

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 4, 1995**

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment to the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the 104th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 noon, were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Donald K. Anderson.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

With gratefulness and praise and with a sense of duty and honor, we express our thanksgivings, O gracious God, that we have the opportunity to serve at this time and place. When we contemplate the demands of justice and the high calling to public service, we pray that Your spirit will illumine our minds, strengthen our resolve and give us hearts of wisdom, tolerance, and compassion. May each person be faithful to the vocation of Government service, that we will be good stewards of the resources of the land, hold to the standards of integrity and loyalty and do all those good things that honor You and serve people everywhere. May Your benediction, O God, that is new every morning and is with us in all the moments of life, continue to bless us and keep us in Your grace, now and evermore. As the prophet Micah has said, "And what does the Lord require of you, but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God." Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The CLERK. Will the Members-elect and their guests please remain standing and join with us in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The Clerk 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.

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, this is the day fixed by the 20th amendment to the Constitution and Public Law 103-395 for the meeting of the 104th Congress and, as the law directs, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect.

Certificates of election covering 428 seats in the 104th Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called.

The Clerk lays before the House the following communication from the

Secretary of the State of the State of Alabama.

STATE OF ALABAMA,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Montgomery, AL, December 19, 1994.

Hon. DONNALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: According to the unofficial results of the election held on November 8, 1994, in the state of Alabama, the following individuals received a majority of the votes for a term of two years beginning on January 3, 1995, to the United States House of Representatives:

- Sonny Callahan—1st District.
- Terry Everett—2nd District.
- Glen Browder—3rd District.
- Tom Bevill—4th District.
- Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr.—5th District.
- Spencer Bachus—6th District.
- Earl F. Hilliard—7th District.

The official results and certificates of election will be transmitted to you as soon as I am authorized to do so. Should the official results differ from this in any way, I will notify you immediately.

Sincerely,

JIM BENNETT,  
Secretary of State.

The CLERK. Without objection, the Representatives-elect from the State of Alabama will be allowed to record their presence by electronic device and also to vote on the election of the Speaker.

There was no objection.

The CLERK. Without objection, the Representatives-elect will record their presence by electronic device and their names will be reported in alphabetical order by States, beginning with the State of Alabama, to determine whether a quorum is present.

There was no objection.

The CLERK. Representatives-elect who have not obtained their voting ID cards may do so now in the Speaker's lobby.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Representatives-elect responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—432

ALABAMA		
Bevill	Hilliard	Everett
Browder	Bachus	
Cramer	Callahan	
ALASKA		
	Young	
ARIZONA		
Pastor	Kolbe	Shadegg
Hayworth	Salmon	Stump
ARKANSAS		
Dickey	Lambert-Lincoln	
Hutchinson	Thornton	

CALIFORNIA		
Baker	Farr	Packard
Becerra	Fazio	Pelosi
Bellenson	Fliner	Pombo
Berman	Galglegly	Radanovich
Bilbray	Harman	Riggs
Bono	Herger	Rohrabacher
Brown	Horn	Roybal-Allard
Calvert	Hunter	Royce
Condit	Kim	Seastrand
Cox	Lantos	Stark
Cunningham	Lewis	Thomas
Dellums	Lofgren	Torres
Dixon	Martinez	Tucker
Dooley	Matsui	Waters
Doolittle	McKeon	Waxman
Dornan	Miller	Woolsey
Dreier	Mineta	
Eshoo	Moorhead	

COLORADO		
Allard	McInnis	Schroeder
Hefley	Schaefer	Skaggs

CONNECTICUT		
DeLauro	Gedjenson	Kennelly
Franks	Johnson	Shays

DELAWARE		
Castle		

FLORIDA		
Billirakis	Goss	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown	Hastings	Scarborough
Canady	Johnston	Shaw
Deutsch	McCollum	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Meek	Thurman
Foley	Mica	Weldon
Fowler	Miller	Young
Gibbons	Peterson	

GEORGIA		
Barr	Deal	Linder
Bishop	Gingrich	McKinney
Chambliss	Kingston	Norwood
Collins	Lewis	

HAWAII		
Abercrombie	Mink	

IDAHO		
Chenoweth	Crapo	

ILLINOIS		
Collins	Flanagan	Porter
Costello	Gutierrez	Poshard
Crane	Hastert	Reynolds
Durbin	Hyde	Rush
Evans	LaHood	Weller
Ewing	Lipinski	Yates
Fawell	Manzullo	

INDIANA		
Burton	Jacobs	Souder
Buyer	McIntosh	Visclosky
Hamilton	Myers	
Hostettler	Roemer	

IOWA		
Ganske	Leach	Nussle
Latham	Lightfoot	

KANSAS		
Brownback	Roberts	
Meyers	Tlaht	

KENTUCKY		
Baesler	Lewis	Ward
Bunning	Rogers	Whitfield

□ 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.

LOUISIANA			OKLAHOMA		
Baker	Jefferson	Tauzin	Brewster	Istook	Lucas
Fields	Livingston		Coburn	Largent	
Hayes	McCreary				
MAINE			OREGON		
Baldacci	Longley		Bunn	DeFazio	Wyden
			Cooley	Furse	
MARYLAND			PENNSYLVANIA		
Bartlett	Gilchrist	Morella	Borski	Fox	Mascara
Cardin	Hoyer	Wynn	Clinger	Gekas	McDade
Ehrlich	Mfume		Coyne	Goodling	McHale
			Doyle	Greenwood	Murtha
MASSACHUSETTS				Holden	Shuster
Blute	Meehan	Studds	English	Kanjorski	Walker
Frank	Moakley	Torkildsen	Fattah	Klink	Weldon
Kennedy	Neal		Foglietta		
Markey	Oliver				
MICHIGAN			RHODE ISLAND		
Barcia	Dingell	Levin	Kennedy	Reed	
Bonior	Ehlers	Rivers			
Camp	Hoekstra	Stupak	Clyburn	Inglls	Spence
Chrysler	Kildee	Smith	Graham	Sanford	Spratt
Conyers	Knollenberg	Upton			
MINNESOTA			SOUTH CAROLINA		
Gutknecht	Oberstar	Sabo			
Luther	Peterson	Vento			
Minge	Ramstad		Bryant	Ford	Quillen
			Clement	Gordon	Tanner
			Duncan	Hilleary	Wamp
MISSISSIPPI			TEXAS		
Montgomery	Taylor	Wicker	Archer	DeLay	Johnson, E. B.
Parker	Thompson		Armey	Doggett	Johnson, Sam
			Barton	Edwards	Laughlin
MISSOURI				Fields	Ortiz
Clay	Gephardt	Skelton	Bonilla	Frost	Smith
Danner	Hancock	Talent	Bryant	Geren	Stenholm
Emerson	McCarthy	Volkmer	Chapman	Gonzalez	Stockman
			Coleman	Green	Tejeda
MONTANA				Hall	Thornberry
	Williams		Combast	Jackson-Lee	Wilson
			de la Garza		
NEBRASKA			UTAH		
Barrett	Bereuter	Christensen	Hansen	Orton	Waldholtz
NEVADA			VERMONT		
Ensign	Vucanovich			Sanders	
NEW HAMPSHIRE			VIRGINIA		
Bass	Zelliff		Bateman	Goodlatte	Scott
			Bliley	Moran	Siskysky
			Boucher	Payne	Wolf
			Davis	Pickett	
NEW JERSEY			WASHINGTON		
Andrews	Menendez	Smith			
Franks	Pallone	Torricelli			
Frelinghuysen	Payne	Zimmer	Dicks	McDermott	Smith
LoBlondo	Roukema		Dunn	Metcalf	Tate
Martini	Saxton		Hastings	Nethercutt	White
NEW MEXICO			WEST VIRGINIA		
Richardson	Schiff	Skeen	Mollohan	Rahall	Wise
NEW YORK			WISCONSIN		
Ackerman	LaFalce	Paxon	Barrett	Klug	Petri
Boehlert	Lazio	Quinn	Gunderson	Neumann	Roth
Engel	Lowe	Rangel	Kleccka	Obey	Sensenbrenner
Flake	Maloney	Schumer			
Forbes	Manton	Serrano			
Frisa	McHugh	Slaughter			
Hinchev	McNulty	Solomon			
Houghton	Mollinari	Towson			
Kelly	Nadler	Velazquez			
King	Owens	Walsh			
NORTH CAROLINA			WYOMING		
Ballenger	Funderburk	Myrick			
Burr	Hefner	Rose			
Clayton	Heineman	Taylor			
Coble	Jones	Watt			
NORTH DAKOTA			OHIO		
	Pomeroy		Boehner	Hoke	Pryce
			Brown	Kaptur	Regula
			Chabot	Kasich	Sawyer
			Creameans	LaTourette	Stokes
			Gillmor	Ney	Trafcant
			Hall	Oxley	
			Hobson	Portman	

District of Columbia: the election of the Honorable VICTOR O. FRAZER as Delegate from the Virgin Islands; the election of the Honorable ENI F.H. FALOMAVAEGA as Delegate from American Samoa; and the election of the Honorable ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD as Delegate from Guam.

#### FAREWELL REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DONNALD K. ANDERSON

The CLERK. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, if you will indulge me for just one moment, I will shortly take leave of this Chamber after 35 years in your service, the last 8 in the high stewardship as your Clerk.

My heart is filled with the happy reflections of those years, a deep sense of fulfillment, and profound gratitude for your unfailing confidence and friendship. Indeed, I am grateful above all to the one Nation which affords opportunity for an ordinary citizen to achieve extraordinary responsibility. You will remain constantly in my thoughts and in my prayers that God will bless each of you in the work which you are about and may He forever prosper this House and the United States of America.

I bid you an affectionate farewell.  
(Applause, the Members rising.)

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DONNALD K. ANDERSON

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Clerk, before we proceed with the nominations for Speaker of the House, on behalf of Republican Members of the House, we want to thank you for your 35 years of service to this institution, and your 35 years of service to the American people. You have done your job ably on behalf of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

And to the other officers of the House, who have served the House so ably and the American people so ably, we want to thank them as well for their service in this House.

Farewell, and best wishes from all of us.

Mr. FAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHNER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate my friend yielding.

I, too, would like to add a few words of tribute to our friend.

When the 103d Congress came to an official close on noon Tuesday, the House literally lived on for the next 24 hours in the person of the gentleman from Sacramento, CA, the Clerk of the House, Donald K. Anderson. In serving as the first presiding officer for the

The CLERK. The quorum call discloses that 432 Representatives-elect have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CLERK

The CLERK. The Clerk will state that credentials, regular in form, have been received showing the election of the Honorable CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for a term of 4 years beginning January 3, 1993; the election of the Honorable ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON as Delegate from the

□ 1230

purpose of organizing the 104th Congress, he fulfilled his last ministerial duty to this institution. After four successive terms as Clerk and a career with the House that began as a Page when Dwight Eisenhower was President and Sam Rayburn sat in the Speaker's chair, Donn Anderson now leaves a distinguished career of public service.

On a personal level for many of us in this Chamber, it was only natural for Donn Anderson to have been the thread of continuity from one Congress to the next. For over 30 years, Donn has embodied every good virtue of this House. He has been its memory, its defender, its champion and often its conscience. He understood perhaps better than anyone here the meaning of the word "bipartisanship" and he lived it daily in his work with the Members. In his 8 years as the second highest ranking officer of the House, he worked tirelessly to move the House into the information age and so greatly benefited our constituents, the American people.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, I looked forward to our annual ritual of hearings knowing that I could always count on the Clerk for the most splendid testimony. Although Donn himself admitted to his preference for Victorian manners, there was nothing old-fashioned about the direction of his office. He was thoroughly modern in his vision for the future of the House, and he fought hard to keep us current with the times. Just as Donn could explain the artistic nuances of paintings in the Rotunda, he could just as easily give you the technical lowdown of cameras in this Chamber and on this floor. As the House moves forward today with the institutional reforms and the reorganization, we do so with the solid foundation left behind by Donn Anderson.

Perhaps in parting we can borrow a phrase from our late and great Speaker Tip O'Neill. He simply said on so many occasions, "So long, old pal."

Thank you, Donn Anderson.

**ELECTION OF SPEAKER**

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress.

Nominations are now in order.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am honored and privileged to welcome my colleagues and the American people to this historic day. We have been sent here—to the People's House—to write, together, a new chapter in our blessed Nation's history. There is great anticipation, excitement, and expectation in America about what this new chapter will say. To America I say, we shall write the chapter as you dictate it to

us. This is your House and your will will be reflected in our actions.

As the first sentence of this new chapter, I am directed by the unanimous vote of the Republican Conference to present the name of the Honorable NEWT GINGRICH, a Representative-elect from the State of Georgia, for election to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress.

The CLERK. The Clerk now recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress the name of the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, a Representative-elect from the State of Missouri. I am proud to so make that nomination.

□ 1240

The CLERK. The Honorable NEWT GINGRICH, a Representative-elect from the State of Georgia, and the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, a Representative-elect from the State of Missouri, have been placed in nomination.

Are there any further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint tellers.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The tellers will come forward and take their seats at the desk in the front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding to their names will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The reading clerk will now call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for the Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]  
**GINGRICH—228**

Allard	Bonilla	Coble
Archer	Bono	Coburn
Armey	Brownback	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Bryant (TN)	Combest
Baker (CA)	Bunn	Cooley
Baker (LA)	Bunning	Cox
Ballenger	Burr	Crane
Barr	Burton	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Creameans
Bartlett	Callahan	Cubin
Barton	Calvert	Cunningham
Bass	Camp	Davis
Bateman	Canady	DeLay
Bereuter	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bilbray	Chabot	Dickey
Billrakis	Chambliss	Doolittle
Bliley	Chenoweth	Dornan
Blute	Christensen	Dreier
Boehlert	Chrysler	Duncan
Boehner	Clinger	Dunn

Ehlers	Kelly	Regula
Ehrlich	Kim	Riggs
Emerson	King	Roberts
English	Kingston	Rogers
Ensign	Klug	Rohrabacher
Everett	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Ewing	Kolbe	Roth
Fawell	LaHood	Roukema
Fields (TX)	Largent	Royce
Flanagan	Latham	Salmon
Foley	LaTourette	Sanford
Forbes	Lazio	Saxton
Fowler	Leach	Scarborough
Fox	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Franks (CT)	Lewis (KY)	Schiff
Franks (NJ)	Lightfoot	Seastrand
Frelinghuysen	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Frisa	Livingston	Shadegg
Funderburk	LoBiondo	Shaw
Gallegly	Longley	Shays
Ganske	Lucas	Shuster
Gekas	Manzullo	Skeen
Gilchrest	Martini	Smith (MI)
Gillmor	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Gilman	McCreery	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	McDade	Smith (WA)
Goodling	McHugh	Solomon
Goss	McInnis	Souder
Graham	McIntosh	Spence
Greenwood	McKeon	Stearns
Gunderson	Metcalfe	Stockman
Gutknecht	Meyers	Stump
Hancock	Mica	Talent
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Tate
Hastert	Molinar	Taylor (NC)
Hastings (WA)	Moorhead	Thomas
Hayworth	Morella	Thornberry
Hefley	Myers	Tiahrt
Heineman	Myrick	Torkildsen
Henger	Nethercutt	Upton
Hilleary	Neumann	Vucanovich
Hobson	Ney	Waldholtz
Hoekstra	Norwood	Walker
Hoke	Nussle	Walsh
Horn	Oxley	Wamp
Hostettler	Packard	Weldon (FL)
Houghton	Paxon	Weldon (PA)
Hunter	Petri	Weller
Hutchinson	Pombo	White
Hyde	Porter	Whitfield
Inglis	Portman	Wicker
Istook	Pryce	Wolf
Johnson (CT)	Quillen	Young (AK)
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Young (FL)
Jones	Radanovich	Zeliff
Kasich	Ramstad	Zimmer

**GEPHARDT—202**

Abercrombie	de la Garza	Hamilton
Ackerman	Deal	Harman
Andrews	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Baesler	DeLauro	Hayes
Baldacci	Dellums	Heffer
Barcia	Deutsch	Hilliard
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Hinchee
Becerra	Dingell	Holden
Bellenson	Dixon	Hoyer
Bentsen	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dooley	Jacobs
Bevill	Doyle	Jefferson
Bishop	Durbin	Johnson (SD)
Bonior	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Borski	Engel	Johnston
Boucher	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Brewster	Evans	Kaptur
Browder	Farr	Kennedy (MA)
Brown (CA)	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Brown (FL)	Fazio	Kennelly
Brown (OH)	Fields (LA)	Kildee
Bryant (TX)	Filner	Kleczka
Cardin	Flake	Klink
Chapman	Foglietta	LaFalce
Clay	Ford	Lambert-Lincoln
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Clement	Frost	Laughlin
Clyburn	Furse	Levin
Coleman	Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)
Collins (IL)	Geren	Lipinski
Collins (MI)	Gibbons	Lofgren
Condit	Gonzalez	Lowe
Conyers	Gordon	Luther
Costello	Green	Maloney
Coyne	Gutierrez	Manton
Cramer	Hall (OH)	Markey
Danner	Hall (TX)	Martinez

Mascara	Payne (VA)	Stokes
Matsui	Pelosi	Studds
McCarthy	Peterson (FL)	Stupak
McDermott	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
McHale	Pickett	Tauzin
McKinney	Pomeroy	Tejeda
McNulty	Poshard	Thompson
Meehan	Rahall	Thornton
Meek	Rangel	Thurman
Menendez	Reed	Torres
Mfume	Reynolds	Torricelli
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Towns
Mineta	Rivers	Trafilant
Minge	Roemer	Tucker
Mink	Rose	Velazquez
Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Vento
Mollohan	Rush	Viscosky
Montgomery	Sabo	Volkmer
Moran	Sanders	Ward
Murtha	Sawyer	Waters
Nadler	Schroeder	Watt (NC)
Neal	Schumer	Waxman
Oberstar	Scott	Williams
Obey	Serrano	Wilson
Olver	Sistsky	Wise
Ortiz	Skaggs	Woolsey
Orton	Skelton	Wyden
Owens	Slaughter	Wynn
Pallone	Spratt	Yates
Pastor	Stark	
Payne (NJ)	Stenholm	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Gephardt Parker  
Gingrich Taylor (MS)

□ 1310

The CLERK. If there are any Representatives-elect who did not answer the rollcall, they may come to the well and vote at this time.

The tellers agree in their tallies that the total number of votes cast is 434, of which the Honorable NEWT GINGRICH of the State of Georgia has received 228 and the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT of the State of Missouri has received 202, with 4 voting "present."

Therefore, the Honorable NEWT GINGRICH of the State of Georgia is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress, having received a majority of the votes cast.

The Clerk would request visitors on the floor, most respectfully, including former members, to relinquish seats on the floor to Members-elect, prior to the presentation of the Speaker-elect.

□ 1320

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

The committee will retire from the Chamber to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 104th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the ladies and gentlemen of the House that I first want to thank my Democratic colleagues for their support and their confidence. I noted we were a little short, but I appreciate your friendship and your support.

As you might imagine, this is not a moment that I had been waiting for. When you carry the mantle of progress, there is precious little glory in defeat. But sometimes we spend so much time lionizing the winners and labeling the losers, we lose sight of the victory we all share in this crown jewel of democracy.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this is a day to celebrate a power that belongs not to any political party, but to the people, no matter the margin, no matter the majority. All across the world, from Bosnia to Chechnya to South Africa, people lay down their lives for the kind of voice we take for granted. Too often the transfer of power is an act of pain and carnage, not one as we see today of peace and decency.

□ 1330

But here in the House of Representatives, for 219 years, longer than any democracy in the world, we heed the people's voice with peace and civility and respect. Each and every day, on this very floor, we echo the hopes and dreams of our people, their fears and their failures, their abiding belief in a better America.

We may not all agree with today's changing of the guard. We may not all like it, but we enact the people's will with dignity and honor and pride. In that endeavor, Mr. Speaker, there can be no losers, and there can be no defeat.

Of course, in the 104th Congress there will be conflict and compromise. Agreements will not always be easy; agreements sometimes not even possible. However, while we may not agree on matters of party and principle, we all abide with the will of the people. That is reason enough to place our good faith and our best hopes in your able hands.

I speak from the bottom of my heart when I say that I wish you the best in these coming 2 years, for when this gavel passes into your hands, so do the futures and fortunes of millions of Americans. To make real progress, to improve real people's lives, we both have to rise above partisanship. We have to work together where we can and where we must.

It is a profound responsibility, one which knows no bounds in party or pol-

itics. It is the responsibility not merely for those who voted for you, not merely for those who cast their fate on your side of the aisle, but also for those who did not.

These are the responsibilities I pass, along with the gavel I hold, will hold in my hand, but there are some burdens that the Democratic Party will never cease to bear. As Democrats, we came to Congress to fight for America's hard-working middle-income families, the families who are working, often for longer hours, for less pay, for fewer benefits in jobs they are not sure they can keep.

We, together, must redeem their faith that if they work hard and they play by the rules they can build a better life for their children. Mr. Speaker, I want this entire House to speak for those families. The Democratic Party will. That mantle we will never lay to rest.

So with partnership but with purpose, I pass this great gavel of our Government. With resignation, but with resolve, I hereby end 40 years of Democratic rule of this House; with faith and with friendship and the deepest respect. You are now my Speaker, and let the great debate begin.

I now have the high honor and distinct privilege to present to the House of Representatives our new Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say first of all that I am deeply grateful to my good friend, DICK GEPHARDT. When my side maybe overreacted to your statement about ending 40 years of Democratic rule, I could not help but look over at Bob Michel, who has often been up here and who knows that everything DICK said was true. This is difficult and painful to lose, and on my side of the aisle, we have for 20 elections been on the losing side. Yet there is something so wonderful about the process by which a free people decides things.

