regard MVA as a tool to assist management and inform others, not as an end in itself. The end, or the objective of management, is risk-controlled return on equity. While we recognize that there will be costs associated in converting to MVA, we strongly believe that the benefits will far outweigh those costs. These benefits will arise out of higher valuations for bank stocks and a reduced cost of capital for banks. Investors will be better able to identify well-managed banks and will reward them. So too, will regulators.

#### DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Banking is the business of taking relatively low-cost money, primarily deposits, and lending and investing it at a spread. Banking entails taking risks: credit—the borrowers are not as certain to repay principal and interest as are the depositors to claim theirs; and interest—the time gap between the maturity of the deposit, usually shorter, and the maturity or repricing of the loan, usually longer. This arises because the cost of the deposit may rise and exceed the rate of return on the loan before it matures or reprices. The art of banking is gauging and managing those risks.

Bank customers, regulators and investors need to have measures of the risks banks are incurring and the means of monitoring their success in managing those risks while generating profits. (Note that under this definition, regulators need to concern themselves as much with profit as safety and soundness; the subject of our Banking Issues publication of April 20, 1993.) To accurately measure and monitor, the banking industry needs an accounting system that is, as closely as possible, abreast of the latest techniques and technology of bank interest rate risk management. Inevitably, that system will include market valuation accounting (MVA).

#### THE TECHNOLOGY OF BANKING

Banking is an evolving business. Over the decades, competition, both domestic and international, has intensified, resulting in the narrowing of spreads and profit margins. At the same time, volatility in financial markets has increased and customers have sought to transfer the risk of that volatility to their banks. The bankers, eager to serve their customers, have absorbed the transferable risks, mainly interest rate and foreign exchange risk. Credit risk, a separate concern, has always been and will continue to be present in banking.

Another aspect of modern day banking is asset-liability management. This has been refined to include gap and duration analysis as a means of controlling interest rate risk and limiting the exposure of capital to interest rate shocks.

As a part of this technological evolution, the markets have developed a myriad of risk

transference vehicles—futures contracts, options, options on futures, forward markets, swaps of every conceivable construct (and some virtually inconceivable), asset-backed securities and derivatives. Banks actively participate in these markets—buying, selling, holding.

The management of banks on the cutting edge of risk management have concluded that traditional GAAP accounting by itself does not provide them with sufficient, accurate and timely information to make possible the measurement and management of the wide and diverse complex of risks and still generate a satisfactory return on equity. Instead, they have turned to market value accounting, marked-to-market valuations where possible, and timely reporting. That is the only way they can keep control of their interest rate risk and better assure their ongoing safety and soundness. In other words, many large and sophisticated banks are already engaging in market valuation accounting and relying on that information for managerial purposes. Separately, they report their quarterly results to customers, stockholders and regulators in GAAP accounting terms which is based on historic cost accounting (HCA).

The problem with GAAP is that it is fundamentally a backward-looking, cost-based system. Accurate reporting when analyzing a bank's earnings, its balance sheet and its capital is crucial since volatility, unmeasured by HCA, can substantially alter all of those.

#### DEFINING MARKET VALUATION

In determining market value, current values would be placed on all assets, liabilities and off balance sheet obligations. The resulting derived net worth would indicate a market value of a bank's cushion for customers and regulators, and the equity value from the point of view of stockholders. Market value would be calculated by first determining the magnitude and timing of cash flows for all assets and liabilities. Second, the calculation would require the application of appropriate discount rates to each cash flow item derived from the current Treasury yield curve. The last step would be to subtract the discounted present value of the liabilities from the discounted present value of the assets. The remainder would be the present value of the net worth.

The selection of terminology here is important. For many bank assets and liabilities, there will not be a specific market against which to mark and value the item. That is why the term "market valuation" is used instead of "market-to-market." The goal is current value, not the price the item would realize in the event of a forced sale on short notice. While it is generally recognized that market valuations will often be based on estimates, they will be conscientious efforts at the best approximations of current value as against the historic cost accounting methodology, which makes no attempt to value on the basis of current conditions but only on the basis of historic costs with adjustments for accruals. HCA is an accounting system that is based on the assumption that markets and, therefore, asset and liability valuations, are inherently stable. MVA assumes that they are not.

As with any new remedy, the warning label should read "use only as directed." MVA is a management tool; it is not an objective. After all, a bank is an ongoing business so that liquidation value is not central to decisionmaking. Bankers manage for income and return on equity with some volatility restraints. MVA is a guide. It identifies interruptions to the income stream that might

arise owing to volatility, it is a necessary bridge from the balance sheet to the income stream.

Another point, MVA requires an examination of the bank as a whole. Line by line, some items, on and off the balance sheet, may not seem appropriate. But when analyzed in the context of the entire set of financials, they may play an important role.

#### OBJECTIONS TO MVA

A number of substantive objections have been raised to MVA. Some may be classified as transition problems which, while no less real, will eventually go away or be resolved once an MVA system is adopted. The tougher ones are these:

(1) How do users of the MVA reports deal with the volatility impact on the income statement and capital?

(2) How do users of the data compare one institution with another?

(3) Can MVA reports be verified?

(4) How do public accountants and regulators impose a new accounting system, with all its implications, on a resistant banking industry?

These may be answered as follows. One of the purposes of changing to MVA is to identify volatility. With the benefit of hindsight, analysts can always distinguish market noise from cyclical or structural changes in market relationships. But at the moment, this is never clear. So, all parties—bank managers, customers, stockholders and regulators—need to know and have a right to know the status of the bank's assets, liabilities and capital. If a bank customarily has exposed itself to volatility, it would and should acquire more capital. If it finds the volatility onerous, it would and should hedge more, either on the balance sheet itself or through off balance sheet hedging. The claim that bank managers understand their assets and liabilities better than outsiders is probably correct. The logical extension that outsiders should "trust" the management has resulted in several cases of major financial shocks and even disasters. The purpose of accounting reports is to minimize the need for trust with regard to a bank's financial status.

This goes even further. If management has better knowledge of its balance sheet items than outsiders, management might, under stress circumstances in which it needed to generate profits fast, be inclined to sell those balance sheet items that are at a premium, not recognized under HCA, and retain those items that are at a discount, also not recognized by HCA. If such a discount, also not recognized by HCA. If such a tactic is pursued by bank management over a period of time, an institution could end up holding discounted values without detection under HCA.

The comparability issue is more readily answered. Bankers, the accounting profession, regulators and other interested parties would have to agree on common methods and procedures.

The argument that the financial reports of nonbank foreign financial institutions or domestic nonfinancial institutions would no longer be comparable to domestic banking institutions using MVA really becomes a transition issue. If MVA is the more useful accounting method, others eventually are almost certain to follow.

The verification issue seems less of a hurdle when one realizes that the accounting profession and regulators would have to agree on common methods and procedures. In any case, under HCA, some important measures currently reported are not com-

pletely verifiable. These include depreciation rates, repossessed assets and reserves for retirees. To be sure, no one is claiming that MVA would be perfect; but it seems very much less imperfect than present historic cost accounting.

Finally with regard to the substantive arguments, once the accounting profession and regulators agree on MVA methods and procedures, the banks would follow—they would have to. It should be noted that they have resisted other changes in disclosure and regulation over the years and then complied when all recourse was closed off to them. Compliance with MVA would be inevitable.

The transition would be a problem. First, banking institutions would have to undertake large investments in human resources, equipment and software and absorb ongoing costs. That is to say, people would have to be trained and retrained in the accounting methodology, hedging, asset-liability management techniques, etc., etc. Computer equipment would have to be, in many cases, upgraded and the appropriate software would have to be acquired, only to be upgraded again as the evolution continues. People would have to be trained in the use of the software. Many institutions might have difficulty making that transition. In time, a transition to MVA might accelerate the consolidation process in the financial services industry, which is already under way.

Finally, there is the problem of immersion. A lot of work in this area still needs to be done. Should the banking industry wade in gradually to MVA or plunge all at once? A wade-in process can be more confusing than helpful since market valuations undertaken on a piecemeal basis would probably be more distorting to the total valuation of an institution than HCA. After all, valuing marketable securities while not currently valuing liabilities could lead to gross distortions. Specifically, FAS 107, which would market value just financial instruments but not their matching liabilities, would distort the balance sheet and net worth, and could be more misleading than helpful. In contrast to wade-in, a plunge could create unanticipated shocks.

Perhaps the best way to approach MVA would be to start with those institutions already engaging in the practice for internal management purposes. Clearly, a long phase in period would be necessary. Eventually, accounting firms and regulators would likely provide an education to less sophisticated institutions.

#### THE PAYOFF

The long term advantages of MVA would be many and substantial. All of the benefits would arise out of more accurate financial information on individual institutions. First and most important, management would benefit, especially at those institutions not presently using market value accounting. Regulators would benefit in that they, too, would have a better reading on each institution. If the regulators benefit, so will the public since it is the public that has financed egregious banking and regulatory errors of the past. Bank customers would benefit in that they would have a better reading on the safety of their deposits and the soundness and long term viability of the bank with which they are doing business. Finally, stockholders would benefit since they would have more reliable reports on which to base their investment decisions.

All of that is in the first instance. There would be secondary benefits as well. The argument that income and capital would be harmed when volatility erodes assets cuts

both ways. They would be enhanced when volatility pushes values in the other direction. More important, institutions that engage in careful underwriting practices would be identified and their loan portfolios would move to a premium, thereby rewarding conservative lending practices. The new reporting system would better identify astute managements and rank them, with rewards to the best through higher market valuations of the banks' stock.

Bank stockholders would benefit by fuller and more accurate disclosure because the valuation discount on bank stocks relative to the broader stock market would probably diminish, perhaps significantly. That probably would happen if investors in general had more comfort that bank financial reports were not obscuring damage to financial assets, liabilities, income and capital owing to unreported volatility. At minimum, the uncertainty would be reduced. As a result, banks would incur a relatively lower cost of capital. That alone would more than pay for the costs of developing and maintaining an MVA system.

Finally, armed with more accurate and complete information, regulators could take comfort that the bank financial data they are examining and analyzing are what they say they are. That could reduce some of the excesses of regulation currently in place and in prospect, another potentially large cost saving.

We would like to note that MVA is not a panacea. As the industry progresses in this new direction, all concerned parties will have to learn as they go. There will undoubtedly be missteps and surprises along the way. Moreover, no matter how refined bankers may become in measuring market values, they will never escape the need for sound lending practices and astute credit analysis. Credit risk has always been, and will continue to be, inherent in banking. Central to the bankers' art is the making and management of credit judgments to minimize risk and maximize return.

Achieving widespread market value accounting, initially in the banking industry, then other financial firms and finally business in general will be no small task. It will take time, talent, investment and cultural change. But the process is inevitable. Indeed, it is already underway. The technology of banking has evolved and outrun the historic system of keeping records and reporting results. The challenge to the banking industry is to manage that change to achieve the best results at minimal cost and with minimal disruption, though disruption there will be.

As early as 1959, Morris A. Schapiro wrote about "The Need For Disclosures," a subject he has returned to repeatedly over the years. Indeed, in the March 1967 issue of "The Bank Stock Quarterly" he said with regard to disclosures, "... bankers should have more confidence in themselves. A well run bank need not fear disclosures. On the contrary, disclosures would inspire confidence among depositors and stockholders... Shareholders are entitled to basic information needed for intelligent evaluation of their holdings."—Eugene J. Sherman.

Now we might say, "Well, I thought all of this would be known and established." Well, that is what they used to say about the S&L's. But why did we get into this mess? As I said, the thing that hurts me the most is no comfort for me to say that way over 20 years ago, and especially going back to 1966, I first began to call attention, and I

was shocked to find that nobody was aware that there is no protection against usury anymore; there is not. That is why we could have this great, great scam of 20-, 21-percent prime interest rates of 1980.

Mr. Speaker, that is what has undone thousands, tens of thousands of businesses, individuals, into bankruptcy. How can a small businessman, I asked 20 years ago, how can he stay in business if he has to borrow, say, even \$3,000? A little, little businessman? Maybe he has a cleaning establishment, and he has got to get inventory for his supplies and equipment, which is costly, and he goes to the bank to borrow \$3,000 at 17-18 percent. He cannot stay in business. He is working for that bank. That is usury.

And here are these banks that can borrow their money from the Fed at 3 percent or less, and then, if one wants to get a loan from them, are they going to charge 1 or 2 percent as they always say they do only? No, they would be lucky if they can get 9 percent. In my area, Mr. Speaker, 10, and 11, and 12 percent is what they charge.

So, what these banks are reporting as profits is on the basis of interest gouging, usurers all, flagellating our people constantly with uncontrolled and unregulated interest rates, and I say to my colleagues, "I introduced a bill oh so many years ago—well, 20 years ago—to try to put a cap and restore the Pre-1865 Interest Rate Control Act, and I couldn't even get a hearing at that time even though I was a member of the committee. I don't think I could get much farther today. I would be immediately labeled as an absolute unrealistic and destructive radical."

But the truth is that sooner or later, and I believe it will be sooner, but only because of the development of an unwanted crisis, and was all of this necessary? Of course not. This was not an act of God. This was manmade, and it was avoidable, and I have said so since more than 20 years ago.

Are we going to continue without addressing this for fear of what? Who do we fear? The voter? Well, my experience is that the constituents want truth, that they have enough intestinal fortitude and moral courage to accept, even though at the moment they may not want to because of its unpalatability, a truth that hurts. But they would rather have the truth than a sugar-coated lie that temporarily keeps them lulled until the day of rude awakening when suddenly they find themselves homeless and refugees in their own homeland.

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

[From Economics, May 7, 1993]

THEY'RE NOT BANKS ANY MORE

(By John Hoefle)

Commercial banks in the United States posted record profits of \$32.2 billion in 1992,

and judging by the reports coming in for the first quarter of 1993, they're in for another big profit this year. At least they would be, were these income reports not lies, designed to hide the massive losses of the bankrupt U.S. banking system. Despite these happy numbers, and the ongoing covert federal bailout, the banking system is sinking fast.

The banks piled up an impressive number of full-year and quarterly records in 1992. The claimed net income for the year was 30% above the previous record of \$28.4 billion in 1988, and 80% above the \$17.9 billion of claimed profit for 1991. The first quarter's \$7.6 billion profit was the highest quarterly profit on record, easily topping the \$7.3 billion reported in the first quarter of 1989. The second quarter was even better, at \$7.9 billion, and the third quarter better still, at \$8.5 billion, or nearly half the full-year 1991 profits. The string was broken in the fourth quarter, when banks reported \$8.2 billion in profits, but it was still the second-best quarter ever.