In my own case, I lost two elections, and with the good help of my friend VIC FAZIO came close to losing two others. I am sorry, guys, it just did not quite work out. Yet I can tell you that every time when the polls closed and I waited for the votes to come in, I felt good, because win or lose, we have been part of this process.

In a little while, I am going to ask the dean of the House, JOHN DINGELL, to swear me in, to insist on the bipartisan nature of the way in which we together work in this House. JOHN's father was one of the great stalwarts of the New Deal, a man who, as an FDR Democrat, created modern America. I think that JOHN and his father represent a tradition that we all have to recognize and respect, and recognize that the America we are now going to try to lead grew from that tradition and is part of that great heritage.

I also want to take just a moment to thank Speaker Foley, who was extraordinarily generous, both in his public utterances and in everything that he and Mrs. Foley did to help Marianne and me, and to help our staff make the transition. I think that he worked very hard to reestablish the dignity of the House. We can all be proud of the reputation that he takes and of the spirit with which he led the speakership. Our best wishes go to Speaker and Mrs. Foley.

I also want to thank the various house officers, who have been just extraordinary. I want to say for the public record that faced with a result none of them wanted, in a situation I suspect none of them expected, that within 48 hours every officer of this House reacted as a patriot, worked overtime, bent over backwards, and in every way helped us. I am very grateful, and this House I think owes a debt of gratitude to every officer that the Democrats elected 2 years ago.

This is a historic moment. I was asked over and over, how did it feel, and the only word that comes close to adequate is overwhelming. I feel overwhelmed in every way, overwhelmed by all the Georgians who came up, overwhelmed by my extended family that is here, overwhelmed by the historic moment. I walked out and stood on the balcony just outside of the Speaker's office, looking down the Mall this morning, very early. I was just overwhelmed by the view, with two men I will introduce and know very, very well. Just the sense of being part of America, being part of this great tradition, is truly overwhelming.

I have two gavels. Actually, DICK happened to use one. Maybe this was appropriate. This was a Georgia gavel I just got this morning, done by Dorsey Newman of Tallapoosa. He decided that the gavels he saw on TV weren't big enough or strong enough, so he cut down a walnut tree in his backyard, make a gavel, put a commemorative item on it, and sent it up here.

So this is a genuine Georgia gavel, and I am the first Georgia Speaker in over 100 years. The last one, by the way, had a weird accent, too. Speaker Crisp was born in Britain. His parents were actors and they came to the United States—a good word, by the way, for the value we get from immigration.

Second, this is the gavel that Speaker Martin used. I am not sure what it says about the inflation of Government, to put them side by side, but this was the gavel used by the last Republican Speaker.

I want to comment for a minute on two men who served as my leaders, from whom I learned so much and who are here today. When I arrived as a freshman, the Republican Party, deeply dispirited by Watergate and by the loss of the Presidency, banded together and worked with a leader who helped

pave the way for our great party victory of 1980, a man who just did a marvelous job. I cannot speak too highly of what I learned about integrity and leadership and courage from serving with him in my freshman term. He is here with us again today. I hope all of you will recognize Congressman John Rhodes of Arizona.

□ 1340

I want to say also that at our request, the second person was not sure he should be here at all, then he thought he was going to hide in the back of the room. I insisted that he come on down front, someone whom I regard as a mentor. I think virtually every Democrat in the House would say he is a man who genuinely cares about, loves the House, and represents the best spirit of the House. He is a man who I studied under and, on whom I hope as Speaker I can always rely for advice. I hope frankly I can emulate his commitment to this institution and his willingness to try to reach beyond his personal interest and partisanship. I hope all of you will join me in thanking him for his years of service, Congressman Bob Michel of Illinois.

I am very fortunate today. My mom and my dad are here, they are right up there in the gallery. Bob and Kit Gingrich. I am so delighted that they were both able to be here. Sometimes when you get to my age, you cannot have everyone near you that you would like to have. I cannot say how much I learned from my dad and his years of serving in the U.S. Army and how much I learned from my mother, who is clearly my most enthusiastic cheerleader.

My daughters are here up in the gallery, too. They are Kathy Lovewith and her husband Paul, and Jackie and her husband Mark Zyler. Of course, the person who clearly is my closest friend and my best adviser and whom if I listened to about 20 percent more, I would get in less trouble, my wife Marianne, is in the gallery as well.

I have a very large extended family between Marianne and me. They are virtually all in town, and we have done our part for the Washington tourist season. But I could not help, when I first came on the floor earlier, I saw a number of the young people who are here. I met a number of the children who are on the floor and the young adults, who are close to 12 years of age. I could not help but think that sitting in the back rail near the center of the House is one of my nephews, Kevin McPherson, who is 5. My nieces Susan Brown, who is 6, and Emily Brown, who is 8, and Laura McPherson, who is 9, are all back there, too. That is probably more than I was allowed to bring on, but they are my nieces and my nephews. I have two other nephews a little older who are sitting in the gallery.

I could not help but think as a way I wanted to start the Speakership and to

talk to every Member, that in a sense these young people around us are what this institution is really all about. Much more than the negative advertising and the interest groups and all the different things that make politics all too often cynical, nasty, and sometimes, frankly, just plain miserable; what makes politics worthwhile is the choice, as DICK GEPHARDT said, between what we see so tragically on the evening news and the way we try to work very hard to make this system of free, representative self-government work. The ultimate reason for doing that is these children, the country they will inherit, and the world they will live in.

We are starting the 104th Congress. I do not know if you have ever thought about this, but for 208 years, we bring together the most diverse country in the history of the world. We send all sorts of people here. Each of us could find at least one Member we thought was weird. I will tell you, if you went around the room the person chosen to be weird would be different for virtually every one of us. Because we do allow and insist upon the right of a free people to send an extraordinary diversity of people here.

Brian Lamb of C-SPAN read to me Friday a phrase from de Tocqueville that was so central to the House. I have been reading Remini's biography of Henry Clay and Clay, as the first strong Speaker, always preferred the House. He preferred the House to the Senate although he served in both. He said the House is more vital, more active, more dynamic, and more common.

This is what de Tocqueville wrote: "Often there is not a distinguished man in the whole number. Its members are almost all obscure individuals whose names bring no associations to mind. They are mostly village lawyers, men in trade, or even persons belonging to the lower classes of society."

If we include women, I do not know that we would change much. But the word "vulgar" in de Tocqueville's time had a very particular meaning. It is a meaning the world would do well to study in this room. You see, de Tocqueville was an aristocrat. He lived in a world of kings and princes. The folks who come here do so by the one single act that their citizens freely chose them. I do not care what your ethnic background is, or your ideology. I do not care if you are younger or older. I do not care if you are born in America or if you are a naturalized citizen. Everyone of the 435 people have equal standing because their citizens freely sent them. Their voice should be heard and they should have a right to participate. It is the most marvelous act of a complex giant country trying to argue and talk. And, as DICK GEPHARDT said, to have a great debate, to reach great decisions, not through a

civil war, not by bombing one of our regional capitals, not by killing a half million people, and not by having snipers. Let me say unequivocally, I condemn all acts of violence against the law by all people for all reasons. This is a society of law and a society of civil behavior.

Here we are as commoners together, to some extent Democrats and Republicans, to some extent liberals and conservatives, but Americans all. STEVE GUNDERSON today gave me a copy of the "Portable Abraham Lincoln." He suggested there is much for me to learn about our party, but I would also say that it does not hurt to have a copy of the portable F.D.R.

This is a great country of great people. If there is any one factor or acts of my life that strikes me as I stand up here as the first Republican in 40 years to do so. When I first became whip in 1989, Russia was beginning to change, the Soviet Union as it was then. Into my whip's office one day came eight Russians and a Lithuanian, members of the Communist Party, newspaper editors. They asked me, "What does a whip do?"

They said, "In Russia we have never had a free parliament since 1917 and that was only for a few months, so what do you do?"

I tried to explain, as DAVE BONIOR or TOM DELAY might now. It is a little strange if you are from a dictatorship to explain you are called the whip but you do not really have a whip, you are elected by the people you are supposed to pressure—other members. If you pressure them too much they will not reelect you. On the other hand if you do not pressure them enough they will not reelect you. Democracy is hard. It is frustrating.

So our group came into the Chamber. The Lithuanian was a man in his late sixties, and I allowed him to come up here and sit and be Speaker, something many of us have done with constituents. Remember, this is the very beginning of perestroika and glasnost. When he came out of the chair, he was physically trembling. He was almost in tears. He said, "Ever since World War II, I have remembered what the Americans did and I have never believed the propaganda. But I have to tell you, I did not think in my life that I would be able to sit at the center of freedom."

It was one of the most overwhelming, compelling moments of my life. It struck me that something I could not help but think of when we were here with President Mandela. I went over and saw RON DELLUMS and thought of the great work RON had done to extend freedom across the planet. You get that sense of emotion when you see something so totally different than you had expected. Here was a man who reminded me first of all that while presidents are important, they are in effect an elected kingship, that this and the

other body across the way are where freedom has to be fought out. That is the tradition I hope that we will take with us as we go to work.

Today we had a bipartisan prayer service. FRANK WOLF made some very important points. He said, "We have to recognize that many of our most painful problems as a country are moral problems, problems of dealing with ourselves and with life."

□ 1350

He said character is the key to leadership and we have to deal with that. He preached a little bit. I do not think he thought he was preaching, but he was. It was about a spirit of reconciliation. He talked about caring about our spouses and our children and our families. If we are not prepared to model our own family life beyond just having them here for 1 day, if we are not prepared to care about our children and we are not prepared to care about our families, then by what arrogance do we think we will transcend our behavior to care about others? That is why with Congressman GEPHARDT's help we have established a bipartisan task force on the family. We have established the principle that we are going to set schedules we stick to so families can count on time to be together, built around school schedules so that families can get to know each other, and not just by seeing us on C-SPAN.

I will also say that means one of the strongest recommendations of the bipartisan committee, is that we have 17 minutes to vote. This is the bipartisan committee's recommendations, not just mine. They pointed out that if we take the time we spent in the last Congress where we waited for one more Member, and one more, and one more, that we literally can shorten the business and get people home if we will be strict and firm. At one point this year we had a 45-minute vote. I hope all of my colleagues are paying attention because we are in fact going to work very hard to have 17 minute votes and it is over. So, leave on the first bell, not the second bell. OK? This may seem particularly inappropriate to say on the first day because this will be the busiest day on opening day in congressional history.

I want to read just a part of the Contract With America. I don't mean this as a partisan act, but rather to remind all of us what we are about to go through and why. Those of us who ended up in the majority stood on these steps and signed a contract, and here is part of what it says:

On the first day of the 104th Congress the new Republican majority will immediately pass the following reforms aimed at restoring the faith and trust of the American people in their government: First, require all laws that apply to the rest of the country also to apply equally to the Congress. Second, select a major, independent auditing

firm to conduct a comprehensive audit of the Congress for waste, fraud or abuse. Third, cut the number of House committees and cut committee staffs by a third. Fourth, limit the terms of all committee chairs. Fifth, ban the casting of proxy votes in committees. Sixth, require committee meetings to be open to the public. Seven, require a three-fifths majority vote to pass a tax increase. Eight, guarantee an honest accounting of our federal budget by implementing zero baseline budgeting.

Now, I told DICK GEPHARDT last night that if I had to do it over again we would have pledged within 3 days that we will do these things, but that is not what we said. So we have ourselves in a little bit of a box here.

Then we go a step further. I carry the T.V. Guide version of the contract with me at all times.

We then say that within the first 100 days of the 104th Congress we shall bring to the House floor the following bills, each to be given full and open debate, each to be given a full and clear vote, and each to be immediately available for inspection. We made it available that day. We listed 10 items. A balanced budget amendment and line-item veto, a bill to stop violent criminals, emphasizing among other things an effective and enforceable death penalty. Third was welfare reform. Fourth, legislation protecting our kids. Fifth was to provide tax cuts for families. Sixth was a bill to strengthen our national defense. Seventh was a bill to raise the senior citizens' earning limit. Eighth was legislation rolling back Government regulations. Ninth was a commonsense legal reform bill, and tenth was congressional term limits legislation.

Our commitment on our side, and this is an absolute obligation, is first of all to work today until we are done. I know that is going to inconvenience people who have families and supporters. But we were hired to do a job, and we have to start today to prove we will do it. Second, I would say to our friends in the Democratic Party that we are going to work with you, and we are really laying out a schedule working with the minority leader to make sure that we can set dates certain to go home. That does mean that if 2 or 3 weeks out we are running short we will, frankly, have longer sessions on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. We will try to work this out on a bipartisan basis to, in a workmanlike way, get it done. It is going to mean the busiest early months since 1933.

Beyond the Contract I think there are two giant challenges. I know I am a partisan figure. But I really hope today that I can speak for a minute to my friends in the Democratic Party as well as my own colleagues, and speak to the country about these two challenges so that I hope we can have a real dialog. One challenge is to achieve a balanced budget by 2002. I think both Democratic and Republican Governors

will say we can do that but it is hard. I do not think we can do it in a year or two. I do not think we ought to lie to the American people. This is a huge, complicated job.

The second challenge is to find a way to truly replace the current welfare state with an opportunity society.

Let me talk very briefly about both challenges. First, on the balanced budget I think we can get it done. I think the baby boomers are now old enough that we can have an honest dialog about priorities, about resources, about what works, and what does not work. Let me say I have already told Vice President GORE that we are going to invite him to address a Republican conference. We would have invited him in December but he had to go to Moscow. I believe there are grounds for us to talk together and to work together, to have hearings together, and to have task forces together. If we set priorities, if we apply the principles of Edwards Deming and of Peter Drucker we can build on the Vice President's re-inventing government effort and we can focus on transforming, not just cutting. The choice becomes not just do you want more or do you want less, but are there ways to do it better? Can we learn from the private sector, can we learn from Ford, IBM, from Microsoft, from what General Motors has had to go through? I think on a bipartisan basis we owe it to our children and grandchildren to get this Government in order and to be able to actually pay our way. I think 2002 is a reasonable timeframe. I would hope that together we could open a dialog with the American people.

I have said that I think Social Security ought to be off limits, at least for the first 4 to 6 years of the process, because I think it will just destroy us if we try to bring it into the game. But let me say about everything else, whether it is Medicare, or it is agricultural subsidies, or it is defense or anything that I think the greatest Democratic President of the 20th century, and in my judgment the greatest President of the 20th century, said it right. On March 4, 1933, he stood in braces as a man who had polio at a time when nobody who had that kind of disability could be anything in public life. He was President of the United States, and he stood in front of this Capitol on a rainy March day and he said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." I want every one of us to reach out in that spirit and pledge to live up to that spirit, and I think frankly on a bipartisan basis. I would say to Members of the Black and Hispanic Caucuses that I would hope we could arrange by late spring to genuinely share districts. You could have a Republican who frankly may not know a thing about your district agree to come for a long weekend with you, and you will agree to go for a long weekend with them. We

begin a dialog and an openness that is totally different than people are used to seeing in politics in America. I believe if we do that we can then create a dialog that can lead to a balanced budget.

But I think we have a greater challenge. I do want to pick up directly on what DICK GEPHARDT said, because he said it right. No Republican here should kid themselves about it. The greatest leaders in fighting for an integrated America in the 20th century were in the Democratic Party. The fact is, it was the liberal wing of the Democratic Party that ended segregation. The fact is that it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who gave hope to a Nation that was in distress and could have slid into dictatorship. Every Republican has much to learn from studying what the Democrats did right.

But I would say to my friends in the Democratic Party that there is much to what Ronald Reagan was trying to get done. There is much to what is being done today by Republicans like Bill Weld, and John Engler, and Tommy Thompson, and George Allen, and Christy Whitman, and Pete Wilson. There is much we can share with each other.

We must replace the welfare state with an opportunity society. The balanced budget is the right thing to do. But it does not in my mind have the moral urgency of coming to grips with what is happening to the poorest Americans.

I commend to all Marvin Olasky's "The Tragedy of American Compassion." Olasky goes back for 300 years and looked at what has worked in America, how we have helped people rise beyond poverty, and how we have reached out to save people. He may not have the answers, but he has the right sense of where we have to go as Americans.

□ 1400

I do not believe that there is a single American who can see a news report of a 4-year-old thrown off of a public housing project in Chicago by other children and killed and not feel that a part of your heart went, too. I think of my nephew in the back, Kevin, and how all of us feel about our children. How can any American read about an 11-year-old buried with his teddy bear because he killed a 14-year-old, and then another 14-year-old killed him, and not have some sense of "My God, where has this country gone?" How can we not decide that this is a moral crisis equal to segregation, equal to slavery? How can we not insist that every day we take steps to do something?

I have seldom been more shaken than I was after the election when I had breakfast with two members of the Black Caucus. One of them said to me, "Can you imagine what it is like to visit a first-grade class and realize that

every fourth or fifth young boy in that class may be dead or in jail within 15 years? And they are your constituents and you are helpless to change it?" For some reason, I do not know why, maybe because I visit a lot of schools, that got through. I mean, that personalized it. That made it real, not just statistics, but real people.

Then I tried to explain part of my thoughts by talking about the need for alternatives to the bureaucracy, and we got into what I think frankly has been a pretty distorted and cheap debate over orphanages.

Let me say, first of all, my father, who is here today, was a foster child. He was adopted as a teenager. I am adopted. We have relatives who were adopted. We are not talking out of some vague impersonal Dickens "Bleak House" middle-class intellectual model. We have lived the alternatives.

I believe when we are told that children are so lost in the city bureaucracies that there are children who end up in dumpsters, when we are told that there are children doomed to go to schools where 70 or 80 percent of them will not graduate, when we are told of public housing projects that are so dangerous that if any private sector ran them they would be put in jail, and the only solution we are given is, "Well, we will study it, we will get around to it," my only point is that this is unacceptable. We can find ways immediately to do things better, to reach out, break through the bureaucracy and give every young American child a better chance.

Let me suggest to you Morris Schectman's new book. I do not agree with all of it, but it is fascinating. It is entitled "Working Without a Net." It is an effort to argue that in the 21st century we have to create our own safety nets. He draws a distinction between caring and caretaking. It is worth every American reading.

He said caretaking is when you bother me a little bit, and I do enough, I feel better because I think I took care of you. That is not any good to you at all. You may be in fact an alcoholic and I just gave you the money to buy the bottle that kills you, but I feel better and go home. He said caring is actually stopping and dealing with the human being, trying to understand enough about them to genuinely make sure you improve their life, even if you have to start with a conversation like, "If you will quit drinking, I will help you get a job." This is a lot harder conversation than, "I feel better. I gave him a buck or 5 bucks."

I want to commend every Member on both sides to look carefully. I say to those Republicans who believe in total privatization, you cannot believe in the Good Samaritan and explain that as long as business is making money we can walk by a fellow American who is hurt and not do something. I would say

to my friends on the left who believe there has never been a government program that was not worth keeping, you cannot look at some of the results we now have and not want to reach out to the humans and forget the bureaucracies.

If we could build that attitude on both sides of this aisle, we would be an amazingly different place, and the country would begin to be a different place.

We have to create a partnership. We have to reach out to the American people. We are going to do a lot of important things. Thanks to the House Information System and Congressman VERN EHLERS, as of today we are going to be on line for the whole country, every amendment, every conference report. We are working with C-SPAN and others, and Congressman GEPHARDT has agreed to help on a bipartisan basis to make the building more open to television, more accessible to the American people. We have talk radio hosts here today for the first time. I hope to have a bipartisan effort to make the place accessible for all talk radio hosts of all backgrounds, no matter their ideology. The House Historian's office is going to be more aggressively run on a bipartisan basis to reach out to Close Up, and to other groups to teach what the legislative struggle is about. I think over time we can and will this Spring rethink campaign reform and lobbying reform and review all ethics, including the gift rule.

But that isn't enough. Our challenge shouldn't be just to balance the budget or to pass the Contract. Our challenge should not be anything that is just legislative. We are supposed to, each one of us, be leaders. I think our challenge has to be to set as our goal, and maybe we are not going to get there in 2 years. This ought to be the goal that we go home and we tell people we believe in: that there will be a Monday morning when for the entire weekend not a single child was killed anywhere in America; that there will be a Monday morning when every child in the country went to a school that they and their parents thought prepared them as citizens and prepared them to compete in the world market; that there will be a Monday morning where it was easy to find a job or create a job, and your own Government did not punish you if you tried.

We should not be happy just with the language of politicians and the language of legislation. We should insist that our success for America is felt in the neighborhoods, in the communities, is felt by real people living real lives who can say, "Yes, we are safer, we are healthier, we are better educated, America succeeds."

This morning's closing hymn at the prayer service was the Battle Hymn of the Republic. It is hard to be in this building, look down past Grant to the

Lincoln Memorial and not realize how painful and how difficult that battle hymn is. The key phrase is, "As he died to make men holy, let us live to make men free."

It is not just political freedom, although I agree with everything Congressman GEPHARDT said earlier. If you cannot afford to leave the public housing project, you are not free. If you do not know how to find a job and do not know how to create a job, you are not free. If you cannot find a place that will educate you, you are not free. If you are afraid to walk to the store because you could get killed, you are not free.

So as all of us over the coming months sing that song, "As he died to make men holy, let us live to make men free," I want us to dedicate ourselves to reach out in a genuinely non-partisan way to be honest with each other. I promise each of you that without regard to party my door is going to be open. I will listen to each of you. I will try to work with each of you. I will put in long hours, and I will guarantee that I will listen to you first. I will let you get it all out before I give you my version, because you have been patient with me today, and you have given me a chance to set the stage.

But I want to close by reminding all of us of how much bigger this is than us. Because beyond talking with the American people, beyond working together, I think we can only be successful if we start with our limits. I was very struck this morning with something Bill Emerson used, a very famous quote of Benjamin Franklin, at the point where the Constitutional Convention was deadlocked. People were tired, and there was a real possibility that the Convention was going to break up. Franklin, who was quite old and had been relatively quiet for the entire Convention, suddenly stood up and was angry, and he said:

I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men, and if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible that an empire can rise without His aid?