"The numbers also tell a story of strong, clear, undeniable improvement in earnings, capital loan losses, charge-offs—all the vital signs," Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. (FDIC) Chairman Andrew Hove insisted in a press release announcing the 1992 results.

How does it happen that the banks can claim to do so well in a year in which the economy sank deeper into depression, personal and business bankruptcies hit new highs, real estate values continued their plunge, and unemployment soared?

The answer is that, in many respects, the biggest U.S. banks have ceased to be banks and have become speculators, using money provided by the U.S. taxpayers to gamble in international financial markets, while lying about the deterioration of their assets and loan portfolios.

The taxpayer funds come in the form of loans from the Federal Reserve to the big banks. The banks use these loans, for which they pay some 3% interest, to buy U.S. government-guaranteed securities which pay interest rates in the range of 7%. The result is a federal subsidy of some 4% or so.

Thanks to what the FDIC termed an "unusually wide" spread between short- and long-term interest rates, the banks' 1992 net interest income of \$133.5 billion was up \$12.6 billion over 1991.

On top of that, the banks do not have to set aside any reserves for their holdings of U.S. government securities, whereas they must set aside reserves for any loans they make.

No wonder the banks are pouring money into government securities instead of making loans.

During 1992, the dollar value of loans held by U.S. banks fell by \$27 billion, to \$2,032 billion, while their holdings of government securities soared. Commercial banks' holdings of U.S. government securities rose by \$99 billion during the year, to \$661 billion from \$562 billion, according to the Federal Reserve. At the same time, the banks' business loans dropped \$15 billion, to \$603 billion from \$618 billion.

Meanwhile, the banks' reported levels of non-performing loans have dropped for seven consecutive quarters. From a peak of \$83 billion at the first quarter of 1991 non-current loans and leases fell to \$62 billion at the end of 1992. This magical decrease in bad loans has allowed the banks to reduce their reserves the loan losses and their charge-offs of bad loans. The banks charged off a net \$25.5 billion in bad loans in 1992 compared to \$32.8 billion in 1991, for the first year-to-year decline since 1978.

With a guaranteed income from the federal government and the illusion of improving loan portfolios, the banks have been free to rush headlong into the derivatives markets.

According to Salomon Brothers the U.S. commercial banks' notional principal holdings of derivatives instruments jumped from \$2.2 trillion in 1986, to \$8.3 trillion in 1989, and \$15.2 trillion in 1991. As of June 30, 1992, Salomon reported, Citicorp had a total notional value of derivatives instruments of \$1,426 billion, seven times its \$213 billion balance-sheet assets; Chemical Banking Corp. had \$1,296 billion of derivatives, or nine times its \$140 billion in assets; J.P. Morgan had \$1,014 billion, or ten times its \$103 billion in assets; Chase Manhattan had \$837 billion, or nine times its \$96 billion in assets, Bankers Trust had \$958 billion, or 13 times its \$72 billion assets; First Chicago had \$387 billion, or eight times its \$49 billion in assets; and Continental Banking had \$136 billion, or ten times its \$14 billion in assets. BankAmerica was conservative by comparison, with \$795 billion in derivatives, or just four times its \$181 billion in assets.

Overall, banks reported securities gains of \$4 billion in 1992, compared to \$3 billion in 1991.

#### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PATH TO PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today, June 10, 1963, the young President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, delivered one of his most important and greatest speeches at my alma mater, American University. With the eloquence that only John F. Kennedy could deliver, Mr. Speaker, he outlined a path to peace centered around nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask that the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] honoring this occasion and sharing his own thoughts on nuclear disarmament be introduced into the RECORD following my remarks. My colleague, Mr. KENNEDY, continues to carry today the torch of peace which his late uncle lit.

No doubt this was a difficult and risky political speech for President Kennedy. The cold war was raging. The United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were engaged in a massive arms buildup. The Earth was a chessboard. Both countries made foreign policy based on the moves of the other country. Nations were pawns of the two great powers. Those countries with special chess moves were those who had some form of a nuclear capability.

Mr. Speaker, no country had more moves, more bombs, more delivery capability, more killing power, than the United States and the U.S.S.R. Might was measured in number of bombs in the nuclear stockpile and their accuracy. At the same time thought was given, even urged, by the two superpowers that nuclear proliferation was

not good for the world order. Nations were encouraged not to develop a nuclear capability.

□ 2040

Thoughts and words were forming that in the midst of the arms race, the two great powers should take steps to end the entire arms race, especially between the two great powers.

President Kennedy took that first great step in 1963, 30 years ago today. At that time the United States and the U.S.S.R. were still conducting nuclear tests above ground, atmospheric tests, as they were called.

The U.S. tests were conducted above ground at the Nevada Test Site. I visited that test site as a Member of Congress. I even spent the night there. I received all kinds of briefings and a tour of the current test sites and how they do it, now conducted, of course, underground in tunnels a mile and a half into the ground in very deep wells.

I also toured a historic site, the flats where above ground nuclear bombs were detonated and tested. One can still find wooden bleacher seats where VIPs and the media could view a detonation, like a grand holiday. Imagine. Imagine the stupidity.

Also at that time citizens of the world were calling for an end to testing. Not only because of the human health hazard from these atmospheric tests, but also as a first step to ending the nuclear arms race.

It is in this context, 30 years ago, that President Kennedy took this bold step, seeking an end to atmospheric tests, driving them underground. But that was significant progress at that time.

Thirty years later we are still testing underground in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD President Kennedy's entire speech, but let me recall some of the words from President Kennedy.

It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the allied air forces in the Second World War, it makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

Quoting further:

There is no single simple key to this peace, no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of manifestations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation.

Quoting further:

We have also been talking in Geneva about other first step measures of arms control designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risk of accidental war. Our primary long-range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament, designed to take place by stages—stages—permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which

would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920s.

The President further stated:

The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight, yet where a fresh start is badly needed, is in a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty, so near and yet so far, would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security. It would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require a steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

Then the President outlined and stated his two important decisions. One was that he was asking Chairman Khrushchev and Prime Minister McMillan to have discussions in Moscow, looking for an early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. To show his good faith, he proposed and said that the United States would not conduct atmospheric tests, so long as the other states do not do so.

It was brilliant. The President said:

We will not be the first to resume. We will not be the first to resume atmospheric testing.

Finally our President said, in closing, confident and unafraid, "We labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation, but toward a strategy of peace."

Thirty years later, Mr. Speaker, there is no cold war, and there is no Soviet Union. The Great Bear is dead. Let us deal with it.

There is a new threat, however, with nuclear bombs, yes, of course. And this threat we must deal with today. Yes, in the next few weeks.

The question is no longer how many nuclear bombs are in the stockpile of any nation nor how accurate those bombs are. The threat to the world, the threat to every American citizen, is whether any nation has even one nuclear bomb. One bomb, regardless of delivery capability, regardless of accuracy, one is enough.

Many nations today still fear the United States. Why? Because the Soviet Union no longer exists. No one great power exists to check the overwhelming power of the United States on this world chessboard on which we still live. Thus, as the argument proceeds, they must have at least one bomb. Many little nations with one bomb.

Imagine. Recently I had a meeting with the American Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. He says, "Your law says you can test 15 more times. So what if we test once? So what?"

Many little nations with one bomb, one baby bomb. Imagine, Korea, Pakistan, India, Iraq, Libya, Israel.

The world is at a new crossroads. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a new,

young, bright President, and he will soon make a decision, a decision as profound, yea, maybe even more so, certainly as historic, certainly with wider ramifications, than President Kennedy's decision 30 years ago today.

Editorial writers recently throughout the United States are giving our young President advice on this matter. This issue has not gone unnoticed in those who have followed this issue through the years, those who understand history, those who understand the new world order and fears.

To help President Clinton with his decision, these editorial writers have written. Let me take a moment to quote from a few and maybe even comment.

□ 2050

The Statesman's-Journal, my hometown newspaper in Salem, OR, said on June 10, just today:

Resuming nuclear tests at the Nevada Testing Site makes no sense, unless you want to maintain salaries and good jobs for government scientists in bomb-making labs or unless you want to create more nuclear disorder in the world.

It goes on to say:

A world that finally may have achieved relief from the threat of nuclear war should not have to live with a new escalation of tensions from a new threat. If the United States resumes testing, we could become that new threat.

Let us talk about the testing labs for a moment, what I call this American death squad of scientists, who relish new ways of destroying planet Earth, using their great minds and intellect that God gave them that probably the American educational system nurtured that they use in their testing labs, this evil purveying of science.

Yes, these lab scientists are significant. And quite frankly, they are very powerful. They are very powerful. Though they are out West, they are very powerful here in Washington, DC.

In reading the history of disarmament, you see their fingers designing the bombs, looking for more ways to destroy people, not just buildings, not just plant life, not just a military target, but every living person on Earth. That is what occurs in these testing labs, and these people use their education and their talents and their creativity to design death.

That is their job. They enjoy it. They live it. They come to Congress every year and ask for more money.

Now they are afraid, because we told them last year, we stood up to them. And we said, "We will not test after 1996, unless some other nation tests."

And after the law went into effect, they scurried about, saying, "We have got to reorganize. We have got to go to the new President and convince him and his administration of the need for continued testing of the ability to come up with new ways to destroy every living person on Earth."

The American death squad is alive and well. They are powerful. They almost convinced the staffs of the administration recently to propose testing to the President beyond 1996. Enough political heat was applied such that it is our understanding that that will not be one of the options presented to the President.

It is a hollow victory, because it is a victory we already won. But these folks want to continue their job of creating death. So they are still about. There is mischief in the air, and it originates from these testing labs.

The mischief here in Washington, pervades the air. There is no question about it. There is no excuse for this.

The Oregonian newspaper, May 14:

Clinton has an opportunity to assure a safer and saner world by rejecting this last gasp of the nuclear arms industry and getting on with the work of taking nonproliferation a big step closer to reality.

The New York Times, "Play Taps for Nuclear Tests," it begins:

The nuclear arms race has run its course, but the nuclear laboratories and the Pentagon don't seem to know it. Rattling windows in Nevada to warn the world that Washington still has the bomb seems particularly perverse, when the U.S. is trying to persuade nuclear have-nots to stay out of the bomb-making business. True, banning tests won't guarantee that proliferation can be prevented. States like Pakistan have developed nuclear arms without testing them. But a test ban will help stigmatize the bomb.

Once again, the New York Times knows and recognizes the power of the nuclear laboratories in this whole political decision.

Finally, the Washington Post, May 18:

In fact, no other decision serves the national interest as well as an immediate and permanent halt to all testing. Considerations of safety, reliability and development are not foolish and irrelevant. But they can be dealt with without testing subverting the overwhelming purpose of discouraging the spread of nuclear arms. A test is more than a test: It is a spectacular announcement that nuclear weapons are important, useful and appropriate instruments of national power. If the nuclear great power says so, who are would-be nuclear countries to say no? Les Aspin, speaking a few months before he became Defense Secretary, said: "International cooperation is at the core of nonproliferation efforts, and that cooperation is going to be difficult if the United States continues insisting on nuclear testing." He got it just right.

Mr. Speaker, today, 30 years later from President Kennedy's speech, we wait with apprehension, anxiety, and hope, for a report has gone to the President outlining various options for the future of testing in this United States. The window is open for only a few more years, and the issue before the President is whether to test at all.

If so, under law, American law, he is allowed only 15 more tests relating to safety and reliability only. And as the one paper suggested, scientists have said repeatedly that both safety and re-

liability tests can be done without detonating a bomb but with computer modulating and other forms of scientific advancements that we have today.

What are the options that went to the President's desk, that sit there waiting for a decision? Peace, a giant step toward nonproliferation or another mirage of peace perpetrated by the testing labs and those who make their careers and money and reputation and who, with all the gluttony of a pig in a cornfield, anxiously await an excuse to test another bomb?

History, the history of nuclear weapons on Earth started with America. And I do not debate at this point the arguments back then at this time. But history, will it end by the actions of an American, one American, our President, Bill Clinton? I do not know. I do not know.

The reality of today, Mr. Speaker, is that for the first time since 1944, a period of 48 years, this Nation will not have detonated a nuclear bomb for full calendar year. Because of the various reporting requirements in the law which we passed this last year in Congress, it will be impossible to test a nuclear bomb in calendar year 1993.

What a historic occasion. For the first time in 48 years, this Nation will go a full calendar year without detonating a nuclear bomb, no nuclear explosion for 1 year, and we will continue to be militarily the strongest, second to none, yea, I even say, the second and third place in military might in this world.

□ 2100

The question this raises for President Clinton, therefore, is will he become known in history as the President who resumes this Nation's dance with death and starts detonating nuclear bombs again? Will President Clinton flip the switch and detonate nuclear bombs? What will history say of this little flick of a switch?

I trust the President will give this decision his utmost consideration. This is, without question, one of the most important decisions he could ever make as a President. Were he to flip a switch, the chain reaction he would begin is not limited to the nuclear chain reaction that unleashes the single most powerful destructive force created by mankind. He will set off another nuclear chain reaction.

Other nations, France, could detonate a nuclear bomb again. They have suggested so. Russia, perhaps the Ukraine, could again demonstrate its nuclear prowess. The President's flip of a switch could give the green light to China to detonate another nuclear bomb.

What will Pakistan, India, and other nations with a nuclear capability do? Today we have a world pause in the detonation of nuclear bombs. Will President Clinton break that pause, or

will he turn the pause into a policy of cessation? What a grand, peaceful opportunity for our new President. By not acting, by not flipping the switch, he could make history. By not flipping the switch he will make peace. He will make our world safer, safer than it has ever been since prior to 1945. He will restore sanity to the world, a saneness we have not had for nearly 50 years, 50 years.

Will he flip the switch? I plead and pray that he will not. I hope the President will do as John F. Kennedy did, which he ordered, which he ordered as President with respect to the atmospheric tests.

Mr. Speaker, I remind us of President Kennedy's words 30 years ago today: "We will not be the first to resume."

What will President Clinton do? He will do only that which he truly wants to do.

I include for the RECORD the remarks of President Kennedy:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN WASHINGTON, JUNE 10, 1963

President Anderson, members of the faculty, board of trustees, distinguished guests, my old colleague, Senator Bob Byrd, who has earned his degree through many years of attending night law school, while I am earning mine in the next 30 minutes, ladies and gentlemen:

It is with great pride that I participate in this ceremony of the American University, sponsored by the Methodist Church, founded by Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, and first opened by President Woodrow Wilson in 1914. This is a young and growing university, but it has already fulfilled Bishop Hurst's enlightened hope for the study of history and public affairs in a city devoted to the making of history and to the conduct of the public's business. By sponsoring this institution of higher learning for all who wish to learn, whatever their color or their creed, the Methodists of this area and the Nation deserve the nation's thanks, and I commend all those who are today graduating.