At that point the Constitutional Convention stopped. They took a day off for fasting and prayer.

Then, having stopped and come together, they went back, and they solved the great question of large and small States. They wrote the Constitution, and the United States was created. All I can do is pledge to you that, if each of us will reach out prayerfully and try to genuinely understand each other, if we will recognize that in this building we symbolize America, and that we have an obligation to talk with each other, then I think a year from now we can look on the 104th Congress as a truly amazing institution without regard to party, without regard to ideology. We can say, "Here, America

comes to work, and here we are preparing for those children a better future."

Thank you. Good luck and God bless you.

Let me now call on the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

(Applause, the Members rising.)

□ 1410

I am now ready to take the oath of office. I ask the dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL of Michigan, to administer the oath of office.

Mr. DINGELL then administered the oath of office to Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

#### SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to the precedent, the Chair will swear in all Members of the House at this time and, without objection, the Members from the State of Alabama will also be sworn in at this time, there being no contest as to their elections.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. If the Members will rise, the Chair will now administer the oath of office.

The Members-elect and Delegates-elect and the Resident Commissioner-elect rose, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

Congratulations, the gentlemen and gentlewomen are now Members of the 104th Congress.

#### MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable RICHARD K. ARMEY, has been selected as the majority leader of the House.

## MINORITY LEADER

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as minority leader the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

## MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as our majority whip the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable TOM DELAY.

## MINORITY WHIP

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic members have selected as minority whip the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable DAVID E. BONIOR.

## ELECTION OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, SERGEANT AT ARMS, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 1

*Resolved*, That Robin H. Carle, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, be, and she is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Wilson S. Livingood, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Scott M. Faulkner, of the State of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

That Reverend James David Ford, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the resolution, but I request there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

□ 1420

The SPEAKER. The question will be divided.

The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

That portion of the resolution was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO: That Thomas O'Donnell, of the State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That George Kundanis, of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives; and

That Marti Thomas, of the District of Columbia, be, and she is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

The remainder of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now swear in the officers of the House. The officers will come forward, please.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen and gentlewomen are now Members of the 104th Congress. Congratulations.

## NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 2

*Resolved*, That the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that NEWT GINGRICH, a Representative from the State of Georgia, has been elected Speaker; and Robin H. Carle, a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 3

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

## AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 4

*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected NEWT GINGRICH, a Representative from the State of Georgia, Speaker; and Robin H. Carle, a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MAKING IN ORDER IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order immediately to consider in the House a resolution adopting the rules of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress; that the resolution be considered as read; that the resolution be debatable initially for 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question, except that the question of adopting the resolution shall be divided among nine parts, to wit: Each of the eight sections of title I, and then title II; each portion of the divided question shall be debatable separately for 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees, and shall be disposed of in the order stated, but if the yeas and nays are ordered on the question of adopting any portion of the divided question, the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on that question

until a later time during the consideration of the resolution; and, pending the question of adopting the ninth portion of the divided question, it shall be in order to move the previous question thereon, and if the previous question is ordered, to move that the House commit the resolution to a select committee, with or without instructions, and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to commit to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] several questions about his unanimous-consent request.

First of all, does the gentleman's request allow us to offer an amendment to ban gifts by lobbyists?

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, You are entitled under the rules to offer a germane amendment in your motion to commit if it is ruled by the Parliamentarian that such an amendment is germane.

Mr. BONIOR. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would propound to my distinguished friend from Texas another question:

Is your request an open amendment process which allows Members the opportunity to offer germane amendments? We have the opportunity to offer germane amendments?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, I am advised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that the rule is more open than any we have ever had in the past.

Mr. BONIOR. Is the gentleman saying that no amendments are in order under the request and this is a closed rule?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, there are plenty of amendments in order.

Mr. BONIOR. Does this afford the minority a right to offer an amendment. I would ask the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am again advised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that my colleague can include any amendment he wants in the motion to commit so long as it meets the test of germaneness.

Mr. BONIOR. Will we have time to debate the motion to commit?

Mr. ARMEY. I believe under the rules of the House it is a nondebatable motion.

Mr. BONIOR. So we can offer the motion and we cannot debate it?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, there will be about 3½ hours of debate, and it is the judgment of this Member that there will be plenty of opportunity within that time since time will be allocated to the minority for debate purposes to make the points that the gentleman might want to make related to their motion to commit.

□ 1430

It is a common practice that we used many times when we were in the minority exercising our prerogative to make a motion to commit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding we will not be able to offer amendments on the motion the gentleman has put forward, and that we will not be able, for instance, to offer the amendment that we wish to offer on the gift ban.

In fact, I would ask another question of my friend. Does this request envision a division of the open-amendment process for the Congressional Accountability Act to be considered at the end of the day?

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Perhaps at this point I might address the Speaker and express my wonderment as to whether or not the gentleman is going to make an objection.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, let me just say that given that the gentleman has informed the House that he is requesting two completely closed rules, two gag rules, I might add, on the first day of the Congress, I object.

The SPEAKER. An objection has been heard.

The Chair now recognizes the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, since there is no Committee on Rules yet, and the Committee on Rules has not met yet to organize and will not until tomorrow, by direction of the Republican Conference, I call up a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 5

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 6) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Fourth Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read. The resolution shall be debatable initially for 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening

motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in sections 2 and 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 2. The question of adopting the resolution shall be divided among nine parts, to wit: each of the eight sections of title I; and title II. Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable separately for 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees, and shall be disposed of in the order stated.

SEC. 3. Pending the question of adopting the ninth portion of the divided question, it shall be in order to move that the House commit the resolution to a select committee, with or without instructions. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to commit to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is a matter of privilege. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, or in this case the minority whip, or his designee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a special rule authorized by the Republican Conference providing for the consideration of a resolution adopting the rules of the House for the 104th Congress.

While such a special rule is not unprecedented, I think the last time it was done was back in 1893. So this is an unusual situation. We have never before had an objection to the rules being brought up by unanimous consent.

As returning Members are aware, ordinarily the resolution adopting House rules at the beginning of a Congress is considered as privileged in the House and subject to just 1 hour of debate, with no amendments, and on up-or-down vote following the vote on the previous question and any motion to commit the resolution.

This special rule allows for a different and more expansive consideration of the House rules resolution.

First, instead of just 1 hour of debate, which is customary in this House and traditional over the years, certainly all of the years I have been here, it provides for a total of 3½ hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the majority and the minority party.

Second, instead of just one vote on adopting the resolution, the special rule allows for nine separate votes, not counting a vote on committing the resolution. I would again call this to the attention of the Members on that side of the aisle. It allows for nine separate votes, not counting a vote on committing the resolution, which I assume the minority would be offering.

This time will be divided as follows: First, there will be 30 minutes of general debate on the resolution, equally divided between the majority and the minority.

Second, there will follow 20 minutes of debate each on the eight sections contained in title I of the resolution, and that is the Contract with America: The Bill of Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, each of these sections will be subject to a separate vote under an automatic division of the question.

Third, there will be additional 20 minutes of debate on title II of the resolution, containing an additional 23 sections, followed by a separate vote on title II. That is nine votes altogether.

It would be in order for the minority, prior to the final vote on adopting title II of this bill, to offer a motion to commit the resolution.

However, I want to point out that this special rule does not allow for a separate previous question vote on title II. So if the minority wishes to have a previous question vote to alter the terms of this procedure and make in order additional amendments, it must defeat the previous question on this special rule. They have that prerogative.

We are allowing the minority its traditional previous question vote through this rule, but we are not being so generous as to allow the minority two previous question votes. We are going to be here until 10:30, 11:30, possibly even 2 o'clock in the morning, and we want to expedite this as quickly as possible.

I would also point out in that same regard that the previous question is automatically ordered on the adoption of each of the eight sections in title I.

That means that there will be no separate previous question votes on those sections, nor will there be an opportunity to commit any of those sections, with or without instructions.

That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that the minority will be precluded in its final motion to commit on title II from revisiting any matter that has been adopted in title I. They can still take that opportunity, if they wish. On the contrary, all of the rules of the House that have been adopted to that point are still subject to further amendment in any motion to commit, and any additional amendments to House rules will be in order as well.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we have designed in this procedure the fairest and most open process on a House rules resolution in over a century in this House. We have allowed over three times as much debate as is usual on opening day, and nine times as many votes.

We will be giving Members on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to separately vote on each of the nine items contained in our Contract with America as embodied in title I. And the minority will retain its usual right to alter this procedure further if it defeats the previous question on this rule, and it will retain its usual right to commit the resolution with a final

amendment at the conclusion of debate on title II.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge adoption of this special rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, perhaps for a colloquy with the minority whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people voted for change.

They sent a message to this House, a message of anger and frustration.

We, in our party, have heard that message, the message of working families whose incomes are squeezed, working families who are tired of business as usual, who feel that no one speaks for them.

In the days and weeks and months ahead, we, in the Democratic Party intend to be their voice.

When tax cuts are proposed, we intend to make sure that it is working families who benefit, not the wealthiest few.

In our efforts to balance the budget, we intend to make sure that our seniors are not robbed of their right to Social Security or Medicare, that our children are not deprived of their right to education and practical training for good jobs.

And we intend to make sure that when we talk about reforming this House, those reforms are real, concrete, and that they make a difference. We have seen the symbols of change today. In what is the greatest tribute to, this, the world's greatest democratic institution, the gavel has changed hands. Power has shifted.

The Republican Party has promised an agenda of reform. We, Democrats intend to make sure they keep their promises. Today, we deal with the rules of this House. These issues may seem arcane, removed from the lives of average Americans. But what we do today sends a powerful signal. For today, we define the rules and standards that we, as Members of Congress, are determined to live by.

Most Democrats will support most of the reforms that are being offered. Some of them were our own reforms, reforms that were blocked last year, in a cynical move for partisan advantage by the Republican Party. Some of them are of little consequence. Whether they pass or not makes little difference. But, none of these reforms go far enough. They stop short. They are just window dressing, hiding the real shift in power the Republicans intend to bring about.

The American people voted for change last November. They did not vote to create a Congress that is for sale to the highest bidder. They voted for change. But they did not vote for a Congress where leaders take care of their own private profits before they take care of the public business.

They voted for change. But they did not vote for a Congress that is be-

holden to multimillionaires. And they did not vote to allow Members of Congress to trade on the public trust, and become millionaires themselves. They did not vote for a Congress that is entangled with special interests or tied to the powerful concerns of foreign corporations.

The American people did not vote to open the doors of Congress to the Power Rangers or the powers that be, but to the power of the average American. With this paltry package of reforms, the Republican Party has shown that they just don't get the message.

We are about to witness the biggest takeover by special interests in the history of the U.S. Congress, and this so-called reform package does nothing to stop it. This rules package is nothing more than a string of broken promises.

After the years of whining and complaining on the Republican side about the damages to democracy of closed rules, what is the first thing they offer us? A closed rule. Not just one closed rule, but a closed rule within a closed rule.

Where is democracy, where is open debate, where is the free flow of ideas? Not one amendment will be able to be offered to anything the Republicans do today. Not one amendment.

This would not matter so much, if the Republicans had offered us real reform. But their package leaves out the single most important effort that could help stop the influence of special interests, a ban on gifts from lobbyists.

Last year, the Republicans ran from reform, and blocked passage of the gift ban bill in the Senate. This year, they are going even further. With this closed rule, with this gag rule, they have prevented a gift ban from being offered as a separate amendment.

We need to defeat the previous question on this gag rule, to provide an open rule that will allow us to get to the real issues of reform, including a ban on gifts from special interests.

This is essentially the same gift ban provision that was passed overwhelmingly last year, Republicans claimed to be for it then, now that they are in control, it is time to get real about reform, and pass this ban on gifts.

In recent weeks, it has become clear that there is a serious loophole in even this major reform. We have discovered that there are backdoors to getting gifts. And one of these back doors is through book deals, with lucrative advances and multimillion dollar royalty contracts.

I will be urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can offer an open rule which will allow an amendment to directly address this issue of whether a Member of Congress should be allowed to earn millions of dollars in book royalties while employed at the taxpayers expense.

We intend to try to offer an amendment that would cap royalties from

any individual book to one-third of a Member's annual salary.

Let me make this very clear: by making this proposal today, we are not trying to discourage Members from writing books. Public officials all the way back to ancient Greece have written books, including many esteemed Members of this body.

But at the same time, no Member should be able to use the prestige of this office to cut a special deal.

No Member of Congress should be allowed to use this office—this public trust—for personal gain. No Member of Congress should make a book deal in one day that equals far more than the average American family earns in their entire lifetime.

A one-third cap on royalties is reasonable. It is more than generous. The public expects us to do no less.

We were not elected to this body to get rich; we're here to do the people's business and that is a full time job.

It is important today that we send the word out across America that we are serious about reform, that this Congress is not for sale, our offices are not open to the highest bidder.

A vote for the previous question and for this gag rule is a vote to shut out real reform. It is a vote to fling open the doors to special interests. It is a vote to continue the old order.

I urge my colleagues, especially those of you for whom this is your very first vote, those of you who ran on the promise of reform, do not side with the special interest. Let us open the door to real reform. Vote no on the previous question and let's come back with a rule that will allow us to ban gifts from lobbyists and to limit the royalties of Members of Congress.

This House of Representatives is not for sale. Say no to gifts. Say no to excessive book deals. Support an open rule.

□ 1440

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself such time as I might consume just briefly.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and he is a good friend and I have deep respect for him, but I believe, DAVID, that you were a member of the task force on the ethics bipartisan task force that allowed Members to take book royalties from legitimate book firms back, what year was that, back in 1981 or 1982, I believe. 1989, it was even more recent.

But let me just address this rule business, because when Speaker GINGRICH called me before him when we were going to talk about the formation of the new Committee on Rules, he instructed me, along with the other eight Republicans that will make up that

committee to be as open and fair and accountable as we possibly can. As the gentleman knows, in recent years under the past two Speakers, we have gone to almost a totally structured rule process, where Members on both sides of the aisle have literally been gagged. The House was not allowed to work its will.

The gentleman knows that conservative Democrats on your side of the aisle complained bitterly about it, people like the gentleman from Minnesota, Tim Penny, and the gentleman from Louisiana, BILL TAUZIN, and others, because they were not allowed to offer amendments on this floor.

Speaker GINGRICH has asked me to be as open and fair as we possible can, and to reverse the fact that 70 percent of all of the rules that came to this floor last year were closed or structured or restricted rules. He has asked us to try to make an open rule process the norm, and not the exception. We are going to do that. I am going to follow his instructions. Now, at this point, let me yield to a Member who served on the Speaker's task force to reform this House. I had the privilege of serving with him. We developed these kinds of reforms that we are offering here today, 8 of them in the contract for America, 23 in title II, all of which are additional reforms to the existing 1993 Democrat rules package that is here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a very distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

□ 1450

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Glens Falls, the soon to be chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say that as I have listened to the words from my very dear friend, the gentleman from Mount Clemens, MI [Mr. BONIOR], who has described this as a closed rule, I have to say that it is absolutely preposterous to claim that what is clearly the most open rule on an opening day in recent congressional history is closed. Now, in the past we have regularly seen basically a single up-or-down vote, but as Speaker GINGRICH said in his remarks earlier, we are going to be today casting votes on eight different provisions, providing Members with the opportunity to look at virtually every aspect of the preamble of our contract with America.

As I listen to the arguments about a closed rule here, I cannot help but think about the fact that nearly every single week during the second session of the 103d Congress I stood right there at that desk and asked the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], or his representative, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], or the gentleman from Mary-

land [Mr. HOYER], or another Member when we could expect the congressional reform package to get to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, the response was regularly "Well, we are hoping that we will be able to get it up first in early spring of 1994." Then it was late spring, then early summer, then midsummer then before we adjourned for August, and then after August it was before we adjourned. As we all know very well, at the end of the 103d Congress, we got a little speck and nothing more than that when we passed this rule calling for congressional compliance.

It seems to me that as we look at this issue, this issue is a very important one which we have struggled to get our friends who were formerly in the majority to bring to the House floor, and because of their recalcitrance on the issue of congressional reform over the past 2 years, we are on the opening day bringing these reforms as expeditiously as we possibly can. Why? Because we have debated these throughout virtually every campaign. On every measure that dealt with the issue of congressional reform, I attempted to defeat the previous question, to make in order our congressional reform package, which again had been promised for consideration by the leadership in the past.

I believe very strongly that this rule is going to allow us to have free, fair, and open debate on this extraordinarily important issue, on this extraordinarily important day. I say we have got to get the job of congressional reform completed and completed today, so that we can do what the American people are anticipating from us in the next 100 days.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California, [Mr. DREIER], he also stood at that desk over there every single day and he condemned closed rules as being a violation of the democratic process, and he promised that if he were in charge we would never again see closed rules.

And where are we today? The first day of the first session of Congress, when you are finally in charge, and the very first rule you bring to the House is a closed rule. Now I would just have to say to the gentlemen from California and New York, Mr. DREIER and Mr. SOLOMON, it is a curious thing to see on the first day of the House these two gentlemen, who took up so much of our time talking about closed rules, to be the authors of a closed rule on the first day of this Congress.

It is indeed also curious that, after so much talk about reform, that they would bring to the House floor today a set of rules that excludes any reference to reform of the process we have today

under which lobbyists are permitted to buy gifts, meals, and thinly disguised vacation trips for Members of Congress.

I must say it is especially curious inasmuch as in October the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, was on "Meet the Press" saying, and I quote, "I am prepared to pass a bill that bans lobbyists from dealing with Members of Congress in terms of gifts."

Yet here we are on the first day, the first opportunity to do it, and not only is it not a part of the Republican package, we are prohibited from even offering an amendment to the Republican package to prohibit lobbyists from buying gifts, free meals, and thinly disguised vacations for Members of Congress.

They will not allow us to offer that amendment for a very simple reason, because they know that it would pass overwhelmingly.

The Speaker and his leadership allies fought tooth and nail last year to kill the ban on gifts from lobbyists. They tried to keep the bill from being considered in the House, and when that failed, they encouraged a Senate filibuster which succeeded in killing it, even though twice it passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly and with a bipartisan majority. They said they were against it because somehow or another it interfered with the grass-roots lobbying.

I have an amendment which we will bring up when this previous question is defeated, which says that gifts will no longer be permitted to be given to Members of Congress in the forms of meals, free trips, free costly golf vacations or anything else from members of the lobby, from the lobbyists.

I urge the new Republican Members, today you will decide whether you are in lock-step with this new Republican majority and the Speaker, or you are committed to the public. If you are committed to the public, vote against the previous question. Let us do the public's business today and prohibit lobbyists from giving gifts, free meals, free vacations, free golf trips, and all other manner of freebies to Members of the House of Representatives.

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

The gentleman from Texas mentioned lockstep. Yes, we Republicans are in lockstep. We are in lockstep with the message that was sent by the American people on November 8, and we are going to accomplish the things they asked us to do.

That means shrinking the size of this Congress by one-third, eliminating 600 jobs, and setting the example for what we will do when we take up the 100 days Contract With America in which we will shrink Government and we will grow the private sector. That is what we are laying the groundwork here today for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished member from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me this time.

It is the 4th of January, but it seems like the 4th of July, to me. It is Independence Day. It is Independence Day in this House, as we begin to set ourselves free from the shackles of what America knows is the status quo, business as usual.

I hardly need to remind my colleagues about the Dark Ages, when committee chairmen zealously perpetuated their turfs; when Members missed committee meetings because votes were taken by proxy; when committee meetings could be held in the dead of the night behind closed doors, sometimes locked closed doors, locked to the minority; when Members could come to this floor and apparently wilfully disclose classified information without admonition; when large tax bills could pass on the slimmest of margins and huge spending packages could slide through on a voice vote.

The excesses of Congresses past are well documented. On November 8, Americans sent a message. Well, Mr. Speaker, message received. Limiting the terms of committee chairmen, banning proxy voting, establishing truth in budgeting, reducing staff, opening up and streamlining the committee process, mandating recorded votes on spending bills, these changes today will make this a more responsive and responsible House. By laying this groundwork for a new beginning, we take the first concrete steps toward earning back the trust of the people that we are here to serve.

I am pleased that this rules package includes a simple but important requirement that Members wishing access to classified material sign an oath of secrecy, a powerful change that should increase Members' awareness and accountability where national security is at stake.

At the same time, we are taking major steps to bring sunshine into the daily workings of this House's business and to ensure individual Members' accountability for all of their actions. All around, this is a balanced package of substantive change.

It is not exclusive. There will be more, and I invite the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] to join me in sponsoring my bill that bans lobbyist-paid travel, if he wants further reform. This is the beginning step.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of these new rules today. It is not the final thing, but it is the most important thing we are going to do, because it is going to show America we are serious about making the changes.

Of course, there will be more oncoming. Today it is a good agenda. It is an American agenda, and it is today's agenda, so let us pass it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud new Member of the 104th Congress, and I want to speak just for a moment to my fellow new Members, because we all campaigned for reform. I urge you, do not get cold feet.

I come armed with the Constitution of the United States of America that says "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union," among other things, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," not to Congress, not to individual congressional Members, but the people want for themselves the right to live and the right to know that their Congress is not owned and bought.

□ 1500

The American people want reform, not phony reform but real reform. They want to know that the ties of special interests are now really broken. They want to know that the days of free meals and free trips and special privileges are over. They are angry and we did hear their voices. We the Democratic Members heard their voices in November, and today we want to start fresh and anew talking about reform. But we need to go a lot further. If we want to send a real signal that we are really changing Washington, we need to ban gifts from lobbyists and special interests. As Members of Congress, we should not be using public office for private gain. We are here to make change, not to protect the old order. Let us begin by having an open debate. What is wrong with amendments allowing us to raise the voice of the American people? No more closed rules, no more status quo. Let the American people realize that we are not for sale.