Professor Woodrow Wilson once said that every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time, and I am confident that the men and women who carry the honor of graduating from this institution will continue to give from their lives, from their talents, a high measure of public service and public support.

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university," wrote John Masefield, in his tribute to English universities—and his words are equally true today. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens and ivied walls. He admired the splendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was "a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see."

I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables

men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles—which can only destroy and never create—is not the only, much less than most efficient, means of assuring peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them to do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a Nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

First: Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept this view. Our problems are manmade—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again.

I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream. I do not deny the values of hopes and dreams but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are with families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may see, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

Second: Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. It is discouraging to think that their leaders may actually believe what their propagandists write. It is discouraging to read a recent authoritative Soviet text on Military Strategy and find, on page after page, wholly baseless and incredible claims—such as the allegation that "American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars . . . that there is a very real threat of a preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union . . . [and that] the political aims of the American imperialists are to enslave economically and politically the European and other capitalist countries . . . [and] to achieve world domination . . . by means of aggressive wars."

Truly, as it was written long ago: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth." Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements—to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning—a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible, and communication as nothing more than an exchange of threats.

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.

Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique, among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of this country east of Chicago.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironic but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours. And even in the cold war, which brings burdens and dangers to so many countries, including this Nation's closest allies—

our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting massive sums of money to weapons that could be better devoted to combating ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

Third: Let us reexamine our attitude toward the cold war, remembering that we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different.

We must, therefore, persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us. We must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace. Above all, while defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy—or of a collective death-wish for the world.

To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility.

For we can seek a relaxation of tensions without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute. We do not need to jam foreign broadcasts out of fear our faith will be eroded. We are unwilling to impose our system on any unwilling people—but we are willing and able to engage in peaceful competition with any people on earth.

Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument for peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can finally be abolished.

At the same time we seek to keep peace inside the non-Communist world, where many nations, all of them our friends, are divided over issues which weaken Western unity, which invite Communist intervention or which threaten to erupt into war. Our efforts in West New Guinea, in the Congo, in the

Middle East, and in the Indian subcontinent, have been persistent and patient despite criticism from both sides. We have also tried to set an example for others—by seeking to adjust small but significant differences with our own closest neighbors in Mexico and Canada.

Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because our concern and theirs substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but also because their interests and ours converge.

Our interests converge, however, not only in defending the frontiers of freedom, but in pursuing the paths of peace. It is our hope—and the purpose of allied policies—to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future, so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others. The Communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others is the primary cause of world tension today. For there can be no doubt that, if all nations could refrain from interfering in the self-determination of others, the peace would be much more assured.

This will require a new effort to achieve world law—a new context for world discussions. It will require increased understanding between the Soviets and ourselves. And increased understanding will require increased contact and communication. One step in this direction is the proposed arrangement for a direct line between Moscow and Washington, to avoid on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreadings of the other's actions which might occur at a time of crisis.

We have also been talking in Geneva about other first-step measures of arms control, designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risks of accidental war. Our primary long-range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920's. It has been urgently sought by the past three administrations. And however dim the prospects may be today, we intend to continue this effort—to continue it in order that all countries, including our own, can better grasp what the problems and possibilities of disarmament are.

The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight, yet where a fresh start is badly needed, is in a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty, so near and yet so far, would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1993, the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

I am taking this opportunity, therefore, to announce two important decisions in this regard.

First: Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

Second: To make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter, I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states do not do so. We will not be the first to resume. Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty, but I hope it will help us achieve one. Nor would such a treaty be a substitute for disarmament, but I hope it will help us achieve it.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us examine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives—as many of you who are graduating today will have a unique opportunity to do, by serving without pay in the Peace Corps abroad or in the proposed National Service Corps here at home.

But wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because freedom is incomplete.

It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government—local, State, and National—to provide and protect that freedom for all of our citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections of this country to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence?

While we proceed to safeguard our national interests, let us also safeguard human interests. And the elimination of war and arms is clearly in the interest of both. No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at the John M. Reeves Athletic Field on the campus of

American University after being awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws. In his opening words he referred to Hurst R. Anderson, president of the university, and Robert C. Byrd, U.S. Senator from West Virginia.

#### STOP NUCLEAR TESTING AND NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

(By Representative Joseph P. Kennedy II)

Thirty years ago today, President John F. Kennedy captured the world's imagination with a visionary speech at the American University.

Some six months after the Cuban Missile Crisis had brought the United States to the brink of nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, he appealed for an end to the Cold War and the nuclear arms race.

President Kennedy announced that talks would commence for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban—the first step in slowing the build-up of atomic weapons.

We also pledged that the United States would halt atmospheric nuclear testing as long as other countries followed suit.

While a comprehensive ban was not at hand, the Limited Test Ban Treaty was signed on August 5, 1963 and ratified October 7.

Thirty years after President Kennedy's historic speech, President Clinton should seize upon these landmark anniversaries to make progress toward the comprehensive test ban, bringing our nation and the world ever closer to the day when we can live without fears of nuclear destruction.

The urgency of this matter cannot be underestimated: A growing number of countries have gained nuclear capability in recent years while other nations are on the threshold of adding atomic weapons to their arsenal.

The United States should take a bold first step toward ending nuclear proliferation by announcing that we will forswear nuclear tests of any kind unless another country conducts them first.

A "no first test" policy would save hundreds of millions of dollars annually in Department of Energy testing costs and avoid extensive environmental degradation.

More importantly, it would be a dramatic but responsible step to affirm U.S. leadership in the effort to curb the development of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction. Some thirty countries possess or seek such weapons. Stopping the proliferation of these weapons is perhaps the most pressing security agenda of the decades ahead.

Last year, Congress passed a nine-month moratorium on nuclear testing, putting the U.S. in the company of Russia and France.

The U.S. testing moratorium expires July 1, 1993. In the coming weeks the White House will report to the Congress on how they intend to pursue a Comprehensive Test Ban that would end all testing by September 30, 1996.

Last year's moratorium law would allow the Administration, after delivering their report, to conduct as many as five tests a year up to the September 1996 end date. The Administration is reportedly considering a proposal to conduct ten tests during that period.

There is growing sentiment in Congress for a more inspired course. The United States should not be the first to break the testing moratorium. We should urge others to demonstrate similar restraint. We should open vigorous multilateral negotiations directed toward a comprehensive test ban. In the wake of the Vancouver Summit agreement

by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin that test ban talks should begin soon, it is apparent that the Administration is taking important first steps toward these negotiations.

A "no first test policy" would reduce the chance of testing by current nuclear powers, increase U.S. leverage—by the force of example—in consultations over extending and strengthening the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995 and acknowledge the scientific reality that little is to be gained from further nuclear testing.

Our global security interests are best enhanced not by testing but by pushing for a more vigorous non-proliferation policy.

The Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan inherited nuclear weapons as a result of the break-up of the Soviet Union. North Korea, Iran and Iraq fall in the category of threshold states poised to join the ranks of nuclear powers.

Our efforts to end nuclear proliferation would be weakened by the message that resumed testing would send out to these and other nations.

President Clinton has spoken forcibly about the threat of nuclear proliferation.