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

I would just point out to the gentlewoman, I know she is a freshman Member, but in the last Congress, the 103d Congress, 70 percent of every rule that came to this floor under Speaker Foley was a restricted, closed, or modified rule. We are reversing that through your order, sir, and we will have open rules in this House. We will have openness, fairness, and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], the very distinguished new member of the Committee on Rules.

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

I would like to point out that it is clear what the theme of the day is from your side and, that is, gifts from lobbyists and that is going to appeal not to

the people in this body but to the people watching this on C-SPAN.

It is worth noting that after 40 years of rule, including the last 2 when the Democrats had control of both the House and the Senate and also the White House, that this should have been able to have been passed. But this rule is not about gifts from lobbyists. That is a bill to come. This rule does not include amendments for campaign finance reform or parking at Washington National or indeed paid travel from lobbyists. This rule has to do with process, process of how Congress acts, the committees, the staffs, the way we budget. We will deal with those issues at a later date in separate bills. We have done that in the past. We have cooperated in trying to get campaign finance reform to the floor, in trying to get lobbying reform to this House, all in stand-alone, individual bills. Let us be honest about it.

We understand your point of view in the minority, trying to distract Americans' attention from the issue of the day, which is passing a rule by which we live for the next 2 years. This rule deals with process, how Congress conducts itself. Let us contain our comments to that point.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, like our Republican colleagues as a new Member of this Congress, I came seeking constructive change, and of that change I was most eager to join with our Republican colleagues the concept of opening this House.

Yet at this first opportunity for change, this Republican rules package fails. I do not know what they call a rule in California or New York where you get no amendment and no alternative, but in Texas we call that closed government.

You propose two completely closed rules, two rules that do not allow one new Member, one old Member, one Republican, one Democrat to offer any amendment to this package. More than that, you have done what is unprecedented perhaps in the history of this country, and that is to provide a closed rule within a bill that is brought up under a closed rule.

This is not open government. This is not reform. It is more closed government as usual. This is barring the door, slamming the door shut and actually then barring that door for people to participate in the process of democracy.

It was only a few months ago that the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] suggested that when a closed rule is foisted on this House, the Members are denied the opportunity to represent their constituents. That is no less true today.

You have said that this is a new chapter in the history of this House,

but you have made it an edited, indeed a censored chapter. You have said you have changed the course of business in this House, but I would submit, to use the words of the distinguished gentleman from New York, that it is merely shortchange.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to say to Members on that side of the aisle how refreshing it is now to see Members from the Democratic Party standing up and fighting for those minority rights that we fought for for 40 years on this floor. We welcome you into this debate and we are going to open up this House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], one of the senior Members of this House.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today is truly a momentous occasion. After serving in the minority for 11 terms, new and historic horizons are being opened as Republicans become the majority party in the House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years.

We are beginning the first day of the 104th Congress with a full schedule of much-needed internal reforms in the House of Representatives. We will vote on eight separate reforms including a reduction of committee staff by one-third, requiring that committee meetings be open to the public and requiring that members of committees be present for votes in their committees.

This new openness in the committee process is important because it is the first step in establishing the accountability that the American people are demanding of the Congress. The most important decisions on legislation are often made during committee deliberations. Members of committees become experts in the areas of the committee's jurisdiction and other Members rely on their judgment.

One of the most important reforms we are voting on today is the ban of proxy voting in committees. Proxy voting allows another Member to cast a vote on legislation for a Member who is absent. Of the 22 standing committees in the last Congress, only 4 banned absentee voting. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee which has never allowed the use of proxy voting. All Members should be present to vote on issues before the committee.

Accountability to the American public begins in the committee system by Members being present for meetings and votes, and those meetings being open to the public. We must assure all of our constituents of the seriousness with which we approach our work of deliberating the issues of importance to our country. Only then can the integrity of the Congress be reestablished.

Today's action can be defined in five words: "Accountability in the People's House."

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my opposition to the closed rule on the Republican rules package. This package contains many important reforms that I support, but it does not contain the most crucial reform, a ban on gifts from lobbyists. The gift ban is central to our ability to break the bond between the special interests and the Congress. That is what the public clamored for, separate special interests from the institution of the Congress.

The Democratic proposal would ban all gifts to Members of Congress. It bans meals, entertainment, and travel. It says no more business as usual.

On this first day of the 104th Congress when so many hopes are pinned on people reclaiming their Government, it is time to end the special interests' influence over Congress. It is time to say no. No to dinners, no to golf jackets, no to the old style perks and privileges. The only privilege we need is the privilege to serve in this body.

The new Republican majority claims that they are leading a revolution to reform this institution. That is what they told the American public. But keeping closed rules, protecting perks and privileges is just more hypocrisy.

Support real change. Open the rule and support a gift ban.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why the Republicans oppose the Democratic rules change in this closed rule. Our rules change makes every rules change proposed by the Republicans today pale in comparison. Theirs are plastic and papier mache. Ours have the hard steel of real change because they address the key issue of the integrity of Congress.

Today as we speak on this floor with a few Members, so many others are enjoying this wonderful first day of service in Congress. They came here promising to represent their districts, not the special interests. Our rules change addresses that straightforwardly. It prohibits and limits any gifts from lobbyists and special interest groups so that new Members and old Members alike will not be ensnared in these special interest tangles. And equally important, Mr. Speaker, it closes or at least restricts a dangerous loophole.

By the rules of the House I cannot go out and give a speech and earn one dollar. But I can go out, and in the name of writing a book, supposedly earn legally millions of dollars. That kind of ridiculous loophole puts this House in jeopardy and every Member of it.

I would suggest that we stick with the Democratic changes and defeat the previous question.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to a very distinguished new Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I came from South Carolina, a State that a few years ago sent about 18 people to jail because they took shirts, they took shoes, they took golf trips, and they sold their vote. If Members want to reform me, I challenge them to do so. But everything in its time. For 40 years Democrats have had control of this body to do that.

What the American people need to know, and what I want constituents to know at home is what we are talking about doing the first day is to change the way this institution operates. NEWT GINGRICH, the new Speaker of the House, has done something that no Speaker of the House has ever done in this body, Republican or Democrat. He has instituted a measure to limit his own term as Speaker. I congratulate him for doing that. Leadership and reform begins at the top, and that is what he has demonstrated, and on behalf of the freshman class we thank him for doing something other than talk.

Also in this rule is a provision that would limit committee chairmen to serve 6 years. If we want to change America, that is a great place to start, and that is what we are talking about today, changing this institution to breathe the new life into it.

Mr. Speaker, ideas do matter, and they are going to have a new day.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 hour ago you addressed every Member of this body and the House, you addressed the entire United States of America and you said this is the 104th Congress. Think of it, 208 years. For 208 years, Mr. Speaker, we have existed under the rule of the majority.

Two hundred eight years ago, Mr. Speaker, as a student of history you know that the Constitutional Convention adopted the Constitution rejecting the Articles of Confederation that have a super majority requirement. By a rules change, with no committee hearings, with only 20 minutes of debate, you want to strike a blow at the most fundamental tenet of constitutional principle: rule of the majority, and revert to the Articles of Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, how can you do this on the first day of your tenure in office?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Cleveland, OH [Mr. HOKE].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is hard not to be somewhat amused by the shenanigans that are going on on the floor right now when we are being told that we are

completely shackling the rights of the minority by not allowing them to have the central reform that should be in this rules package; that is, the gift and lobby reform.

It has to be pointed out that for 40 years Democrats have had the opportunity to pass this fundamental gift and lobby reform, and yet they have not been able to do it in a timely way that got through both the House and the Senate and was signed into law. For them now to claim that somehow, somehow this is preventing them from doing this when they know substantively we will get to this later, the question I have is why did they choose the gift and lobby reform as opposed to fundamental campaign finance reform, that is the elimination of special interest contributions. They know and I know that about \$250,000 plus goes into every single incumbent's campaign on a cyclical basis. That is real influence that is being purchased by special interest groups, and yet there is only one group, one group in the entire Congress, not the House Republicans, not the Senate Democrats, not the Senate Republicans that do not want to limit that genuine purchasing of influence, and that group is the House Democrats.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me refresh my friend from Cleveland's memory. We did pass the gift rule ban last Congress and it was killed in the other body by the Republican Party.

I also would like to refresh my friend's memory and suggest to him that we did pass campaign finance reform and it was killed also by Republicans.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I will not yield at this point. I would yield in a second to my friend using his time.

So we have complied with the wishes of the American people on two basic, fundamental reforms which is banning gifts and reducing the influence of outside interests in campaign reform. We passed them in this House not very long ago, a few months ago, sent them over to the Senate and they were killed by Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of congressional reform and in support of several parts of the proposed rules package. No Member in this Chamber has a premium on what's best for this Nation. We all have a contract with America.

The contract to which each Member is bound, is to work in the best interests of the American people.

On election day, we offered our services to this great country, and voters

from Rocky Mount, NC, to the Silicone Valley of California, accepted our offer. We all have a contract with America.

That contract involves being open to the challenge of change. I will vote for several of the reforms offered in this rules package. However, I will vote against those proposals that are considered dangerous to the stability of the American people or undermine the Constitution of this country.

We must get beyond partisan politics and move to the high ground of principle—serving all Americans.

But, real reform must include an end to gag rules. There are important amendments that would be offered, amendments designed to improve and perfect this rules package, but Members are muzzled because the majority has insisted on a closed rule for this debate.

No Member can offer an amendment such as the gift ban. That is an issue that we debated and supported last Congress. As I am informed, the gift ban we passed would have included royalties from books. If we are to be leaders, we must also lead in following the rules under which we are governed. In this House, we have resolved that no Member should be enriched beyond what the people pay. That resolve should not end with the Speaker, it should begin with him.

I will support those thoughtful reforms that have been offered by the majority. But, I will continue to stand up as part of the loyal opposition when I believe pomposity, audacity and duplicity confront us.

No party or person has an exclusive on such things as family values and personal responsibility. Those are standards I absolutely hold dear. And no party or person should be able to take the right to speak and participate from any of us. Too many have sacrificed for that precious liberty. We all, 435 Representatives, have a contract with America. Let no one forget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue with this freest and most open debate in congressional history, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Greensboro, NC [Mr. COBLE].

□ 1520

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Claremont, CA, for having yielded me this time.

Reform the House? We Republicans have previously engaged in this exercise of attempting to reduce the number of staff positions and the number of committees. So this is not a case of first impression.

But each time we proposed these reductions, they fell upon deaf ears, and the Democrat leadership rejected our attempts to streamline the Congress, and in so doing serve as better stewards for taxpayers.

During this session, pending passage of this proposal today, there will be 25

fewer subcommittees, 3 fewer standing committees. This will save taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I am advised that we have eliminated 80 positions on one committee alone. I am not uncaring nor insensitive about this result, but these positions should never have been created in the first place. In applying retroactive psychology, Mr. Speaker, if our Democrat leadership friends had accepted our previous proposals which would have saved taxpayers millions of dollars, we Republicans may not be in the majority today.

But in this town, pride of authorship is jealously guarded, and many people are reluctant to permit any good change unless they can claim the credit therefor.

Today we Republicans again are offering proposals of change which we have previously attempted to no avail. On this day, Mr. Speaker, we will, indeed, prevail.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us a message in November. They want less government, less bureaucracy, more ethics, and more accountability. They did not vote for arrogant government, and they did not vote for coronations of any one party or individual.

This rule is a gag rule, no amendments to the Republican rules package. While the Speaker's first statement was gracious, the first act of this new Republican majority is not about reform. It is about congressional retreat. For all of their talk about reforming the old guard, Republicans today are doing something that probably no other Congress in history has ever done. They have proposed a closed rule within a bill brought up under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, let us have openness and accountability.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue with the most open and free debate in the history of congressional history on any opening day, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Glenwood Springs, CO [Mr. McINNIS], a new member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, we are talking about today new management versus old management, and it is often tough for old management to get used to the new management ideas. So what you have to do on the old management side of the aisle, you have to take a look and say, "How are we going to debate these rascals over there that want new management, that want accountability to the American people? How can we explain the fact we have allowed ghost voting, that we have had

poor management for 40 years, allowed misleading budget information, allowed mostly closed rules, 70 percent last year? How can we explain to the American people there is no sunshine law in Congress? How can we explain these things so those rascals under the new management do not disclose the problems the American people recognized this last November?" The way you do it is you bring in distraction. You do not talk about the positive elements of this rule, which are manifold, elimination of committee staff, no more ghost voting, no more false budget numbers. You have got to bring in distraction.

So let us talk about gifts. I guess if it was your rule change maybe we ought to talk about inherited money and see if we have the same kind of merits.

Do not distract us. Work for improvement. Work for progress. Join the new management.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. There are to be no demonstrations in the gallery. Those in the gallery are here as guests of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule.

I agree with many of the reforms, but there are many, many opportunities for us to perfect this package. We are passing up an opportunity to close forever the huge ethical loophole in congressional activities, the potential for compromise by special interests. We can do so by banning gifts and by restricting the benefits from lobbyists and by restricting the benefits one can receive from our writings as we do now from our speeches.

The American people sent us a message in November. They said they wanted personal accountability. They certainly do not wish for us to enrich ourselves as we serve them.

Let us seize this opportunity to clean up this huge ethical loophole and truly reform congressional activities on this first open day of the debate of the 104th Congress.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as a Member of this House on the Democratic side of the aisle who for 20 years never brought a bill to the floor under a closed rule, I am sure that I speak with credibility that this change is supposed to be about opening up this debate, and in fact that has not happened.

The test is not whether this is more open than what we did on opening day. The test is whether or not this rule is

open or closed, and this rule is, in fact, closed.

What is your fear of having an open rule on congressional reform? That we would overreform the House of Representatives? Hard to conceive of that. What is your fear of having an open rule when you in fact have the votes to beat down any amendment that you do not like? What is your fear, that we would overreform? I do not think so.

Your fear is we would offer what is not in here. The point is this: It is what you do not put in these rules that disturbs us and disturbs the American public, and that is breaking the link between lawyers, lobbyists, money, and legislators, ending the gifts that can be given to legislators and recognizing when the freshman Members took the oath here today, they were given a voting card, not a right to receive gifts to NFL games, to lunches and to dinners.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue with debate on the most open, open reform package that has come to this floor on an opening day, I yield 30 seconds to a very hard-working member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, my friend and classmate, the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, MO [Mr. EMERSON].

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

You know, I have been somewhat amused sitting here listening to our colleagues on the minority side talking about open rules. I hope members of the American public know that we are in the process of reforming the Rules of the House of Representatives here today, that are going to bring a higher level of reform to this body than it has experienced in generations.

I am amused by some of the rhetoric here and chagrined really at what I consider to be the nitpicking. It ill serves you, I think, to be so petty in your quibbling when we are bringing about major reform to this body.

Mr. BONIOR. Well, with all due respect to my friend—and he is my friend—the gentleman from Missouri, breaking the ban and the link between lobbyists and lawyers and the power in this town in this institution we do not consider as petty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, if the debate is free, and truly free, then why cannot we offer significant amendments for reform?

Here is a list of what we can vote for; there is not a list of what we cannot vote for, because you will not permit us to offer certain amendments, and I offer this observation.

But today there is no longer an opportunity for Members to fully participate in offering amendments to reform the House as it should be reformed.

Students of history should note BOB WISE did not say this, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said that on opening day of 1991.

Why is it that those who say they want change—and we all want change—will not permit us to bring to this floor a ban on gifts from lobbyists, a ban on dinners from lobbyists? Is this something radical? It has passed the House twice before. Why can we not bring to the floor the amendment to limit royalties and address another area of concern to the House? If you want change, then you have to vote for it. If you want change, then you have to work for it. If you want change, then you have to let true change flourish, and you have to let us offer these amendments.

This is not true change, this is not reform that you are doing. You said you wanted open rules; make them open.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue debate under the most open process in congressional history, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Roanoke, VA [Mr. GOODLATTE].

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new day in the people's House, and a new day calls for new rules, and we are going to deliver those today.

Let me say to our friends on the other side of the aisle who are claiming our reforms today do not go far enough, for 40 years you ran this place behind closed doors, keeping every perk, privilege, and partisan advantage. Now, suddenly, you are trying to tell the American people you have now become reformers. Well, I realize everyone should have ambitious New Year's resolutions, but this one is just too hard to swallow. Today, despite the resistance from the minority party, we are going to bring more reform to the House in 12 hours than the other party brought in 40 years of iron-fisted rule.

We are wiping out three full standing committees and over 20 subcommittees; we are slashing bloated committee staffs, imposing term limits on the Speaker and committee chairmen and eliminating proxy voting.

Finally, we are going to start making Congress live by the laws that American businesses and families live by. I think I can speak for many Americans when I say it is about time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The gallery will not participate in the proceedings of the House. The gallery may watch as guests of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman who just spoke could not join us today, as he was one who in fact did vote on the gift ban in the last Con-

gress when the issue was before us. I am sorry he did not join us today, when this party in fact has real power but I guess that is not in the cards.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA].

Mr. MASCARA. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I too am proud to be a Member of the 104th Congress. Like many of my new colleagues, I campaigned on the issue of reform. I want to urge other Members to not get cold feet now.

Our task today is very simple: It is to prove to the American people that we care more about the public interest than we do about the special interests; it is to provide that Congress is not for sale.

Mr. Speaker, we are not royalty and, therefore, we do not need gifts. We do not need free trips or free meals or special privileges. We are stewards of the public trust. Our constituents elected us to work hard, to make tough decisions, and to stand up for what is right.

As Members of Congress, we represent the public interest, not private profits.

We are here to make change, not to protect the old order. Let us begin by having an open debate about the real needs of our constituents. No more closed rules, no more status quo.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we proceed with the most open debate in congressional history, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Ocala, FL [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker—it is a wonderful afternoon.

I thank my colleague from California.

My colleague from Florida on the other side of the aisle talked about seizing the opportunity. He agrees with a lot of the reforms that we are going to present here shortly, but he is complaining about the parliamentary procedure. So I say to him why did he not, he and his party, bring all of these forward during the last 40 years? Let us take this opportunity to look at one of these, the Congressional Accountability Act, that we are going to pass here on opening day.

What we are saying is that it will not be business as usual around here, and we intend to make Congress operate in a more fair and open manner.

Thomas Jefferson said, "When a man assumes public trust, he should consider himself as public property." By enacting this new set of rules for the House, we are stating unequivocally we believe in practicing what we preach.

We must continue providing the bold and decisive leadership that brought us to this moment here in history.

I urge my colleague from Florida who talked about seizing the opportunity: Let us move forward.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to answer my friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS]. He raised the issue why did we not do this before? In fact, we did the very reform that the gentleman from Florida spoke about, and that was congressional accountability.

We authored the legislation, we passed it in this body. It was killed by the Republicans in the other body. We came back, incorporated it in a rule which was governable for the rest of the session.

So, to suggest to this Chamber and to the folks who are listening that we did not do that is just not the case.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker and Members, I do not think this is a debate about whether this is the most open of open rules or closed rules in the history of this Congress, because it is a completely closed rule.

If I had in my hand today an amendment to try to preserve for us the right to ban the gifts from lobbyists, I would not be able to do that right now. So let me quote to you some words that I think are most eloquently stated, back in May 25, 1993, "With closed rules, voices all across America are silenced. Republicans want the people to have choices, and that can only be done by having open rules." Those very eloquent words were uttered by our new Speaker, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH.

I would urge all of my colleagues in this House to recognize the words uttered by our new Speaker, that we should have open rules. This is a closed rule, it is not a good way to start this first year of this new Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue with the most open debate in congressional history on opening day, I yield 1½ minutes to the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Rules, my friend the gentleman from Kingsport, TN [Mr. QUILLEN].

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have been a member of the House for 32 years and a member of the Rules Committee for 30 of those years, always in the minority until now. I have probably spoken out on the House floor against closed rules more times than any other Member of this body.

But even as a member of the minority, I have always believed that there were certain issues such as this that should be decided under a restricted or closed rule. To the best of my recollection, the resolutions establishing the rules of the House have been considered under a completely closed rule—with a straight up or down vote. This rule will allow Members the opportunity to vote

on nine separate portions of the rules package. This is certainly a much more open process than any that I have seen in my 32 years.

I think the minority should appreciate that the Republican majority chose to open up consideration of this rules package instead of following the traditional closed process that the Democrats embraced and promoted when they controlled the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker remaining.

□ 1540

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Omaha, NE [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], a new Member who has joined us.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the Republican majority, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Democrat Party to make sure that these reforms come to place, but we have to remember that the American people sent us to do change. They sent us here to make sure that the opening day activities included in the Contract With America were enacted, and that is making Congress live under the same laws that the rest of the American people have to live under. That is cutting one out of every three congressional committee staffers, and that is looking at an audit and getting that started.

What I ask is: "Let's get to the business the American people sent us here to do, and that's the Contract With America."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Miami, FL [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], a new member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I admit that there are great parliamentary debaters on the other side of the aisle. Accordingly, I submit that they must do much better than this, to divert the attention of the American people from what we are doing today. What we are doing today is requiring all laws that apply to the rest of the country to apply to Congress. We are cutting the number of committee staff by a third. We are limiting the terms of committee chairs and subcommittee chairmanships to 6 years. We are banning the scandalous practice, scandalous practice, called proxy voting where Members did not have to go to a committee, and then the chairman, even if they did not have anybody there, did not have any of the Democrats there, they would ultimately win because he had the proxies of all the Members here, truly scandalous, profoundly undemocratic, conduct. That is what we are banning today. That is what we are doing in these rules.