Addressing the same concerns, now-Secretary of Defense Les Aspin told the 1992 commencement audience at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "We've been preaching nonproliferation to other nations, but we haven't been willing to give much on our own nuclear program. International cooperation is at the core of nonproliferation efforts and that cooperation is going to be difficult if the United States insists on continued nuclear testing."

Concerned about the impact of that contradictory message, 50 Members of Congress wrote to President Clinton in May urging that the United States not be the first nation to break the current testing moratorium.

The signatories noted that future tests allowed under current law are unnecessary as the military has stated that it will not incorporate into our nuclear arsenal the safety features to be verified by this testing. They are unnecessary and prohibitively expensive.

The Clinton Administration, committed to the end of the arms race, can and should use the upcoming anniversaries as an opportunity to lead the way to a more secure world.

Thirty years ago, President Kennedy looked forward to a day of international cooperation. "Genuine peace," he said, "must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenges of each new generation."

This year can be the first since 1959 to pass without the detonation of a single nuclear weapon. No single act would better demonstrate the leadership needed in this generation to face the challenges of nuclear proliferation than a commitment to extend the moratorium on all nuclear weapons tests.

[From the Statesman's Journal, June 10, 1993]

#### THERE'S NO EXCUSE FOR U.S. TO RESUME NUCLEAR TESTING

Thirty years ago today, President Kennedy announced that the United States no longer would conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere. He took that step to show this nation's good faith as it negotiated with the Soviet Union for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

That was then; this is now. Today, President Clinton may be about ready to agree to take a step backward and resume nuclear

testing, not atmospheric—we've advanced too far in good sense for that—but underground. Resuming nuclear tests at the Nevada testing site makes no sense, unless you want to maintain salaries and good jobs for government scientists in bomb-making labs, or unless you want to create more nuclear disorder in the world.

If the United States resumes underground nuclear tests, so will other nuclear countries. They've already said so. They won't dare be left behind in the race to develop better and more deadly nuclear bombs and warheads. The only action nuclear nations should take today is to eliminate the nuclear weapons they already have (we have 10,500 warheads in stockpile and 6,000 awaiting dismantling) and to discourage smaller nations from building their own. If we resume tests, we also will destroy our hopes of persuading these wannabe nuclear powers to give up their nuclear programs.

By the end of June, Clinton is expected to get a recommendation from advisers urging him to resume testing; and he is unlikely to reject it. That is, he won't reject it unless the nation rises up and helps him say no. If public opinion fails to sway the president, it is up to Congress to adopt a resolution of disapproval. That will be harder to obtain.

Clinton must hear from his public, especially those in Oregon, where Sen. Mark Hatfield and Rep. Mike Kopetski led the long battle that achieved the temporary test moratorium last year.

A world that finally may have achieved relief from the threat of nuclear war should not have to live with a new escalation of tensions from a new threat. If the United States resumes testing, we become that new threat.

[From the Oregonian, May 14, 1993]

#### LET'S REALLY STOP TESTING

It would be little short of crazy for the U.S. government to extend nuclear testing beyond the Sept. 30, 1996, deadline that Congress has set for having a comprehensive multilateral test ban in place.

But that's what the Departments of Defense and Energy have recommended to President Clinton. They want an exemption for warheads of 1 kiloton or less—about one-tenth the size of the Hiroshima bomb. In other words, to keep right on testing well beyond the deadline as long as the bang doesn't get too loud.

Clinton, who supported a comprehensive test ban during his presidential campaign, should reject this proposal out of hand.

Not only does it make a mockery of congressional determination to end testing once and for all, but it also suggests to known nuclear powers and to smaller countries with simmering nuclear ambitions that the world's last superpower wants nonproliferation only for others—not for itself.

There is suspicion on Capitol Hill that this shortsighted proposal is an attempt by the nation's nuclear-weapons makers and keepers to perpetuate jobs and agency budgets instead of facing up to a radically changing post-Cold War world. If so, it's a dangerous game they're playing.

To their credit, Sen. Mark O. Hatfield, R-Ore., Reps. Elizabeth Furse, Mike Kopetski and Ron Wyden, D-Ore., and 34 other members of Congress have fired off a letter of protest to Anthony Lake, Clinton's national security adviser. Also among the signers is Rep. Jolene Unsoeld, D-Wash.

Hatfield and Kopetski sponsored legislation last year that established a nine-month moratorium on U.S. testing; authorized up to 15 more underground tests before Sept. 30,

1996; and established that date as the deadline for having a test-ban treaty in place.

The law includes an important safety valve—if any other nation detonates a test after September 1996, the United States is free to resume as well.

Now Hatfield, Kopetski and others are marshaling support in this Congress for concurrent resolutions urging Clinton to accelerate work toward a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

As Kopetski pointed out in a House speech Tuesday, it looks as if 1993 will be the first calendar year since 1944 that the United States will not have detonated at least one nuclear explosion. That's real progress.

The French and the Russians, both of whom have voluntarily suspended testing, are now saying they won't resume if we don't. More progress.

Clinton has an opportunity to assure a safer and saner world by rejecting this last gasp of the nuclear-arms industry and getting on with the work of taking non-proliferation a big step closer to reality.

[From the New York Times]

#### PLAY TAPS FOR NUCLEAR TESTS

The nuclear arms race has run its course, but the nuclear laboratories and the Pentagon don't seem to know it. They want to resume testing this year. Test blasts may have made sense when it was important to deter a Soviet attack. But in today's changed climate they would set a terrible example for would-be proliferators.

A group of 23 Democratic senators recognize this dangerous anachronism. They've urged President Clinton to announce that the U.S. will not be the first to break the current moratorium on tests that is now being observed as well by Russia and France. Resumption would discourage negotiation of a truly comprehensive ban on nuclear tests to replace the moratorium.

Last year Congress instructed the President not to resume testing until July 1, and then only after he submitted plans for negotiating a comprehensive test ban by 1996. The bomb-builders want to conduct 15 more tests between now and 1996. They would also trifle with the law by negotiating a treaty that would permit one-kiloton underground testing forever. That's not what Congress meant by a comprehensive test ban.

Those who want to resume testing say they'll oppose ratification of a comprehensive test ban. But what exactly would 15 more tests accomplish? The labs say the tests are needed to make nuclear warheads reliable and safe. But the U.S. has other ways to assure that its warheads work, including computer simulations. And why test new, supposedly safer warheads that the Navy and Air Force say they have no intention of acquiring?

Rattling windows in Nevada to warn the world that Washington still has the Bomb seems particularly perverse when the U.S. is trying to persuade nuclear have-nots to stay out of the bomb-making business. True, banning tests won't guarantee that proliferation can be prevented. States like Pakistan have developed nuclear arms without testing them. But a test ban will help stigmatize the Bomb.

It will also help muster international support for strengthening the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty when it comes up for extension in 1995. Nuclear have-nots like Mexico say they'll oppose a long-term extension of the treaty and won't tighten trade in components and materials unless nuclear nations stop testing.

The 23 senators have the right idea; a no-first-test declaration by President Clinton will prolong the moratorium on testing by others and clear the air for speedy negotiation of a comprehensive test ban. And that will help mobilize political support for stopping the spread of nuclear arms.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1993]

#### AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTING

It is the accepted wisdom that with the ending of the Cold War, nuclear nonproliferation has replaced strategic deterrence as the urgent center of American nuclear concern. The fear of weapons coming into more hands, and less responsible hands, has displaced the old apprehensions of Kremlin threat. But while nonproliferation as an idea is unchallenged, as a reality it is not yet fully knit into American policy. Nowhere in this truer, and potentially more mischievous, than in the matter of nuclear testing.