And what the Democrats now are saying is, "Ah." They are using the parliamentary tactic of there is the Christmas gift for all children in the world is missing from this rules pack-

age. It is not going to work. That is not going to divert the attention of the American people from what we are doing today, and they are going to know what we are doing, they deserve what we are doing, and we are going to do it today.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 4¼ minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge every Member of the House to vote "no" on the previous question and "yes" on the motion to commit.

The Republican leadership would have us believe that they can pass eight or nine bills in a flurry of legislative accomplishment and debate.

In fact, there can be no debate; there can be no discussion; there can be no effort to amend, or strengthen, or truly consider any of their proposals.

This is what we call a closed rule. That means that unless you support every dot and comma in the Republican agenda, it is a closed discussion. And as far as serious public policy is concerned, it is a closed door.

That is a tragedy, because the American people deserve more than rubber-stamp Republicanism.

That is why we must reject this rule, and open the crucial issue of congressional reform to discussion and improvement.

The fact is, Democrats do not want to defeat this rules package. We want real reform. That is why many of the proposals being made today—such as making Congress abide by the laws it writes—have already been passed by the House. And that is why Democrats fought for even tougher reforms, such as a bill to curb the influence of lobbyists, which the Republicans defeated.

The Republican reforms are all well and good—but they simply do not go far enough. They are a handful of procedural and administrative changes here in the House. Many of them are positive. Many of them deserve wide, bipartisan support—and they will have it.

But they do not touch the real problem: the rampant hand of special interests here on Capitol Hill.

If the Republicans were serious about attacking special interests, why would they fight the Democratic proposal to ban gifts from lobbyists?

Do we want to go along and get along, by rubber-stamping this closed rule? Or do we want to rein in the special interests by defeating the rule, and having a real debate about reform?

I urge the latter course. But at the same time, we must all recognize a broader point.

All of this Republican talk of reform—as necessary as it may be, and as productive as it may be—is ultimately a distraction from the real job at hand.

Improving the lives of the hard-working, middle-class families who have seen their incomes erode, and their standard of living slide, for 15 painful years.

No one should pretend that these narrow procedural changes will do anything to raise incomes, to restore economic security, to revive hope and faith in America's future.

And for that matter, no one should pretend that the Contract With America, with its huge tax cuts for the wealthy, and inevitable explosion of the Federal deficit—will improve people's lives, either.

Come back to my district in St. Louis. Meet some of the families where the husband works during the day, the wife works at night, and they barely ever see each other. Meet some of the families that have given up every minute of family time working two, three, even four jobs—and still cannot make ends meet.

Then ask yourself whether some new procedural change can make a difference in their lives.

My colleagues, I urge you to vote "no" on the previous question, and vote "yes" on the motion to commit, so we can have serious congressional reform. And then let us get down to the real business of the people.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say with all due respect to my colleagues that I have never heard such preposterous arguments in my entire 14 years as a Member of this House, and let me say that this clearly is the most open debate that we have ever experienced on opening day in the history of the U.S. Congress. It is exactly what Speaker GINGRICH has called for, and it is exactly what we are creating.

Now, over the past 2 years I had the privilege, mostly during calendar year 1993, to work with my friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] as Republican members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. We were charged with dealing with major reform in this institution. Reform in this institution is going to help working Americans because we are, by nearly 25 percent, reducing the number of committees in this place so we do not have 109 committees and subcommittees with jurisdiction over the Pentagon, 52 subcommittees and full

committees with jurisdiction over programs dealing with children and families, and 92 subcommittees and committees dealing with the Environmental Protection Agency. We are creating an institution that is more accountable.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the majority in years past has prevented us from having the opportunity to even consider those things. On this opening day we are doing it. We are doing it under the most open process in the history of this institution, and I thank my friends for joining with us.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to enunciate a clear policy with respect to the conduct of electronic votes.

As Members are aware, clause 5 of rule XV provides that Members shall have not less than 15 minutes in which to answer an ordinary rollcall vote or quorum call. The rule obviously establishes 15 minutes as a minimum. Still, with the cooperation of the Members, a vote can easily be completed in that time. On occasion, the Chair has announced, and then strictly enforced, a policy of closing electronic votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed period of 15 minutes. Members appreciated and cooperated with the Chair's enforcement of the policy on that occasion.

The Chair desires that those examples be made the regular practice of the House. To that end, the Chair enlists the assistance of all Members in avoiding the unnecessary loss of time in conducting the business of the House. The Chair encourages all Members to depart for the Chamber promptly upon the appropriate bell and light signal. As in recent Congresses, the cloakrooms should not forward to the Chair requests to hold a vote by electronic device, but should simply apprise inquiring Members of the time remaining on the voting clock.

Although no occupant of the chair would prevent a Member who is in the well of the Chamber before the announcement of the result from casting his or her vote, each occupant of the chair will have the full support of the Speaker in striving to close each electronic vote at the earliest opportunity. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber.

□ 1550

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 199, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—232

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Archer	Frisa	Myrick
Armey	Funderburk	Nethercutt
Bachus	Gallegly	Neumann
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Ney
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Norwood
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Nussle
Barr	Gillmor	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Packard
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barton	Goodling	Petri
Bass	Goss	Pombo
Bateman	Graham	Porter
Bereuter	Greenwood	Portman
Bilbray	Gunderson	Pryce
Billrakis	Gutknecht	Quillen
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Quinn
Blute	Hancock	Radanovich
Boehlert	Hansen	Ramstad
Boehner	Hastert	Regula
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Riggs
Bono	Hayworth	Roberts
Brewster	Hefley	Rogers
Brownback	Heineman	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hilleary	Roth
Bunning	Hobson	Roukema
Burr	Hoekstra	Royce
Burton	Hoke	Salmon
Buyer	Horn	Sanford
Callahan	Hostettler	Saxton
Calvert	Houghton	Scarborough
Camp	Hunter	Schaefer
Canady	Hutchinson	Schiff
Castle	Hyde	Seastrand
Chabot	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Chamberliss	Istook	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Chrysler	Jones	Shuster
Clinger	Kasich	Skeen
Coble	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (TX)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Klug	Solomon
Cox	Knollenberg	Souder
Crane	Kolbe	Spence
Crapo	LaHood	Stearns
Creameans	Largent	Stockman
Cubin	Latham	Stump
Cunningham	LaTourrette	Talent
Davis	Lazio	Tate
Deal	Leach	Tauzin
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Dickey	Lightfoot	Thornberry
Doolittle	Linder	Tiahrt
Dornan	Livingston	Torkildsen
Dreier	LoBiondo	Upton
Duncan	Longley	Vucanovich
Dunn	Lucas	Waldholtz
Ehlers	Manzullo	Walker
Ehrlich	Martini	Walsh
Emerson	McCollum	Wamp
English	McCrery	Weldon (FL)
Ensign	McDade	Weldon (PA)
Everett	McHugh	Weller
Ewing	McInnis	White
Fawell	McIntosh	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Wicker
Flanagan	Metcalf	Wolf
Foley	Meyers	Young (AK)
Forbes	Mica	Young (FL)
Fowler	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Fox	Molinari	Zimmer
Franks (CT)	Moorhead	
Franks (NJ)	Morella	

NAYS—199

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boucher
Ackerman	Bellenson	Browder
Andrews	Bentsen	Brown (CA)
Baesler	Berman	Brown (FL)
Baldacci	Bevill	Brown (OH)
Barca	Bonior	Bryant (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Cardin

Chapman	Jefferson	Peterson (FL)
Clay	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Pickett
Clement	Johnston	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Poshard
Coleman	Kaptur	Rahall
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Rangel
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Reed
Condit	Kennelly	Reynolds
Conyers	Kildee	Richardson
Costello	Kleczka	Rivers
Coyne	Klink	Roemer
Cramer	LaFalce	Rose
Danner	Lambert-Lincoln	Roybal-Allard
de la Garza	Lantos	Rush
DeFazio	Laughlin	Sabo
DeLauro	Levin	Sanders
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lipinski	Schroeder
Dicks	Lofgren	Schumer
Dingell	Lowe	Scott
Dixon	Luther	Serrano
Doggett	Maloney	Sisisky
Dooley	Manton	Skaggs
Doyle	Markey	Skelton
Durbin	Martinez	Slaughter
Edwards	Mascara	Spratt
Engel	Matsui	Stark
Eshoo	McCarthy	Stenholm
Evans	McDermott	Stokes
Farr	McHale	Studds
Fattah	McKinney	Stupak
Fazio	McNulty	Tanner
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Flner	Meek	Tejeda
Flake	Menendez	Thompson
Foglietta	Mfume	Thornton
Ford	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Torres
Frost	Minge	Torricelli
Furse	Mink	Towns
Gejdenson	Moakley	Trafficant
Gephardt	Mollohan	Tucker
Geren	Montgomery	Velazquez
Gibbons	Moran	Vento
Gonzalez	Murtha	Visclosky
Gordon	Nadler	Volkmer
Green	Neal	Ward
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Waters
Hall (OH)	Obey	Watt (NC)
Hamilton	Oliver	Waxman
Harman	Ortiz	Williams
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Wilson
Hayes	Owens	Wise
Hefner	Pallone	Woolsey
Hilliard	Parker	Wyden
Hinchee	Pastor	Wynn
Holden	Payne (NJ)	Yates
Hoyer	Payne (VA)	
Jacobs	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop Jackson-Lee

□ 1605

Mr. STUMP and Mr. DICKEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 3 I am recorded as not voting because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR  
Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. —

Mr. BONIOR moves to commit the resolution H.Res. to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with only the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H.Res. ) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Fourth Congress, [captioned Committee Print on H.Res. , bearing the date of January 4, 1995], as modified by the amendment printed in section 4 of this resolution. The resolution, as modified, shall be debatable initially for 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as modified, to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in sections 2 and 3 of this resolution.

Sec. 2. The question of adopting the resolution, as modified, shall be divided among ten parts, to wit: each of the nine sections of title I; and then title II. Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable separately for 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees, and shall be disposed of in the order stated.

Sec. 3. Pending the question of adopting the tenth portion of the divided question, it shall be in order to move that the House commit the resolution, as modified, to a select committee, with or without instructions. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to commit to final adoption without intervening motion.

Sec. 4. At the end of Title I add the following new section:

Sec. (109). The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendment:

#### BAN ON GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS

(a) Clause 4 of rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a)(1) No Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall accept a gift, knowing that such gift is provided directly or indirectly by a paid lobbyist, a lobbying firm (a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity), or an agent of a Foreign principal (as defined in the foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938).

"(2) The prohibition in subparagraph (1) includes the following:

"(A) Anything provided by a lobbyist or a foreign agent which the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe is paid for, charged to, or reimbursed by a client or firm of such lobbyist or foreign agent.

"(B) Anything provided by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent to an entity that is maintained or controlled by a Member, officer, or employee.

"(C) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent on the basis of a designation, recommendation, or other specification of a Member, officer, or employee (not including a mass mailing or other solicitation directed to a broad category of persons or entities).

"(D) A contribution or other payment by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent

to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee.

"(E) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent in lieu of an honorarium to a Member, officer, or employee.

"(F) A financial contribution or expenditure made by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent relating to a conference, retreat, or similar event, sponsored by or affiliated with an official congressional organization, for or on behalf of Members, officers, or employees.

"(3) The following are not gifts subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (1):

"(A) Anything for which the recipient pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

"(B) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(C) Food or refreshments of nominal value offered other than as part of a meal.

"(D) Benefits resulting from the business, employment, or other outside activities of the spouse of a Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances.

"(E) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

"(F) Informational materials that are sent to the office of a Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audio tapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

"(4)(A) A gift given by an individual under circumstances which make it clear that the gift is given for a nonbusiness purpose and is motivated by a family relationship or close personal friendship and not by the position of the Member, officer, or employee shall not be subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (1).

"(B) A gift shall not be considered to be given for a nonbusiness purpose if the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the individual giving the gift will seek—

"(i) to deduct the value of such gift as a business expense on the individual's Federal income tax return, or

"(ii) direct or indirect reimbursement or any other compensation for the value of the gift from a client or employer of such lobbyist or foreign agent.

"(C) In determining if the giving of a gift is motivated by a family relationship or close personal friendship, at least the following factors shall be considered:

"(i) The history of the relationship between the individual giving the gift and the recipient of the gift, including whether or not gifts have previously been exchanged by such individuals.

"(ii) Whether the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was purchased by the individual who gave the item.

"(iii) Whether the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the individual who gave the gift also at the same time gave the same or similar gifts to other Members, officers, or employees.

"(b) In addition to the restriction on receiving gifts from paid lobbyists, lobbying firms, and agents of foreign principals provided by paragraph (a) and except as pro-

vided in this Rule, no Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall knowingly accept a gift from any other person.

"(c)(1) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'gift' means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, or other item having monetary value. The term includes gifts of services, training, transportation, lodging, and meals, whether provided in kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has been incurred.

"(2) A gift to the spouse or dependent of a Member, officer, or employee (or a gift to any other individual based on that individual's relationship with the Member, officer, or employee) shall be considered a gift to the Member, officer, or employee if it is given with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Member, officer, or employee and the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(d) The restrictions in paragraph (b) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) Anything for which the Member, officer, or employee pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

"(2) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(3) Anything provided by an individual on the basis of a personal or family relationship unless the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe that, under the circumstances, the gift was provided because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and not because of the personal or family relationship. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall provide guidance on the applicability of this clause and examples of circumstances under which a gift may be accepted under this exception.

"(4) A contribution or other payment to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee, that is otherwise lawfully made, if the person making the contribution or payment is identified for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(5) Any food or refreshments which the recipient reasonably believes to have a value of less than \$20.

"(6) Any gift from another Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

"(7) Food, refreshments, lodging, and other benefits—

"(A) resulting from the outside business or employment activities (or other outside activities that are not connected to the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder) of the Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse of the Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits have not been offered or enhanced because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances;

"(B) customarily provided by a prospective employer in connection with bona fide employment discussions; or

"(C) provided by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in connection with a fundraising or campaign event sponsored by such an organization.

"(8) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

"(9) Informational materials that are sent to the office of the Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audio tapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

"(10) Awards or prizes which are given to competitors in contests or events open to the public, including random drawings.

"(11) Honorary degrees (and associated travel, food, refreshments, and entertainment) and other bona fide, nonmonetary awards presented in recognition of public service (and associated food, refreshments, and entertainment provided in the presentation of such degrees and awards).

"(12) Donations of products from the State that the Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any individual recipient.

"(13) Food, refreshments, and entertainment provided to a Member or an employee of a Member in the Member's home State, subject to reasonable limitations, to be established by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(14) An item of little intrinsic value such as a greeting card, baseball cap, or a T shirt.

"(15) Training (including food and refreshments furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the training) provided to a Member, officer, or employee, if such training is in the interest of the House of Representatives.

"(16) Bequests, inheritances, and other transfers at death.

"(17) Any item, the receipt of which is authorized by the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or any other statute.

"(18) Anything which is paid for by the Federal Government, by a State or local government, or secured by the Government under a Government contract.

"(19) A gift of personal hospitality of an individual, as defined in section 109(14) of the Ethics in Government Act.

"(20) Free attendance at a widely attended event permitted pursuant to paragraph (e).

"(21) Opportunities and benefits which are—

"(A) available to the public or to a class consisting of all Federal employees, whether or not restricted on the basis of geographic consideration;

"(B) offered to members of a group or class in which membership is unrelated to congressional employment;

"(C) offered to members of an organization, such as an employees' association or congressional credit union, in which membership is related to congressional employment and similar opportunities are available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size;

"(D) offered to any group or class that is not defined in a manner that specifically discriminates among Government employees on the basis of branch of Government or type of responsibility, or on a basis that favors those of higher rank or rate of pay;

"(E) in the form of loans from banks and other financial institutions on terms generally available to the public; or

"(F) in the form of reduced membership or other fees for participation in organization activities offered to all Government employees by professional organizations if the only restrictions on membership relate to professional qualifications.

"(22) A plaque, trophy, or other memento of modest value.

"(23) Anything for which, in exceptional circumstances, a waiver is granted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(e)(1) Except as prohibited by paragraph (a), a Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance at a widely attended convention, conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by the sponsor of the event, if—

"(A) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member's, officer's, or employee's official position; or

"(B) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in subparagraph (1) may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for an accompanying individual if others in attendance will generally be similarly accompanied or if such attendance is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(3) Except as prohibited by paragraph (a), a Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse or dependent thereof, may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at a charity event, except that reimbursement for transportation and lodging may not be accepted in connection with the event.

"(4) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'free attendance' may include waiver of all or part of a conference or other fee, the provision of local transportation, or the provision of food, refreshments, entertainment, and instructional materials furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the event. The term does not include entertainment collateral to the event, or food or refreshments taken other than in a group setting with all or substantially all other attendees.

"(f) No Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift the value of which exceeds \$250 on the basis of the personal relationship exception in paragraph (d)(3) or the close personal friendship exception in section 106(d) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 unless the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issues a written determination that one of such exceptions applies.

"(g)(1) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to adjust the dollar amount referred to in paragraph (d)(5) on a periodic basis, to the extent necessary to adjust for inflation.

"(2) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall provide guidance setting forth reasonable steps that may be taken by Members, officers, and employees, with a minimum of paperwork and time, to prevent the acceptance of prohibited gifts from lobbyists.

"(3) When it is not practicable to return a tangible item because it is perishable, the item may, at the discretion of the recipient, be given to an appropriate charity or destroyed.

"(h)(1)(A) Except as prohibited by paragraph (a), a reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, officer, or employee for necessary transportation, lodging and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip or similar event in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an of-

ficeholder shall be deemed to be a reimbursement to the House of Representatives and not a gift prohibited by this paragraph, if the Member, officer, or employee—

"(i) in the case of an employee, receives advance authorization, from the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works, to accept reimbursement, and

"(ii) discloses the expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed and the authorization to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within 30 days after the travel is completed.

"(B) For purposes of clause (A), events, the activities of which are substantially recreational in nature, shall not be considered to be in connection with the duties of a Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder.

"(2) Each advance authorization to accept reimbursement shall be signed by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works and shall include—

"(A) the name of the employee;

"(B) the name of the person who will make the reimbursement;

"(C) the time, place, and purpose of the travel; and

"(D) a determination that the travel is in connection with the duties of the employee as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the employee is using public office for private gain.

"(3) Each disclosure made under subparagraph (1)(A) of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed shall be signed by the Member or officer (in the case of travel by that Member or officer) or by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works (in the case of travel by an employee) and shall include—

"(A) a good faith estimate of total transportation expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(B) a good faith estimate of total lodging expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(C) a good faith estimate of total meal expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(D) a good faith estimate of the total of other expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(E) a determination that all such expenses are necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses as defined in this paragraph; and

"(F) in the case of a reimbursement to a Member or officer, a determination that the travel was in connection with the duties of the Member or officer as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the Member or officer is using public office for private gain.

"(4) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses'—

"(A) includes reasonable expenses that are necessary for travel—

"(i) for a period not exceeding 4 days including travel time within the unanimous consent or 7 days in addition to travel outside the United States; and

"(ii) within 24 hours before or after participation in an event in the United States or within 48 hours before or after participation in an event outside the United States,

unless approved in advance by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

"(B) is limited to reasonable expenditures for transportation, lodging, conference fees and materials, and food and refreshments, including reimbursement for necessary transportation, whether or not such transportation occurs within the periods described in clause (A);

“(C) does not include expenditures for recreational activities or entertainment other than that provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event; and

“(D) may include travel expenses incurred on behalf of either the spouse or a child of the Member, officer, or employee, subject to a determination signed by the Member or officer (or in the case of an employee, the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the officer or employee works) that the attendance of the spouse or child is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

“(5) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make available to the public all advance authorizations and disclosures of reimbursement filed pursuant to subparagraph (1) as soon as possible after they are received.”

#### SEC. . LIMITATION ON ROYALTY INCOME.

(a) LIMITATION.—Clause 3 of rule XLVII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(g) In calendar year 1995 or thereafter, a Member, officer, or employee of the House may not—

“(1) receive any copyright royalties for any work—

“(A) unless the royalty is received from an established publisher pursuant to usual and customary contractual terms;

“(B) unless the total amount of such royalties for that work does not exceed one-third of that individual's annual pay as a Member, officer, or employee for the year in which the contract is entered into; and

“(C) without the prior notification and approval of the contract for that work by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; or

“(2) receive any advance payment for any such work.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause 3(e)(5) of rule XLVII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

“(5) copyright royalties.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this resolution shall apply only to copyright royalties received by any Member, officer, or employee of the House after adoption of this resolution pursuant to any contract entered into while that individual is such a Member, officer, or employee.

□ 1610

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, the point I want to make is that this is a question on the gift ban and on the book royalty at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just say to the gentleman, we have just been handed a 20-page document here. This is the motion to recommit?

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

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the motion to commit.

Mr. SOLOMON. To commit?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman will yield further, yes. This is what we were talking about for the last hour, the ban on gifts from lobbyists and book royalties.

Mr. SOLOMON. I do not know how that, with no debate, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have time to even know the details of this.

I would urge a no vote.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman makes a good point about debate. Would the gentleman agree to unanimous consent for about 20 minutes to debate this? Then we can discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 20 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would move regular order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request. What happened to my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, there is a unanimous-consent request to dispense with the reading of the 20-page motion.

The SPEAKER. That is the pending request. There can only be one request pending at a time.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is apparent to me that, as one who has been here for several years and has seen what has gone on in past first days of the Congress, I attempted and my staff attempted, beginning back in December, to get a copy of the proposed new House rules for this Congress. We have not been able to.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may not reserve the right to object if regular order is requested.

Is there objection to the request to dispense with the reading?

Does the gentleman still tender his request?

Mr. SPRATT. What I seek, Mr. Speaker, is that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Member was not on his feet, and it was not timely.

The question is on the motion to commit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Members are reminded that this is a 15-minute vote, with a maximum of 2 additional minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 235, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]  
YEAS—196

Abercrombie	Gordon	Owens
Ackerman	Green	Pallone
Andrews	Gutierrez	Parker
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Barcia	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Payne (VA)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Bentsen	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hinchee	Pickett
Bevill	Holden	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hoyer	Poshard
Bontor	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Borski	Jacobs	Rangel
Boucher	Jefferson	Reed
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Rose
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Clay	Kennelly	Sabo
Clayton	Kildee	Sanders
Clement	Kleczka	Sawyer
Clyburn	Klink	Schroeder
Coleman	LaFalce	Schumer
Collins (IL)	Lambert-Lincoln	Scott
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Serrano
Condit	Levin	Siskis
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Costello	Lipinski	Skelton
Coyne	Lofgren	Slaughter
Cramer	Lowey	Spratt
Danner	Luther	Stark
de la Garza	Maloney	Stenholm
DeFazio	Manton	Stokes
DeLauro	Markey	Studds
Dellums	Martinez	Stupak
Deutsch	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Matsui	Tejeda
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson
Dixon	McDermott	Thornton
Doggett	McHale	Thurman
Doyle	McKinney	Torres
Durbin	McNulty	Torricelli
Edwards	Meehan	Towns
Engel	Meek	Trafficant
Eshoo	Menendez	Tucker
Evans	Mfume	Velazquez
Farr	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fattah	Mineta	Visclosky
Fazio	Minge	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Mink	Ward
Filner	Moakley	Waters
Flake	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Montgomery	Waxman
Ford	Moran	Williams
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Wilson
Frost	Nadler	Wise
Furse	Neal	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Wyden
Gephardt	Obey	Wynn
Geren	Olver	Yates
Gibbons	Ortiz	
Gonzalez	Orton	

NAYS—235

Allard	Bereuter	Burr
Archer	Bilbray	Burton
Armey	Bilirakis	Buyer
Bachus	Billey	Callahan
Baessler	Blute	Calvert
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Camp
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Canady
Ballenger	Bonilla	Castle
Barr	Bono	Chabot
Barrett (NE)	Brewster	Chambliss
Bartlett	Brownback	Chenoweth
Barton	Bryant (TN)	Christensen
Bass	Bunn	Clinger
Bateman	Bunning	Coble

Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gillman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Henger  
Hilleary  
Hobson

NOT VOTING—2

Chrysler Norwood

□ 1626

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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—yeas 251, nays 181, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]  
YEAS—251  
Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Billbray  
Billrakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bouillon  
Bono  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Christy  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)

NAYS—181

Becerra  
Bellenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bishop  
Bontor

Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—1

□ 1643

Messrs. ORTIZ, FATTAH, and SKELTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed Resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. RES. 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Pomerooy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

## S. RES. 11

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Strom Thurmond, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, as President pro tempore of the Senate.

## S. RES. 12

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Sheila P. Burke, of California, as Secretary of the Senate.

## RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just agreed to, I call up House Resolution 6 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 6 is as follows:

## H. RES. 6

*Resolved*,

## TITLE I. CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: A BILL OF ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 101. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

**Committee, Subcommittee, and Staff Reforms**

(a) COMMITTEE STAFF REDUCTIONS.—In the One Hundred Fourth Congress, the total number of staff of House committees shall be at least one-third less than the corresponding total in the One Hundred Third Congress.

(b) SUBCOMMITTEE REDUCTIONS.—In clause 6 of rule X, amend paragraph (d) to read as follows:

“(d) No committee of the House shall have more than five subcommittees (except the Committee on Appropriations, which shall have no more than thirteen; the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, which shall have no more than seven; and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which shall have no more than six).”

## (c) CONSOLIDATED COMMITTEE STAFF AND BIENNIAL FUNDING.—

(1) In clause 5(a) of rule XI, amend the first sentence to read as follows: “Whenever any committee, commission, or other entity (except the Committee on Appropriations) is to be granted authorization for the payment of its expenses (including all staff salaries) for a Congress, such authorization initially shall be procured by one primary expense resolution reported by the Committee on House Oversight.”

(2)(A) In clause 5(b) of rule XI, amend the first sentence to read as follows: “After the date of adoption by the House of any such primary expense resolution for any such committee, commission, or other entity for any Congress, authorization for the payment of additional expenses (including staff salaries) in that Congress may be procured by one or more supplemental expense resolutions reported by the Committee on House Oversight, as necessary.”

(B) In clause 5(c)(1) of rule XI—

(i) strike “the contingent fund” and insert “committee salary and expense accounts”;

(ii) strike “any year” and insert “any odd-numbered year”; and

(iii) strike “for that year” and insert “for that Congress”.

(C) In clause 5(c)(2) of rule XI, strike “the contingent fund” and insert “committee salary and expense accounts”.

(D) In clause 5(f)(1) of rule XI—

(i) strike “the contingent fund” and insert “committee salary and expense accounts”; and

(ii) strike “of each year” and insert “in each odd-numbered year”.

(3)(A) INTERIM FUNDING RULE.—For the purposes of implementing this section, and notwithstanding the provisions of clause 5(f) of rule XI, at the beginning of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, the committees established by this resolution are authorized, pending the adoption of the primary expense resolution for the One Hundred Fourth Congress, to expend such sums as are necessary to pay compensation for staff services performed for, or to pay other expenses of, the committee consistent with its planned reductions in committee staff.

(B) Notwithstanding any provision of clause 5(f) of rule XI, payments thereunder during the One Hundred Fourth Congress may be made only on vouchers signed by a Member elected as chairman of the committee concerned in the One Hundred Fourth Congress and approved by the Committee on House Oversight, or, in the case of late expenses of any committee from the One Hundred Third Congress not reestablished by the Rules of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

(4) In clause 5 of rule XI, amend paragraph (d) to read as follows:

“(d) From the funds made available for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to any primary or additional expense resolution, the chairman of each committee shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.”

(5)(A) In clause 6(a)(1) of rule XI, amend the first sentence to read as follows: “Subject to subparagraph (2) and paragraph (f), each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than thirty professional staff members from the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions.”

(B) In clause 6(a)(2) of rule XI, amend the first sentence by striking “six persons” and inserting “ten persons (or one-third of the total professional committee staff appointed under this clause, whichever is less)”.

(C) In clause 6(a) of rule XI, strike subparagraphs (3) through (5);

(D) In clause 6 of rule XI, amend paragraph (b) to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The professional staff members of each standing committee—

“(A) may not engage in any work other than committee business during congressional working hours; and

“(B) may not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business.

“(2) This paragraph does not apply to any staff designated by a committee as ‘associate’ or ‘shared’ staff who are not paid exclusively by the committee, provided that the chairman certifies that the compensation paid by the committee for any such employee is commensurate with the work performed for the committee, in accordance with the provisions of clause 8 of rule XLIII.

“(3) The use of any ‘associate’ or ‘shared’ staff by any committee shall be subject to the review of, and to any terms, conditions, or limitations established by, the Committee on House Oversight in connection with the reporting of any primary or additional expense resolution.

“(4) The foregoing provisions of this clause do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations.”

(E) In clause 6(c) of rule XI strike “, clerical and investigating” and insert “and investigative”.

(F) In clause 6(d) of rule XI, strike “and the Committee on Budget”.

(G)(i) In clause 6(f) of rule XI, strike “, or a minority clerical staff member under paragraph (b),” and strike “or paragraph (b), as applicable”.

(ii) In clause 6(f) of rule XI, strike “or the clerical staff, as the case may be.”

(H) In clause 6(g) of rule XI, strike “or (b)” in both places it appears.

(I) In clause 6 of rule XI, amend paragraph (h) to read as follows:

“(h) Paragraph (a) shall not be construed to authorize the appointment of additional professional staff members of a committee pursuant to a request under such paragraph by the minority party members of that committee if ten or more professional staff members provided for in paragraph (a)(1) who are satisfactory to a majority of the minority party members, are otherwise assigned to assist the minority party members.”

(J) In clause 6(i) of rule XI, strike “paragraphs (a)(2) and (b)(2)” and insert “paragraph (a)(2)”.

SEC. 102. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

**Truth-in-Budgeting Baseline Reform**

(a) In clause 2(1)(3)(B) of rule XI (relating to cost estimates in committee reports) insert before the semicolon the following: “, except that the estimates with respect to new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law”.

(b) In clause 7(a) of rule XIII (relating to required cost estimates in committee reports)—

(1) strike “and” at the end of the subparagraph (1);

(2) strike the period at the end of the paragraph and insert “; and”; and

(3) add the following new subparagraph at the end:

“(3) when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) with the appropriate levels under current law.”

SEC. 103. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

### Term Limits for Speaker, Committee and Subcommittee Chairmen

(a) In clause 7 of rule I, insert "(a)" after "7." and add the following new paragraph at the end:

"(b) No person may serve as Speaker for more than four consecutive Congresses, beginning with the One Hundred Fourth Congress (disregarding for this purpose any service for less than a full session in any Congress)."

(b) In clause 6(c) of rule X, insert after the first sentence the following: "No Member may serve as the chairman of the same standing committee, or as the chairman of the same subcommittee thereof, for more than three consecutive Congresses, beginning with the One Hundred Fourth Congress (disregarding for this purpose any service for less than a full session in any Congress)."

SEC. 104. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

#### Proxy Voting Ban

(a) In clause 2 of rule XI, amend paragraph (f) to read as follows:

#### "Prohibition against proxy voting"

"(f) No vote by any member of any committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy."

(b) In clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI, strike "and whether by proxy or in person." in the third sentence.

SEC. 105. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

#### Committee Sunshine Rules

(a) In rule clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI—

(1) insert ", including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except as provided by clause 3(f)(2)," after "public" the first place it appears;

(2) insert "because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House" after "public" the second place it appears; and

(3) strike ", or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters".

(b) In clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI—

(1) insert ", including to radio, television, and still photography coverage," after "public" the first place it appears; and

(2) insert ", would compromise sensitive law enforcement information," after "would endanger national security" in both places it appears.

(c) In clause 3(d) of rule XI strike "is a privilege made available by the House and".

(d) In clause 3 of rule XI, amend paragraph (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by any committee or subcommittee

of the House is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, except as provided in paragraph (f)(2). A committee or subcommittee chairman may not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized)."

SEC. 106. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

#### Limitations on Tax Increases

(a) THREE-FIFTHS VOTE REQUIRED FOR TAX INCREASE MEASURES AND AMENDMENTS.—In clause 5 of rule XXI, add the following new paragraph at the end:

"(c) No bill or joint resolution, amendment, or conference report carrying a Federal income tax rate increase shall be considered as passed or agreed to unless so determined by a vote of not less than three-fifths of the Members voting."

(b) PROHIBITION ON RETROACTIVE TAX INCREASES.—In clause 5 of rule XXI (as amended by (a) above), add the following new paragraph at the end:

"(d) It shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report carrying a retroactive Federal income tax rate increase. For purposes of this paragraph a Federal income tax rate increase is retroactive if it applies to a period beginning prior to the enactment of the provision."

SEC. 107. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendment:

#### Comprehensive House Audit

During the One Hundred Fourth Congress, the Inspector General, in consultation with the Speaker and the Committee on House Oversight, shall coordinate, and as needed contract with independent auditing firms to complete, a comprehensive audit of House financial records and administrative operations, and report the results in accordance with rule VI.

SEC. 108. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendment:

#### Consideration of the "Congressional Accountability Act"

It shall be in order at any time after the adoption of this resolution to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, the bill (H.R. 1) to make certain laws applicable to the legislative

branch of the Federal Government, if offered by the majority leader or a designee. The bill shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### TITLE II. GENERAL

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress, together with such amendments thereto in this resolution as may otherwise have been adopted, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, with the following amendments:

#### Administrative Reforms

SEC. 201. (a) ABOLITION OF THE OFFICE OF DOORKEEPER; ELECTION OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.—In rule II, strike "Doorkeeper" each place it appears and insert "Chief Administrative Officer".

(b) ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF CLERK.—In rule III ("Duties of Clerk"), add the following new clauses at the end:

"7. In addition to any other reports required by the Speaker or the Committee on House Oversight, the Clerk shall report to the Committee on House Oversight not later than forty-five days following the close of each semiannual period ending on June 30 or on December 31 on the financial and operational status of each function under the jurisdiction of the Clerk. Each report shall include financial statements, a description or explanation of current operations, the implementation of new policies and procedures, and future plans for each function.

"8. The Clerk shall fully cooperate with the appropriate offices and persons in the performance of reviews and audits of financial records and administrative operations."

(c) Amend rules IV, V, and VI to read as follows:

#### "RULE IV.

#### "DUTIES OF THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

"1. It shall be the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms to attend the House during its sittings, to maintain order under the direction of the Speaker or Chairman, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, under the direction of the Clerk, execute the commands of the House, and all processes issued by authority thereof, directed to him by the Speaker.

"2. The symbol of his office shall be the mace, which shall be borne by him while enforcing order on the floor.

"3. He shall enforce strictly the rules relating to the privileges of the Hall and be responsible to the House for the official conduct of his employees.

"4. He shall allow no person to enter the room over the Hall of the House during its sittings; and fifteen minutes before the hour of the meeting of the House each day he shall see that the floor is cleared of all persons except those privileged to remain, and kept so until ten minutes after adjournment.

"5. In addition to any other reports required by the Speaker or the Committee on House Oversight, the Sergeant-at-Arms shall report to the Committee on House Oversight not later than forty-five days following the close of each semiannual period ending June 30 or on December 31 on the financial and operational status of each function under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant-at-Arms. Each

report shall include financial statements, a description or explanation of current operations, the implementation of new policies and procedures, and future plans for each function.

"6. The Sergeant-at-Arms shall fully cooperate with the appropriate offices and persons in the performance of reviews and audits of financial records and administrative operations."

**"RULE V.**

**"CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.**

"1. The Chief Administrative Officer of the House shall have operational and financial responsibility for functions as assigned by the Speaker and the Committee on House Oversight, and shall be subject to the policy direction and oversight of the Speaker and the Committee on House Oversight.

"2. In addition to any other reports required by the Speaker or the Committee on House Oversight, the Chief shall report to the Committee on House Oversight not later than forty-five days following the close of each semiannual period ending on June 30 or December 31 on the financial and operational status of each function under the jurisdiction of the Chief. Each report shall include financial statements, a description or explanation of current operations, the implementation of new policies and procedures, and future plans for each function.

"3. The Chief shall fully cooperate with the appropriate offices and persons in the performance of reviews and audits of financial records and administrative operations.

**"RULE VI.**

**"OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.**

"1. There is established an Office of Inspector General.

"2. The Inspector General shall be appointed by a Congress by the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, acting jointly.

"3. Subject to the policy direction and oversight of the Committee on House Oversight, the Inspector General shall be responsible only for—

"(a) conducting periodic audits of the financial and administrative functions of the House and joint entities;

"(b) informing the Officers or other officials who are the subject of an audit of the results of that audit and suggesting appropriate curative actions;

"(c) simultaneously notifying the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman and ranking minority party member of the Committee on House Oversight in the case of any financial irregularity discovered in the course of carrying out responsibilities under this rule;

"(d) simultaneously submitting to the Speaker, the majority leader, and the chairman and ranking minority party member of the Committee on House Oversight a report of each audit conducted under this rule; and

"(e) reporting to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct information involving possible violations by any Member, officer, or employee of the House of any rule of the House or of any law applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities which may require referral to the appropriate Federal or State authorities pursuant to clause 4(e)(1)(C) of rule X."

(d) In clause 3 of rule X, strike paragraph (j).

(e) In clause 4(d) of rule X—

(1) strike "Committee on House Administration" and insert "Committee on House Oversight";

(2) strike subparagraphs (2) and (3), insert "and" after "House;" in subparagraph (1), redesignate paragraph (4) as paragraph (2), and amend paragraph (2), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

"(2) providing policy direction for, and oversight of, the Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, Chief Administrative Officer, and Inspector General."

(f) In clause 7 of rule XIV, strike "Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper are" and insert "Sergeant-at-Arms is".

**Changes in Committee System**

SEC. 202. (a) THE COMMITTEES AND THEIR JURISDICTION.—Clause 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"1. There shall be in the House the following standing committees, each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned to it by this clause and clauses 2, 3, and 4; and all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee as listed in this clause shall (in accordance with and subject to clause 5) be referred to such committees, as follows:

"(a) **Committee on Agriculture.**

"(1) Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"(2) Agriculture generally.

"(3) Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

"(4) Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"(5) Agricultural economics and research.

"(6) Agricultural education extension services.

"(7) Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products, and commodities (not including distribution outside of the United States).

"(8) Animal industry and diseases of animals.

"(9) Commodities exchanges.

"(10) Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(11) Dairy industry.

"(12) Entomology and plant quarantine.

"(13) Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"(14) Inspection of livestock, and poultry, and meat products, and seafood and seafood products.

"(15) Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"(16) Human nutrition and home economics.

"(17) Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"(18) Rural electrification.

"(19) Rural development.

"(20) Water conservation related to activities of the Department of Agriculture.

"(b) **Committee on Appropriations.**

"(1) Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(2) Rescissions of appropriations contained in appropriation Acts.

"(3) Transfers of unexpended balances.

"(4) The amount of new spending authority (as described in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) which is to be effective for a fiscal year, including bills and resolutions (reported by other committees) which provide new spending authority and are referred to the committee under clause 4(a).

The committee shall include separate headings for 'Rescissions' and 'Transfers of Unexpended Balances' in any bill or resolution as reported from the committee under its jurisdiction specified in subparagraph (2) or (3), with all proposed rescissions and proposed transfers listed therein; and shall include a

separate section with respect to such rescissions or transfers in the accompanying committee report. In addition to its jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph, the committee shall have the fiscal oversight function provided for in clause 2(b)(3) and the budget hearing function provided for in clause 4(a).

"(c) **Committee on Banking and Financial Services.**

"(1) Banks and banking, including deposit insurance and Federal monetary policy.

"(2) Bank capital markets activities generally.

"(3) Depository institution securities activities generally, including the activities of any affiliates, except for functional regulation under applicable securities laws, not involving safety and soundness.

"(4) Economic stabilization, defense production, renegotiation, and control of the price of commodities, rents, and services.

"(5) Financial aid to commerce and industry (other than transportation).

"(6) International finance.

"(7) International financial and monetary organizations.

"(8) Money and credit, including currency and the issuance of notes and redemption thereof; gold and silver, including the coinage thereof; valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"(9) Public and private housing.

"(10) Urban development.

"(d)(1) **Committee on the Budget**, consisting of the following Members:

"(A) Members who are members of other standing committees, including five Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations, and five Members who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means;

"(B) one Member from the leadership of the majority party; and

"(C) one Member from the leadership of the minority party.

No Member other than a representative from the leadership of a party may serve as a member of the Committee on the Budget during more than four Congresses in any period of six successive Congresses (disregarding for this purpose any service performed as a member of such committee for less than a full session in any Congress), except that an incumbent chairman or ranking minority member having served on the committee for four Congresses and having served as chairman or ranking minority member of the committee for not more than one Congress shall be eligible for reelection to the committee as chairman or ranking minority member for one additional Congress.

"(2) All concurrent resolutions on the budget (as defined in section 3 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974), other matters required to be referred to the committee under titles III and IV of that Act, and other measures setting forth appropriate levels of budget totals for the United States Government.

"(3) Measures relating to the congressional budget process, generally.

"(4) Measures relating to the establishment, extension, and enforcement of special controls over the Federal budget, including the budgetary treatment of off-budget Federal agencies and measures providing exemption from reduction under any order issued under part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

"(5) The committee shall have the duty—

"(A) to report the matters required to be reported by it under titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

"(B) to make continuing studies of the effect on budget outlays of relevant existing and proposed legislation and to report the results of such studies to the House on a recurring basis;

"(C) to request and evaluate continuing studies of tax expenditures; to devise methods of coordinating tax expenditures, policies, and programs with direct budget outlays, and to report the results of such studies to the House on a recurring basis; and

"(D) to review, on a continuing basis, the conduct by the Congressional Budget Office of its functions and duties.

"(e) **Committee on Commerce.**

"(1) Biomedical research and development.  
"(2) Consumer affairs and consumer protection.

"(3) Health and health facilities, except health care supported by payroll deductions.  
"(4) Interstate energy compacts.

"(5) Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"(6) Measures relating to the exploration, production, storage, supply, marketing, pricing, and regulation of energy resources, including all fossil fuels, solar energy, and other unconventional or renewable energy resources.

"(7) Measures relating to the conservation of energy resources.

"(8) Measures relating to energy information generally.

"(9) Measures relating to (A) the generation and marketing of power (except by federally chartered or Federal regional power marketing authorities), (B) the reliability and interstate transmission of, and rate-making for, all power, and (C) the siting of generation facilities; except the installation of interconnections between Government waterpower projects.

"(10) Measures relating to general management of the Department of Energy, and the management and all functions of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

"(11) National energy policy generally.

"(12) Public health and quarantine.

"(13) Regulation of the domestic nuclear energy industry, including regulation of research and development reactors and nuclear regulatory research.

"(14) Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.

"(15) Securities and exchanges.

"(16) Travel and tourism.

The committee shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to regulation of nuclear facilities and of use of nuclear energy as it has with respect to regulation of nonnuclear facilities and of use of nonnuclear energy. In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight functions under clause 2(b)(1)), such committee shall have the special oversight functions provided for in clause 3(h) with respect to all laws, programs, and Government activities affecting nuclear and other energy, and nonmilitary nuclear energy and research and development including the disposal of nuclear waste.

"(f) **Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.**

"(1) Child labor.

"(2) Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital.

"(3) Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

"(4) Food programs for children in schools.