Congress imposed a nine-month testing moratorium on President Bush last year; it ends on July 1. The measure was part of a package that permitted the conduct of up to 15 more underground test over the following three years while the American government sought to negotiate a worldwide ban. The immediate question before President Clinton is whether the United States should use some or all of those 15 permitted tests by 1996. The deeper question is whether it should then accept a total test cutoff. Within the executive branch powerful voices have argued for continued testing—to make sure old weapons are safe and reliable and to develop small new weapons. These are the rationales for a proposal to permit small (up to one kiloton) tests on an indefinite basis after 1996. President Clinton, who spoke of a comprehensive ban (but in several tones) during his campaign, has yet to announce how he will come down.

In fact, no other decision serves the national interest as well as an immediate and permanent halt to all testing. Considerations of safety, reliability and development are not foolish and irrelevant. But they can be dealt with without testing subverting the overwhelming purpose of discouraging the spread of nuclear arms. A test is more than a test: It is a spectacular announcement that nuclear weapons are important, useful and appropriate instruments of national power. If the nuclear great power says so, who are would-be nuclear countries to say no?

Les Aspin, speaking a few months before he became defense secretary, said: "International cooperation is at the core of nonproliferation efforts, and that cooperation is going to be difficult if the United States continues insisting on nuclear testing." He got it just right.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BATEMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of attending hearings held in his district by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business;

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business;

Mr. SISISKY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business;

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes each day, on July 1 and 21.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes today, in lieu of 60 minutes previously ordered.

Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes each day, on June 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, and 30.

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 60 minutes each day, on June 10, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29, and 30, and July 1.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROGERS in three instances.

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. KING.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. EVERETT.

Mrs. BENTLEY in two instances.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. TALENT.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. TEJEDA.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
Mr. COPPERSMITH.  
Mr. FORD of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. HOLDEN.

Mr. BREWSTER.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. KLEIN in two instances.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN in two instances.

Mr. MANTON.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. KOPETSKI.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. STRICKLAND.

Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. TOWNS in 15 instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. MINGE.

Mr. HOAGLAND.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

#### SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 535. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution welcoming the XLVI Congress of the Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers (CIOR), commending the Department of Defense and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States for hosting the XLVI Congress of the CIOR, and urging other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate with and assist the XLVI Congress of the CIOR to carry out its activities and programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 890. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to improve the procedures for treating unclaimed insured deposits, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1993, at noon.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them for official foreign travel during the fourth quarter of 1992 and the first quarter of 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Anita R. Brown	10/12	10/17	Costa Rica		1,008.00						1,008.00
Commercial transportation							596.00				596.00
Joan T. Rose	11/21	11/25	Korea		729.00						729.00
Commercial transportation							3,114.00				3,114.00
Hon. E de la Garza	12/13	12/14	Belgium		663.00						663.00
	12/14	12/16	Switzerland		442.50						442.50
Commercial transportation							5,073.00				5,073.00
Marshall Livingston	12/13	12/14	Belgium		663.00						663.00
	12/14	12/16	Switzerland		442.50						442.50
Commercial transportation							5,490.70				5,490.70
<b>Committee total</b>					<b>3,948.00</b>		<b>14,273.70</b>				<b>18,221.70</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E de la GARZA, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1993.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. E de la Garza	2/7	2/8	Mexico		370.78						370.78
Commercial transportation							1,068.45				1,068.45
Xavier Equihua	2/7	2/9	Mexico		725.45						725.45
Commercial transportation					933.95						933.95
<b>Committee total</b>					<b>2,030.18</b>		<b>1,068.45</b>				<b>3,098.63</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E de la GARZA, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1993.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Greg Laughlin	2/6	2/8	Turkey								
	2/8	2/12	Azerbaijan								
	2/12	2/13	Russia		950.00		4,438.15				5,388.15
Hon. Barbara-Rose Collins	4/6	4/7	India								
	4/7	4/10	Nepal		300.00						300.00
	4/10	4/15	India		1,140.00		7,720.45				8,860.45
<b>Committee total</b>					<b>2,390.00</b>		<b>12,158.60</b>				<b>14,548.60</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

NORMAN Y. MINETA, Apr. 29, 1993.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1361. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the report of expenditures of appropriations during the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 162b; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1362. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on the Department of Energy's program activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1363. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting FmHA single family housing legal services contracting activities, during fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1480(d); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1364. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the administration of the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1719a; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1365. A letter from the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting on behalf of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the staff report; to the

Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1366. A letter from the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting a report pursuant to section 1206 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1367. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Capital Construction Change Orders and Cost Overruns Within the Water and Sewer Utility Administration," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1368. A letter from the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting notification

that the Council is choosing an interim chairman; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1369. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—International Education Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1370. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a copy of the recommendations of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council for the coordination of Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5616(c); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1371. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on the Youth Conservation Corps Program in the Department for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1705; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1372. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on procedures for overseeing the expenditures by States and territories of Stripper Well and Exxon funds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1373. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-18), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1374. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Peter W. Galbraith, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1375. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Jean Kennedy Smith, of New York, to be Ambassador to Ireland and members of her family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1376. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the quarterly update of the report required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1377. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a progress report of United States efforts in Somalia (H. Doc. No. 103-98); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1378. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of S. 214, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1379. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1380. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the semiannual report of the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1381. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department's inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, together with the Secretary's report on audit followup, for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1382. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1383. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, together with the Department's semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1384. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in April 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1385. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1386. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Semiannual Management Report for the 6-month period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1387. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993, on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1388. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (96 Stat. 750, 102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1389. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, and the Department's management report on actions taken in response to audit recommendations, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526, 2640); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1390. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1391. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1392. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of

the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1393. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1394. A letter from the President, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1395. A letter from the Chairman, National Science Board, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1396. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, and management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1397. A letter from the Acting Director, Peace Corps of the United States, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1398. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1399. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1400. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, and management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1401. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on audit management and resolution, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1402. A letter from the Executive Director, U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting the annual audit and activities report for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 382a(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1403. A letter from the Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-12, section 3(a)(11) (103 Stat. 29); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1404. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a

copy of the Board's submission to OMB regarding S. 857, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1903(b)(7); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1405. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the Department's Metric Transition Program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1406. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds under the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2201. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to the prevention and control of injuries (Rept. 103-119); to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program of grants relating to preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancer; with an amendment (Rept. 103-120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2204. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program for the prevention of disabilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2205. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to trauma care (Rept. 103-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of California: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2200. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 193. A Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-124). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2295. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1340. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than June 15, 1993.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 2366. A bill to confirm the Federal relationship with the Jena Band of Choctaw Indians of Louisiana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana: H.R. 2367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to provide incentives for certain medical practitioners to practice in rural areas, to provide for the creation of medical savings accounts, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MACHTELEY, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 2368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for expenses of providing care for certain elderly individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUCHER: H.R. 2369. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1863, incorporating the National Academy of Sciences, to authorize the Federal Government to indemnify the academy against liability for certain pecuniary losses to third persons arising from projects and activities undertaken by the academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss COLLINS of Michigan: H.R. 2370. A bill to prevent the stalking of Federal officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE: H.R. 2371. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the previously existing suspension of duty on fresh, chilled, or frozen brussels sprouts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2372. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the previously existing suspension of duty on 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARDEN: H.R. 2373. A bill to authorize the payment of servicemen's group life insurance in accordance with title 38, United States Code, as amended effective on December 1, 1992, in the case of certain members of the Armed Forces killed in an aircraft accident at approximately 10:00 p.m. on November 30, 1992; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma: H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to ensure the continued application of the act's antifraud and antimanipulation protections; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ,