"(5) Labor standards and statistics.

"(6) Measures relating to education or labor generally.

"(7) Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

"(8) Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

"(9) United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

"(10) Vocational rehabilitation.

"(11) Wages and hours of labor.

"(12) Welfare of miners.

"(13) Work incentive programs.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight function provided for in clause 3(c) with respect to domestic educational programs and institutions, and programs of student assistance, which are within the jurisdiction of other committees.

"(g) **Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.**

"(1) The Federal Civil Service, including intergovernmental personnel; the status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"(2) Measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations.

"(3) Federal paperwork reduction.

"(4) Budget and accounting measures, generally.

"(5) Holidays and celebrations.

"(6) The overall economy, efficiency and management of government operations and activities, including Federal procurement.

"(7) National archives.

"(8) Population and demography generally, including the Census.

"(9) Postal service generally, including the transportation of the mails.

"(10) Public information and records.

"(11) Relationship of the Federal Government to the States and municipalities generally.

"(12) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its oversight functions under clause 2(b)(1) and (2)), the committee shall have the function of performing the duties and conducting the studies which are provided for in clause 4(c).

"(h) **Committee on House Oversight.**

"(1) Appropriations from accounts for committee salaries and expenses (except for the Committee on Appropriations), House Information Systems, and allowances and expenses of Members, House officers and administrative offices of the House.

"(2) Auditing and settling of all accounts described in subparagraph (1).

"(3) Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates.

"(4) Except as provided in clause 1(q)(11), matters relating to the Library of Congress and the House Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts.

"(5) Except as provided in clause 1(q)(11), matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(6) Expenditure of accounts described in subparagraph (1).

"(7) Franking Commission.

"(8) Matters relating to printing and correction of the Congressional Record.

"(9) Measures relating to accounts of the House generally.

"(10) Measures relating to assignment of office space for Members and committees.

"(11) Measures relating to the disposition of useless executive papers.

"(12) Measures relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; and Federal elections generally.

"(13) Measures relating to services to the House, including the House Restaurant, parking facilities and administration of the House office buildings and of the House wing of the Capitol.

"(14) Measures relating to the travel of Members of the House.

"(15) Measures relating to the raising, reporting and use of campaign contributions for candidates for office of Representative in the House of Representatives, of Delegate, and of Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico.

"(16) Measures relating to the compensation, retirement and other benefits of the Members, officers, and employees of the Congress.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the function of performing the duties which are provided for in clause 4(d).

"(i) **Committee on International Relations.**

"(1) Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"(2) Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

"(3) Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

"(4) Export controls, including nonproliferation of nuclear technology and nuclear hardware.

"(5) Foreign loans.

"(6) International commodity agreements (other than those involving sugar), including all agreements for cooperation in the export of nuclear technology and nuclear hardware.

"(7) International conferences and congresses.

"(8) International education.

"(9) Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"(10) Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"(11) Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"(12) Measures relating to international economic policy.

"(13) Neutrality.

"(14) Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"(15) The American National Red Cross.

"(16) Trading with the enemy.

"(17) United Nations organizations.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight functions provided for in clause 3(d) with respect to customs administration, intelligence activities relating to foreign policy, international financial and monetary organizations, and international fishing agreements.

"(j) **Committee on the Judiciary.**

"(1) The judiciary and judicial proceedings, civil and criminal.

"(2) Administrative practice and procedure.

"(3) Apportionment of Representatives.

"(4) Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

"(5) Civil liberties.

"(6) Constitutional amendments.

"(7) Federal courts and judges, and local courts in the Territories and possessions.

“(8) Immigration and naturalization.  
 “(9) Interstate compacts, generally.  
 “(10) Measures relating to claims against the United States.  
 “(11) Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members and their acceptance of incompatible offices.  
 “(12) National penitentiaries.  
 “(13) Patents, the Patent Office, copyrights, and trademarks.  
 “(14) Presidential succession.  
 “(15) Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.  
 “(16) Revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States.  
 “(17) State and territorial boundaries.  
 “(18) Subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States.  
 “(k) **Committee on National Security.**  
 “(1) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.  
 “(2) Common defense generally.  
 “(3) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.  
 “(4) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force generally.  
 “(5) Interoceanic canals generally, including measures relating to the maintenance, operation, and administration of interoceanic canals.  
 “(6) Merchant Marine Academy, and State Maritime Academies.  
 “(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.  
 “(8) Tactical intelligence and intelligence related activities of the Department of the Defense.  
 “(9) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, the maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security.  
 “(10) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.  
 “(11) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.  
 “(12) Selective service.  
 “(13) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.  
 “(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.  
 “(15) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.  
 In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight function provided for in clause 3(a) with respect to international arms control and disarmament, and military dependents education.  
 “(l) **Committee on Resources.**  
 “(1) Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.  
 “(2) Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.  
 “(3) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.  
 “(4) Geological Survey.  
 “(5) International fishing agreements.  
 “(6) Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.  
 “(7) Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects, and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects.

“(8) Measures relating to the care and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.  
 “(9) Measures relating generally to the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.  
 “(10) Military parks and battlefields, national cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior, parks within the District of Columbia, and the erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.  
 “(11) Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.  
 “(12) Mineral resources of the public lands.  
 “(13) Mining interests generally.  
 “(14) Mining schools and experimental stations.  
 “(15) Marine affairs (including coastal zone management), except for measures relating to oil and other pollution of navigable waters.  
 “(16) Oceanography.  
 “(17) Petroleum conservation on the public lands and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.  
 “(18) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.  
 “(19) Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.  
 “(20) Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.  
 “(21) Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight functions provided for in clause 3(e) with respect to all programs affecting Indians.

“(m) **Committee on Rules.**

“(1) The rules and joint rules (other than rules or joint rules relating to the Code of Official Conduct), and order of business of the House.  
 “(2) Recesses and final adjournments of Congress.  
 The Committee on Rules is authorized to sit and act whether or not the House is in session.

“(n) **Committee on Science.**

“(1) All energy research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor, and all federally owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratories.  
 “(2) Astronautical research and development, including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities.  
 “(3) Civil aviation research and development.  
 “(4) Environmental research and development.  
 “(5) Marine research.  
 “(6) Measures relating to the commercial application of energy technology.  
 “(7) National Institute of Standards and Technology, standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.  
 “(8) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.  
 “(9) National Space Council.  
 “(10) National Science Foundation.  
 “(11) National Weather Service.  
 “(12) Outer space, including exploration and control thereof.  
 “(13) Science Scholarships.  
 “(14) Scientific research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall

have the special oversight function provided for in clause 3(f) with respect to all nonmilitary research and development.

“(o) **Committee on Small Business.**

“(1) Assistance to and protection of small business, including financial aid, regulatory flexibility and paperwork reduction.

“(2) Participation of small-business enterprises in Federal procurement and Government contracts.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph and (its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight function provided for in clause 3(g) with respect to the problems of small business.

“(p) **Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.**

“(1) Measures relating to the Code of Official Conduct.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provision of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the functions with respect to recommendations, studies, investigations, and reports which are provided for in clause 4(e), and the functions designated in titles I and V of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and sections 7342, 7351, and 7353 of title 5, United States Code.

“(q) **Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.**

“(1) Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, ocean derelicts, and the Coast Guard Academy.

“(2) Federal management of emergencies and natural disasters.

“(3) Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

“(4) Inland waterways.

“(5) Inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

“(6) Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

“(7) Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

“(8) Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.

“(9) Measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House office buildings.

“(10) Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads, other than appropriations therefor; but it shall not be in order for any bill providing general legislation in relation to roads to contain any provision for any specific road, nor for any bill in relation to a specific road to embrace a provision in relation to any other specific road.

“(11) Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

“(12) Measures relating to merchant marine, except for national security aspects of merchant marine.

“(13) Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

“(14) Oil and other pollution of navigable waters, including inland, coastal, and ocean waters.

“(15) Marine affairs (including coastal zone management) as they relate to oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

“(16) Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

"(17) Public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

"(18) Related transportation regulatory agencies.

"(19) Roads and the safety thereof.

"(20) Transportation, including civil aviation, railroads, water transportation, transportation safety (except automobile safety), transportation infrastructure, transportation labor, and railroad retirement and unemployment (except revenue measures related thereto).

"(21) Water power.

"(r) **Committee on Veterans' Affairs.**

"(1) Veterans' measures generally.

"(2) Cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(3) Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.

"(4) Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"(5) Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"(6) Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"(7) Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"(8) Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"(s) **Committee on Ways and Means.**

"(1) Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"(2) Reciprocal trade agreements.

"(3) Revenue measures generally.

"(4) Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

"(5) The bonded debt of the United States (subject to the last sentence of clause 4(g) of this rule).

"(6) The deposit of public moneys.

"(7) Transportation of dutiable goods.

"(8) Tax exempt foundations and charitable trusts.

"(9) National social security, except (A) health care and facilities programs that are supported from general revenues as opposed to payroll deductions and (B) work incentive programs."

(b) Any reference in the rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Third Congress to the following standing committees of the House: the Committee on Armed Services; the Committee on the District of Columbia; the Committee on Education and Labor; the Committee on Energy and Commerce; the Committee on Foreign Affairs; the Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on House Administration; the Committee on Natural Resources; and the Committee on Science, Space and Technology; shall be amended to be a reference to the following standing committees of the House, respectively: the Committee on National Security; the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; the Committee on Commerce; the Committee on International Relations; the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; the Committee on House Oversight; the Committee on Resources; and the Committee on Science.

(c) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, when elected, may revise (within the appropriate levels established in House Concurrent Resolution 218 of the One Hundred Third Congress) allocations of budget outlays, new budget authority, and entitlement authority among committees of the House in the One Hundred Fourth Congress to reflect

changes in jurisdiction under clause 1 of rule X. He shall publish the revised allocations in the Congressional Record. Once published, the revised allocations shall be effective in the House as though made pursuant to sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) In clause 8 of rule XXIV, strike "the Committee on the District of Columbia" through the end of the sentence and insert: "the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, be set apart for the consideration of such business relating to the District of Columbia as may be presented by said committee."

#### Oversight Reform

SEC. 203. (a) In clause 2 of rule X, add the following new paragraphs at the end:

"(d)(1) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, each standing committee of the House shall, in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt its oversight plans for that Congress. Such plans shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and to the Committee on House Oversight. In developing such plans each committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

"(A) consult with other committees of the House that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction, with the objective of ensuring that such laws, programs, or agencies are reviewed in the same Congress and that there is a maximum of coordination between such committees in the conduct of such reviews; and such plans shall include an explanation of what steps have been and will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

"(B) give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority; and

"(C) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdictions are subject to review at least once every ten years.

"(2) It shall not be in order to consider any committee expense resolution (within the meaning of clause 5 of rule XI), or any amendment thereto, for any committee that has not submitted its oversight plans as required by this paragraph.

"(3) Not later than March 31 in the first session of a Congress, after consultation with the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report to the House the oversight plans submitted by each committee together with any recommendations that it, or the House leadership group referred to above, may make to ensure the most effective coordination of such plans and otherwise achieve the objectives of this clause.

"(e) The Speaker, with the approval of the House, may appoint special ad hoc oversight committees for the purpose of reviewing specific matters within the jurisdiction of two or more standing committees."

(b) In clause 1 of rule XI, amend paragraph (d) to read as follows:

"(d)(1) Each committee shall submit to the House not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of that committee under this rule and rule X during the Congress ending on January 3 of such year.

"(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of that committee during that Congress.

"(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(d) of rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by that committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon."

#### Member Assignment Limits

SEC. 204. In clause 6(b) of rule X, insert "(1)" after "(b)" and add the following new subparagraph at the end:

"(2)(A) No Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may serve simultaneously as a member of more than two standing committees or four subcommittees of the standing committees of the House, except that ex officio service by a chairman and ranking minority member of a committee on each of its subcommittees by committee rule shall not be counted against the limitation on subcommittee service. Any other exception to these limitations must be approved by the House upon the recommendation of the respective party caucus or conference.

"(B) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'subcommittee' includes any panel (other than a special oversight panel of the Committee on National Security), task force, special subcommittee, or any subunit of a standing committee that is established for a cumulative period longer than six months in any Congress."

#### Multiple Referral Reform

SEC. 205. In clause 5 of rule X, amend paragraph (c) to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out paragraphs (a) and (b) with respect to any matter, the Speaker shall designate a committee of primary jurisdiction; but also may refer the matter to one or more additional committees, for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the committee of primary jurisdiction; or may refer portions of the matter to one or more additional committees (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) for the consideration only of designated portions; or may refer the matter to a special ad hoc committee appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the House (with members from the committees having jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the House thereon; or may make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate."

#### Accuracy of Committee Transcripts

SEC. 206. In clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI, amend the first sentence to read as follows: "Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action which shall include—

"(A) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcript, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved; and

"(B) a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded."

#### Elimination of "Rolling Quorums"

SEC. 207. In clause 2(1)(2)(A) of rule XI, strike "was actually present" and all that follows through the end of the subdivision and insert "was actually present."

#### Limitation on Committees' Sittings

SEC. 208. In clause 2 of rule XI, amend paragraph (1) to read as follows:

**“Limitation on committees' sittings**

“(1)(1) No committee of the House (except the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and the Committee on Ways and Means) may sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule. For purposes of this paragraph, special leave will be granted unless ten or more Members object; and shall be granted upon the adoption of a motion, which shall be highly privileged if offered by the majority leader, granting such leave to one or more committees.

“(2) No committee of the House may sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.”

**Accountability for Committee Votes**

SEC. 209. In clause 2(1)(2) of rule XI amend subdivision (B) to read as follows:

“(B) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the committee report on the measure or matter.”

**Affirming Minority's Right on Motions to Recommit**

SEC. 210. In clause 4(b) of rule XI, insert before the period at the end the following: “, including a motion to recommit with instructions to report back an amendment otherwise in order (if offered by the minority leader or a designee), except with respect to a Senate bill or resolution for which the text of a House-passed measure has been substituted”.

**Waiver Policy for Special Rules**

SEC. 211. In clause 4 of rule XI, add the following new paragraph at the end:

“(e) Whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution providing for the consideration of any measure, it shall, to the maximum extent possible, specify in the resolution the object of any waiver of a point of order against the measure or against its consideration.”

**Prohibition on Delegate Voting in Committee of the Whole**

SEC. 212. (a) In rule XII, strike clause 2 and the designation of the remaining clause.

(b) In clause 1 of rule XXIII, strike “, Resident Commissioner, or Delegate”.

(c) In clause 2 of rule XXIII, strike paragraph (d).

**Accuracy of the Congressional Record**

SEC. 213. In rule XIV, add the following new clause at the end:

“9. (a) The Congressional Record shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks made during the proceedings of the House, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the Member making the remarks involved.

“(b) Unparliamentary remarks may be deleted only by permission or order of the House.

“(c) This clause establishes a standard of conduct within the meaning of clause 4(e)(1)(B) of rule X.”

**Automatic Rollcall Votes**

SEC. 214. In rule XV, add the following new clause at the end:

“7. The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question on final passage or adoption of any bill, joint resolution, or conference report mak-

ing general appropriations or increasing Federal income tax rates, or on final adoption of any concurrent resolution on the budget or conference report thereon.”

**Appropriations Reforms**

SEC. 215. (a) CONSIDERATION OF LIMITATION AMENDMENTS.—In clause 2(d) of rule XXI, strike “shall have precedence” and insert “shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence”.

(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST NON-EMERGENCY ITEMS IN EMERGENCY SPENDING BILLS.—In clause 2 of rule XXI, add the following new paragraph at the end:

“(e) No provision shall be reported in any appropriation bill or joint resolution containing an emergency designation for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(D) or section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, or shall be in order as an amendment thereto, if the provision or amendment is not designated as an emergency, unless the provision or amendment rescinds budget authority or reduces direct spending, or reduces an amount for a designated emergency.”

(c) PERMITTING OFFSETTING AMENDMENTS.—In clause 2 of rule XXI (as amended by (b) above), add the following new paragraph at the end:

“(f) During the reading of any appropriation bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole, it shall be in order to consider en bloc amendments proposing only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill without increasing the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. When considered en bloc pursuant to this paragraph, such amendments may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment (following the disposition of any points of order against such portions) and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.”

(d) LISTING OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS IN REPORTS.—In clause 3 of rule XXI, insert before the period the following: “, and shall contain a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law (except for classified intelligence or national security programs, projects, or activities)”.

(e) AUTOMATIC RESERVATION OF POINTS OF ORDER.—In rule XXI, add the following new clause at the end:

“8. At the time any appropriation bill is reported, all points of order shall be considered as reserved.”

**Ban on Commemoratives**

SEC. 216. (a) In rule XXII—

(1) amend clause 2 by inserting “(a)” after “2.” and by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

“(b)(1) No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, establishing or expressing any commemoration may be introduced or considered in the House.

“(2) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘commemoration’ means any remembrance, celebration, or recognition for any purpose through the designation of a specified period of time.”

(2) amend clause 3 by striking “or private bill” and inserting “or bill or resolution”.

(b) The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall consider alternative means for establishing commemorations, including the creation of an independent or Executive branch commission for such purpose, and to report to the House any recommendations thereon.

**Numerical Designation of Amendments**

SEC. 217. In clause 6 of rule XXIII, add the following new sentence at the end: “All

amendments to a specified measure submitted for printing in that portion of the Record shall be given numerical designations in the order printed.”

**Pledge of Allegiance**

SEC. 218. In clause 1 of rule XXIV—

(a) insert after the second order of business the following new order of business: “Third. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.”; and

(b) redesignate succeeding orders accordingly.

**Discharge Petitions**

SEC. 219. In clause 3 of rule XXVII, insert the following three new sentences after the fifth sentence: “The Clerk shall cause the names of the Members who have signed a discharge motion during any week to be published in a portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose on the last legislative day of that week. The Clerk shall make available each day for public inspection in an appropriate office of the House cumulative lists of such names. The Clerk shall devise a means by which to make such lists available to offices of the House and to the public in electronic form.”

**Protection of Classified Materials**

SEC. 220. In rule XLIII (“Code of Official Conduct”) insert the following new clause before the two undesignated paragraphs at the end:

“13. Before any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives may have access to classified information, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed:

‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information received in the course of my service with the House of Representatives, except as authorized by House of Representatives or in accordance with its Rules.’

Copies of the executed oath shall be retained by the Clerk of the House as part of the records of the House.”

**Select Committee on Intelligence**

SEC. 221. (a) In clause 1(a) of rule XLVIII (relating to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) strike “nineteen Members with representation to” and insert “sixteen Members, of whom not more than nine may be from the same party. The select committee shall”.

(b)(1) In clause 1(b) of rule XLVIII, insert “(1)” after “(b)”, strike “majority leader”, and insert “Speaker”.

(2) In clause 1(b) of rule XLVIII, add the following new subparagraph at the end:

“(2) The Speaker and minority leader each may designate a member of their leadership staff to assist them in their capacity as ex officio members, with the same access to committee meetings, hearings, briefings, and materials as if employees of the select committee, and subject to the same security clearance and confidentiality requirements as employees of the select committee under this rule.”

(3) In clause 7(c) of rule XLVIII, strike subparagraph (3).

(c) In clause 1 of rule XLVIII, amend paragraph (c) to read as follows:

“(c) No Member of the House other than the Speaker and the minority leader may serve on the select committee during more than four Congresses in any period of six successive Congresses (disregarding for this purpose any service for less than a full session in any Congress), except that the incumbent chairman or ranking minority member having served on the select committee for four Congresses and having served as chairman or

ranking minority member for not more than one Congress shall be eligible for reappointment to the select committee as chairman or ranking minority member for one additional Congress."

(d) In clause 2(a) of rule XLVIII—

(1) insert the following before the period in subparagraph (1): "and the National Foreign Intelligence Program as defined in section 3(6) of the National Security Act of 1947";

(2) strike all after "but not limited to," in subparagraph (2) and insert the following: "the tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense."

(3) amend subparagraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Authorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the following:

"(A) The Central Intelligence Agency, Director of Central Intelligence, and the National Foreign Intelligence Program as defined in section 3(6) of the National Security Act of 1947.

"(B) Intelligence and intelligence-related activities of all other departments and agencies of the Government, including, but not limited to, the tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense.

"(C) Any department, agency, or subdivision, or program that is a successor to any agency or program named or referred to in subdivision (A) or (B)."

#### Abolition of Legislative Service Organizations

SEC. 222. The establishment or continuation of any legislative service organization (as defined and authorized in the One Hundred Third Congress) shall be prohibited in the One Hundred Fourth Congress. The Committee on House Oversight shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure an orderly termination and accounting for funds of any legislative service organization in existence on January 3, 1995.

#### Miscellaneous Provisions and Clerical Corrections

SEC. 223. (a) SPEAKER'S AUTHORITY TO POSTPONE VOTES.—In clause 5(b)(1) of rule I, amend the matter after "questions listed herein:" to read as follows:

"(A) the question of adopting a resolution;

"(B) the question of passing a bill;

"(C) the question of agreeing to a motion to instruct conferees as provided in clause 1(c) of rule XXVIII: *Provided, however*, That proceedings shall not resume on said question if the conferees have filed a report in the House;

"(D) the question of agreeing to a conference report;

"(E) the question of ordering the previous question on a question described in subdivision (A), (B), (C), or (D); and

"(F) the question of agreeing to a motion to suspend the rules."

(b) OFFICE OF FLOOR ASSISTANTS.—There is established in the House of Representatives an office to be known as the Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities. The Speaker shall appoint and set the annual rate of pay for employees of the Office. The Office shall have the responsibility of assisting the Speaker in the management of legislative floor activity.

(c) VICE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE.—In clause 2(d) of rule XI—

(1) strike "The member" and insert "A member"; and

(2) strike "ranking immediately after the chairman" and insert "designated by the chairman of the full committee".