Ms. WATERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend for 10 years the authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide priority health care to veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation or to Agent Orange; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 2376. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationships of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians as distinct federally recognized Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. LEVY):

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that future increases in the monthly amount paid by the State of New York to blind disabled veterans shall be excluded from the determination of annual income for purposes of payment of pension by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANCASTER (for himself, Mr. BREUTER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. PETE GREN of Texas, Mr. MINGE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 2378. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to increase the national maximum speed limit on any highway which is located outside an urbanized area with a population of 50,000 or more, which is constructed to interstate standards, and which is not connected to the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LEWIS of California (for himself, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2379. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI: H.R. 2380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax on the transportation of passengers by water, to impose an excise tax on certain containers used to import or export commercial cargo, and to use the revenues from such taxes for a modified operating differential subsidy program under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2381. A bill to direct the President to encourage the independent states of the former Soviet Union to provide reimbursement to the United States for economic and development assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 2382. A bill to prohibit the use of bovine somatotropin in intrastate, interstate, or international commerce until equivalent marketing practices for the use of bovine somatotropin are established with the marketing practices of other major milk or dairy products exporting nations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE of Virginia:

H.R. 2383. A bill to extend until January 1, 1997, the previously existing suspension of duty on anthraquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2384. A bill to extend until January 1, 1997, the previously existing suspension of duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2385. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself and Mr. COYNE):

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Medicare reimbursement for nurse practitioners, clinical nurse specialists, and certified nurse midwives, to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Medicare reimbursement for physician assistants, to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. UNSOELD:

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a preference in favor of service programs and projects conducted in areas adversely affected by Federal actions related to the management of Federal lands that result in significant regional job losses and economic dislocation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that future increases in the monthly amount paid by the State of New York to blind disabled veterans shall be excluded from the determination of annual income for purposes of payment of pension by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2390. A bill to establish the Financial Advisory Board, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Education and Labor, and Government Operations.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Women's Bureau; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELIFF (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. BALLENGER):

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate a 5-percent investment tax credit, to reduce capital gains taxes, to provide certain tax incentives for investments on closed defense bases, and to provide for the use of certain defense funds for the provision of services to certain displaced defense workers receiving assistance under the Job Training Partnership Act; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Armed Services.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. COX, Mr. PACKARD,

Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. GOSS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. AL-LARD, Mr. KIM, Mr. HANSEN, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 2393. A bill to repeal the act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MEKE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs of research with respect to women and cases of infection with the human immunodeficiency virus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding women and the human immunodeficiency virus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 2396. A bill to increase access of State child support enforcement agencies to certain financial information of noncustodial parents, and to encourage States to improve their enforcement of child support obligations; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 2399. A bill to provide for the settlement of land claims of the Catawba Tribe of Indians in the State of South Carolina and the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with the tribe, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to prepare annual assessments of the progress being made by the independent states of the former Soviet Union and the Baltic States in establishing a free market economy, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FISH, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. PARKER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. MALONEY, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MACTHLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LAZIO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. QUILLEN):

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 7, 1993, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1993 and July 2, 1994 as "National Literacy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. LAROCOCO):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the President convene a White House Conference on Tourism to recognize travel and tourism in America as a major economic force, providing tax revenue for thousands of cities, counties, and States, income for hundreds of thousands of business firms, and contributing to the Nation's growth an economic stability; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. STARK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mrs. MINK):

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution concerning the establishment of a South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. KING, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KYL):

H. Res. 194. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the proposed tax increase on Social Security benefits should not be enacted and if enacted should be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

167. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to the "Freedom of Choice Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

168. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Federal tax laws, policies and programs which have the effect of encouraging U.S. industries to relocate in foreign countries; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALL of Ohio:

H.R. 2397. A bill for the relief of Amanda E. Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 2398. A bill for the relief of Peter Short, Hazel Rosemary Short, Lee Adam Short, Dean Short, and Lynsey-Ann Short; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. BARLOW and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 59: Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 65: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 81: Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. PACKARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 125: Mr. SCOTT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. FURSE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 127: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 133: Mr. SWETT, Mr. WALSH, and Ms. MALONEY.

H.R. 173: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 214: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 299: Mr. WELDON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 301: Mr. HERGER and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 313: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 322: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 326: Ms. DANNER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 349: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 410: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 419: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 466: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. COLLINS of GEORGIA.

H.R. 493: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 495: Ms. LONG.

H.R. 509: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 513: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 520: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. REED, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 544: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 546: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 549: Mr. PAXON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 553: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 591: Mr. COPPERSMITH.

H.R. 615: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 630: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 647, Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 649: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 697: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 767: Mr. REGULA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 778: Mr. SHARP, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 789: Mr. CLINGER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WATT, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 818: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 821: Mr. DELAY and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 872: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 886: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 897: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 937: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 962: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. DUNN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. COX, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 975: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 977: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 982: Mr. LEVY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. BEVILL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1009: Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 1012: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. ORTON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1036: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1042: Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1043: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1048: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1078: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1080: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1081: Mr. SHAYS and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1082: Mr. SHAYS and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1087: Mr. HAYES and Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 1091: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1154: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1200: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1275: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1276: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1322: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1352: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1380: Mr. RANGEL, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1442: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 1455: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1464: Mr. WYNN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. SCHROEDER,

Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1475: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1504: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1519: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DELAY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1520: Mr. HOYER, Mr. MFUME, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1534: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1544: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1551: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1574: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1608: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEAL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1624: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 1671: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 1697: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1710: Mr. LEVY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1733: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1734: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STOKES, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1749: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1775: Mrs. MINK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1786: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 1827: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1881: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1885: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FISH, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1886: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MALONEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LOWEY, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1898: Mr. LEVY, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 1899: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1944: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1966: Mr. DURBIN and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1967: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1969: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1970: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1981: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 2001: Mr. VENTO, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2019: Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2050: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. POSHARD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MANN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. EWING, Mr. LaROCCO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2121: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PARKER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr.

SLATTERY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BAKER of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KING, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 2142: Mr. STOKES, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2200: Mr. WALKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOKE, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2209: Mr. GEKAS and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 2218: Mr. FISH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 2248: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2259: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 2275: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 2286: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2287: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2293: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. KING, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GILLMOR, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2310: Ms. THURMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 2315: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KING, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 2331: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2365: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. SWETT.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. FIELDS of Texas and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 11: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SWETT, Mr. REED, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. ORTON.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. EVERETT.

H.J. Res. 131: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MALONEY, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.J. Res. 148: Ms. SCHENK, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. ORTON, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 163: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. INCLIS of South Carolina, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. KASICH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. LEVY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.J. Res. 180: Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.J. Res. 181: Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.J. Res. 185: Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. STOKES.

H.J. Res. 191: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. DELAY.

H.J. Res. 202: Mr. SABO, Mr. FROST, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. KING, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. PAXON.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. DORNAN.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Res. 22: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H. Res. 53: Mr. BONILLA.

H. Res. 117: Mr. PAXON.

H. Res. 135: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Res. 148: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. DELAY.

H. Res. 165: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. GILCREST, and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 175: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BOEHRER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. COX.

H. Res. 181: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. HYDE.