(d) PROHIBITION AGAINST MEMBERS' USE OF PERSONAL, ELECTRONIC OFFICE EQUIPMENT ON HOUSE FLOOR.—In clause 7 of rule XIV, insert "or to use any personal, electronic office equipment (including cellular phones and computers)" after "to smoke".

(e) SPEAKER'S AUTHORITY TO REDUCE TO FIVE-MINUTES A VOTE FOLLOWING A PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE.—In clause 5(b) of rule XV, amend subparagraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) after a rollcall vote has been ordered on a motion for the previous question, on any underlying question that follows without intervening business";

(f) CLERICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) In clause 3 of rule III, insert "; and" before "certify".

(2) In clause 2(1)(1)(B) of rule XI, strike "does not apply to the reporting" and all that follows through "subdivision (C) and".

(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR BILL SPONSORSHIP ON OPENING DAY.—In the One Hundred Fourth Congress, each of the first 20 bills introduced in the House (H.R. 1 through H.R. 20), and each of the first two joint resolutions introduced in the House (H.J. Res. 1 and H.J. Res. 2), may have more than one Member reflected as a first sponsor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the resolution is initially debatable for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a gratifying day for America, a day of hope and promise for our country. And so it is with a profound sense of honor that I offer, on behalf of the Republican Members of the House, this proposed set of rules for the 104th Congress.

I am very proud of this rules package. I believe it will dramatically alter—and I predict improve—the way in which the House conducts the American people's business.

The distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SOLOMON, and others will offer more detailed explanations of the provisions. Allow me at this point simply to sketch for you our three principal goals—responsibility, reform, and renewal.

Our first goal is greater responsibility with the people's money. We will reduce the size and cost of a Congress that has grown unchecked for too many years. We will slash the number of committees and subcommittees, and reduce committee staff by a third, saving taxpayers about \$40 million a year.

□ 1650

We will stop the funding of 28 special-interest caucuses that cost \$5 million a year. And we have even managed to save \$300,000 a year by ending so-called commemorative legislation like National Pizza and Pasta Day.

It's time for truth in budgeting. From now on, in the budget process,

when we speak of a spending cut, we will mean an actual cut in spending, not just a smaller increase.

Over on the other side of the Capitol, our Senate colleagues actually have a rule requiring a super-majority to cut taxes. Well, is it not about time we put our thumb on the spending-cut side of the scale? House rules will now require a three-fifths majority to raise taxes.

Our second goal is reform. We want to make the House more accountable to the American people. We are throwing open the shutters and letting the sun shine in on committee meetings. We are banning proxy voting and so-called rolling quorums.

This way, Members of Congress will devote more energy to their all-important committee work, knowing that, from now on, they will have to be physically present to cast votes on behalf of their constituents, rather than delegating that high privilege.

And we are making the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a true verbatim transcript of debate, instead of "revisionist history" Members can totally rewrite after the fact.

Our third goal, Mr. Speaker, is renewal. We hope to promote a renewal of respect for this historic institution. And that begins with a renewal of respect for the people who sent us here. It begins with a Congress that obeys the same laws it imposes on private citizens.

Renewal means more accountability on the part of those entrusted with power. And that's why we impose a healthy, 6-year term limit on committee chairmen.

We also feel—and I know you enthusiastically concur, Mr. Speaker—that there should be an 8-year term limit on the Speaker, the same number of years allowed the President.

Allow me to end on a personal note. I would love to see bipartisan support for these rules, because this is not a Republican House. This was not previously a Democratic House. This is the American people's House, and we must restore their faith in this historic and honorable institution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is a violation of the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Texas may proceed.

Mr. ARMEY. I repeat, we must restore their faith in this historic and honorable institution.

I hope today will set a standard for a more cooperative, more idea-driven process in which our first and highest consideration is always the people's business.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on these historic rules on this historic day.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], a member of the leadership.

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

The previous Member just described this as a day of promise, a day for raising standards of this institution, and this is a historic occasion. We will miss a historic, major opportunity to change the way this institution of the Congress is perceived if we do not add to this rules package before us the ban on gifts from lobbyists which this House passed just months ago by an overwhelming vote of 315 to 111.

There are many things in this package, this rules proposal, that I can and will gladly support. Let us be frank about it: Committee proxy voting, super majorities, baseline budgeting, this is Capitol Hill jargon. Some people out in the country get it; most do not, and most could care less. But everybody understands what gifts from lobbyists is all about. That is why we got 315 votes for it the last time it was before the House.

If we want to open up this institution, if we want to freshen its image, redeem its reputation among the American people, then we need to sever the ties, real and perceived, between those who work inside this institution and represent the people as a whole, and those who work Congress from the outside, the lobbyists, Gucci Gulf, the lobbyists who represent special interests and limited numbers of people.

Just a few months ago this ban on gifts from lobbyists was good enough for 315 Members. The provisions that some found problematic then that dealt with grassroots lobbying were purged from the Democratic proposal today. We did add one provision that is contentious. It would limit, not ban, limit the amount of royalties that a Member could earn while sitting as a Member of this House on publications written while he is sitting. But the limit is a third of your salary while serving here, which is a generous dispensation for full-time Members who are paid full-time salaries. With such enormous support, 315 years, why not vote on this package today and make it the rule of the House from day one?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, a new day is here.

Today we begin the first stage of a commitment that was made to the American people last November—indeed, a Contract With America that was signed by the new majority—to restore, renew, and reform the people's House.

The resolution before us today, adopting the Rules of the House for the 104th Congress, is the initial fulfillment of that Contract With America. It makes the most sweeping and comprehensive reform of this House in the last half century.

It brings back to the people's House the intangible words, "openness, fairness, and accountability."

But, even more importantly, by setting the example of substantially reducing the committees and staff of the Congress, we begin the process of shrinking the size and power of the Federal Government.

What we are proposing today in this resolution is unprecedented, both in form and in substance. Instead of the usual 1 hour of debate on this resolution, we have committed to 3½ hours of debate. Instead of the usual single vote on this resolution, we have committed to nine separate votes.

After this initial general debate period of 30 minutes, we will proceed to debate for 20 minutes each on the eight opening day reforms contained in our Contract With America, followed by a separate vote on each.

Those reforms include—

First, a comprehensive reform of our committee system, including a one-third cut in committee staff, a reduction of over 20 subcommittees, and a consolidation of committee staff funding into a publicly disclosed, 2-year funding resolution;

Second, a truth-in-budgeting baseline reform provision that measures next year's budget against this year's spending levels instead of inflated baseline spending levels;

Third, a four-term limit on the Speaker of the House, and three-term limit on committee and subcommittee chairmen;

Fourth, a ban on proxy or ghost voting in committees;

Fifth, a committee sunshine rule to ensure that all committee meetings and hearings are open to the public and the media;

Sixth, a required three-fifths vote on any bill increasing income tax rates, and a prohibition against retroactive tax increases;

Seventh, a comprehensive audit of all House books to ferret out past waste, fraud, and abuse in this House so that we can operate this House in the future in an open and fiscally sound manner; and

Eighth, the consideration of a bill that will make the Congress subject to the same laws that now apply to the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, following the debate and votes on those opening day contract items, we will proceed for an additional 20 minutes to debate and then vote on title II of this resolution which contains 23 additional reforms of this House which have been long overdue, including—comprehensive reform of

the administrative structure of the House; a reduction in the number of committees and an overhaul of their jurisdictions; a requirement for more comprehensive oversight of the executive branch by our committees; a publication of all committee rollcall votes; a reform of our appropriations process; a requirement that our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and committee transcripts be an accurate account of words actually spoken; a ban on so-called commemorative bills; and a ban on taxpayer-funded special interest caucuses.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and discuss the many other reform items in this rules resolution, but, in the interest of allowing other Members to participate in this debate, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### A CONTRACT FOR A NEW HOUSE

(A section-by-section summary of H. Res. —, adopting the Rules of the House for the 104th Congress, to be offered by the Majority Leader, or a designee.)

The Rules of the House of the 103rd Congress would be adopted as the rules for the 104th Congress together with the following amendments:

#### TITLE I. CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: A BILL OF ACCOUNTABILITY

[Note: Each section below in Title I would be under a separate introductory paragraph adopting House Rules from the 103rd Congress as the Rules of the 104th Congress with the additional amendment(s) in the section, thereby permitting a division of the question and separate debate and vote on each of the 8 Contract items. The 23 items in Title II, on the other hand, would be subject to a single vote.]

Sec. 101. Committee, Subcommittee and Staff Reforms: Committee staff in the 104th Congress is reduced by at least one-third from comparable levels in the 103rd Congress. No committee could have more than 5 subcommittees (except Appropriations which could have no more than 13; Government Reform and Oversight, no more than 7; and Transportation and Infrastructure, no more than 6). Statutory and investigative staff salary authorization levels would be consolidated in a single, 2-year committee expense resolution (except for the Committee on Appropriations). The distinction between professional and clerical staff would be eliminated while retaining the overall core staff of 30 for each committee (20-majority, 10-minority, or a one-third guarantee to the minority if less than 30). Committee chairmen would be required to ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to exercise its responsibilities under committee rules, including fair treatment to the minority in subcommittee staffing. Interim funding authority for House committees, consistent with planned staff reductions, would be provided pending the adoption of the primary expense resolution for 1995-96.

Sec. 102. Truth-in-Budgeting Baseline Reform: Cost estimates in committee reports would include a comparison of total estimated funding for the program(s) to the appropriate levels under current law.

Sec. 103. Term Limits for Speaker, Committee and Subcommittee Chairmen: Beginning with the 104th Congress: (a) No person could serve as Speaker for more than four consecutive Congresses (disregarding any service for less than a session). (b) No Member could be the chairman of any committee,

or of the same subcommittee of a committee, for more than three consecutive Congresses (excluding any service for less than a session in a Congress).

Sec. 104. Proxy Voting Ban: No vote could be cast by proxy on any committee or subcommittee thereof.

Sec. 105. Committee Sunshine Rules: Committee meetings, which can now be closed for any reason, could only be closed by majority rollcall vote if disclosure would endanger national security, compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. Broadcast coverage of any committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing open to the public would be a right (not requiring a vote of approval as at present).

Sec. 106. Limitations on Tax Increases: (a) No bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report carrying an income tax rate increase, could be considered as passed or agreed to unless so determined by a vote of at least three-fifths of the House. (b) No measure of amendment could be considered that contains a retroactive income tax rate increase.

Sec. 107. Comprehensive House Audit: The Inspector General would be authorized to contract with one or more independent auditing firms to conduct a comprehensive audit of House financial records, physical assets, and operational facilities.

Sec. 108. Consideration of "Congressional Accountability Act": The majority leader, or a designee, would be authorized to call up for consideration on Jan. 4, 1995, a bill (H.R. 1), the "Congressional Accountability Act of 1995," subject to one-hour of debate in the House, divided equally between the majority leader and minority leader, or their designees, and to one motion to recommit.

#### TITLE II. GENERAL

Sec. 201. House Administrative Reforms: The Office of Doorkeeper would be abolished and its functions transferred to the Sergeant-at-Arms. A Chief Administrative Officer, elected by the House, would replace the Director of Financial and Non-Legislative Services. The authority of the Inspector General would be broadened to audit all House functions and to refer possible violations of rules or law to the ethics committee for action or possible referral to the appropriate Federal or State authorities.

Sec. 202. Changes in Committee System: The Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and the District of Columbia would be abolished and their jurisdiction transferred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries would be abolished and its jurisdiction transferred to the committees on National Security, Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure. The Committee on Budget would be given shared legislative jurisdiction over certain budgetary legislation. Term limits for members of the Budget Committee would be changed from three-terms in any five Congresses to four-terms in any six Congresses. Other committees would be renamed and jurisdictions transferred.

Sec. 203. Oversight Reform: Committees would be required to adopt oversight plans for the Congress and submit them to the Committee on House Oversight and Government Reform and Oversight by Feb. 15th of the first session. The Committee on House Oversight and Government Reform and Oversight would report the plans to the House by March 31st together with any recommendations of the committee or joint leadership to ensure maximum coordination. Committees

would be required to include an oversight section in their final activity reports reporting on the implementation of their plans. The Speaker would be authorized to appoint ad hoc oversight committees, subject to House approval, for specific oversight projects from committees sharing jurisdiction.

Sec. 204. Member Assignment Limits: No Member could have more than two standing committee and four subcommittee assignments (except committee chairman and ranking minority members could serve as ex officio members of all subcommittees of their committees). Any exception to the assignment limits must be approved by the House upon the recommendation of the respective party caucus or conference.

Sec. 205. Multiple Bill Referral Reform: The joint referral of bills to two or more committees would be prohibited. The speaker would designate a committee of primary jurisdiction when a bill is introduced, may refer parts of bills to appropriate committees, and may sequentially refer bills, either upon introduction or after the primary committee has reported, subject to time limits for reporting.

Sec. 206. Accuracy of Committee Transcripts: Committee hearing and meeting transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks made during proceedings, subject only to technical grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

Sec. 207. Elimination of "Rolling Quorums": The existing "rolling quorum" rule which allows drop-by voting to report measures and permits less than a quorum to report if no point of order is raised, would be repealed.

Sec. 208. Prohibition on Committee Meetings During House Consideration of Amendments: No Committee (except the Committees on Appropriations, Rules, Standards and Ways and Means) could sit while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule without special leave (which shall be granted unless 10 members object), or unless upon the adoption of a motion offered by the majority leader which shall be privileged. No committee could sit while the House and Senate are meeting in joint session or when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

Sec. 209. Accountability for Committee Votes: Committee reports on any bill or other matter would include the names of those voting for and against on rollcall votes on any amendments or on the motion to report a measure.

Sec. 210. Affirming Minority's Rights on Motions to Recommit: The Rules Committee could not report a special rule denying the minority the right to offer amendatory instructions in a motion to recommit if offered by the minority leader or a designee.

Sec. 211. Waiver Policy for Special Rules: The Committee on Rules would be required, to the maximum extent possible, to specify in any special rule providing for the consideration of a measure any provisions of House rules being waived.

Sec. 212. Prohibition on Delegate Voting in Committee of Whole: The Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the Delegates from Guam, Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the District of Columbia could not vote in or preside over the Committee of the Whole.

Sec. 213. Accuracy of Congressional Record: The Congressional Record would be a verbatim account of proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical and typographical corrections by the Member speak-

ing. Unparliamentary remarks may be deleted only by unanimous consent or order of the House.

Sec. 214. Automatic Roll Call Votes: Automatic roll call votes would be required on final passage of bills making appropriations, raising taxes, and conference reports thereon; and on final adoption of budget resolutions and their conference reports.

Sec. 215. Appropriations Reforms: Limitation amendments could be offered to appropriations bills at the end of the regular amendment process without having to first defeat the motion to rise and report. A motion to rise could only be offered by the majority leader (or a designee) if limitation amendments are still pending. Non-emergency items could not be reported or offered as amendments to emergency spending bills (except to rescind budget authority or reduce direct spending to pay for the emergency benefits). Off-setting, deficit neutral amendments could be offered en bloc to any appropriations measure. Reports on all appropriations bills would be required to include not only a listing of legislative provisions contained in the measures (as presently required), but of all unauthorized activities being funded by the measure (except for classified intelligence or national security programs). Points of order would automatically be reserved against an appropriations bill when filed.

Sec. 216. Ban on Commemoratives: No bill, resolution or amendment could be introduced or considered in the House that establishes or expresses any commemoration (defined as any remembrance, celebration or recognition for any purpose) for a specified time period (e.g., day, week, month). The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight would be directed to consider alternative means of establishing commemorations, such as an independent or Executive Branch Commission, and to report to the House any recommendations.

Sec. 217. Numerical Designation of Amendments Submitted for Record: Amendments submitted for the amendments section of the Congressional Record for any bill would be given numerical designations in the order printed for that bill to facilitate easy reference by Members and committees.

Sec. 218. Pledge of Allegiance: The Pledge of Allegiance would be required in the House as the third order of business each day.

Sec. 219. Discharge Petitions: The Clerk would be required to publish the names of new signers of discharge petitions in the last Congressional Record of each week and make available to the public through an appropriate office the current names of signers on a daily basis. The Clerk shall also devise a system for making the names of signers available to House offices and the public through electronic form.

Sec. 220. Protection of Classified Materials: The Code of Official Conduct would be amended to require that, prior to having access to any classified materials, Members, officers and employees take an oath not to disclose such materials except as authorized by the House or its Rules.

Sec. 221. Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence would be reduced in size from 19 to 16 members, with a 9-7 majority to minority ratio. Member terms would be increased from three to four and the chairman and ranking minority member could serve a fifth term if they held the those positions for only one Congress. The Speaker (currently the majority leader) and minority leader would serve as ex officio,

non-voting members, and may designate a member of their leadership staff to assist them and have access to committee proceedings and materials, as if committee staff, subject to the same security clearance and confidentiality requirements as committee staff. Current jurisdictional arrangements would be clarified.

Sec. 222. Abolition of Legislative Service Organizations: The establishment or continuation of any Legislative Service Organization (as defined and authorized by regulation in the 103rd Congress) would be prohibited in the 104th Congress. The Committee on House Oversight would be directed to take necessary steps to ensure the orderly termination and accounting for funds of LSOs in existence on Jan. 4, 1995.

Sec. 223. Miscellaneous Provisions and Clerical Corrections: The Speaker's authority to postpone votes on certain matters would include postponing the previous question vote on those matters. The Speaker's authority to reduce time for voting to 5-minutes after a 15-minute vote on the previous question would extend to any previous question vote (currently applies only to previous question vote on special rules from the Rules Committee). There would be established a Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, with employees to be appointed by the Speaker to assist in the management of legislative floor activity. The Chairman of a committee could designate any member of the committee or a subcommittee as the vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee. Members would be prohibited from using any personal, electronic office equipment (including cellular phones, and laptop computers) on the House floor. Certain specified, priority measures introduced on Jan. 4, 1995, could have more than one prime sponsor.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF HOUSE RULES RESOLUTION

(H. Res. —, Adopting House Rules, 104th Congress, January 5, 1995)

#### TITLE I. CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: A BILL OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Title I of the resolution contains eight sections relating to the "Opening Day Checklist" of House reforms contained in the "Contract with America." Each section is preceded by an identical introductory paragraph adopting the rules of the previous Congress together with the amendment(s) in that section in order to permit a division of the question vote on each section.

Sec. 101. Committee, Subcommittee and Staff Reforms: (a) Committee staff reductions.—Subsection (a) requires that the number of House committee staff in the 104th Congress be at least one-third less than the corresponding total in the 103rd Congress. It is the intent of the resolution that this reduction be achieved at the outset of the new Congress. The Committee on House Oversight will be responsible for overseeing the reductions and enforcing them through the committee funding process.

(b) Subcommittee reductions.—Subsection (b) replaces clause 6(d) of House rule X which currently requires all committee having more than 20 members to establish at least four subcommittees. In its place, the new paragraph requires that committees establish no more than six subcommittees. The only exceptions are the committees on Appropriations (13), Government Reform and Oversight (7), and Transportation and Infrastructure (6).

This paragraph should be read in the context of sec. 204 of the resolution which limits Members to no more than four subcommittee

assignments. In that section, subcommittee is defined as "any panel (other than a special oversight panel of the Committee on National Security), task force, special subcommittee, or any subunit of a standing committee that is established for a cumulative period longer than six months in any Congress." The intent of these two limitations is to make both Member and committee work more deliberative, participatory, and manageable by reducing scheduling conflicts and jurisdictional overlap. This is especially important given the ban on proxy voting in committees.

(c) Consolidated committee staff and biennial funding.—Subsection (c) amends clause 5 of rule XI ("Committee Expenses") in two important respects. First, it requires that all committee staff salaries and expenses be authorized in an expense resolution reported by the Committee on House Oversight. At present, only investigative staff salaries and expenses are funded through expense resolutions while so-called statutory staff (see amendments to rule XI clause 6 below), are paid for directly from appropriations.

Second, the subsection provides for one primary expense resolution per Congress instead of one each session. This is the system currently in effect in the Senate. The purpose for the biennial resolution is to permit committee to plan for a full Congress and to free-up the time otherwise consumed by the House and its committees on processing two budgets per Congress.

The ability of committees to request additional or supplemental expense resolutions in a Congress is preserved. The only committee exempted from this consolidated funding process will be Appropriations which has been traditionally exempt to avoid undue pressures on its funding decisions. The Budget Committee, which has been exempt from the funding process since its formation in 1975, would be brought under the funding process by this rule change.

The resolution contains a free-standing, interim funding rule for committees until their expense resolutions are adopted. This permits committees to incur expenses consistent with their planned staff reductions.

Clause 5(d) of rule XI is amended to require that committee chairmen make available to each subcommittee sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under committee rules, and that the minority is treated fairly in the appointment of subcommittee staff. This replaces an existing provision which entitles each subcommittee chairman and ranking minority member to appoint one staff person at a rate of pay up to 75% of the maximum allowable for committee staff.

It is the intent of this provision to reestablish the primacy of committees over subcommittees while maintaining the ability of subcommittees to carry out their functions as arms of the parent committee. Nothing in this rule would prevent a committee chairman from allowing a subcommittee chairman to nominate a staff member for approval, either as a matter of policy or committee rule. But, it places ultimate authority over all committee staff in the full committee chairman and restores the line of responsibility of all such staff to the full committee.

Subsection (d) amends clause 6 of rule XI ("Committee Staffs") in several respects. First, it eliminates the distinction between professional and clerical staff so that all 30 of the core committee staff are termed "professional." Under existing rules, each committee may appoint 18 professional and 12 clerical staff, with the minority entitled to

one-third of each category. The one-third guarantee to the minority is retained, but with the difference that it would apply even if the committee appoints fewer than 30 staff.

The existing conditions that committee staff engage only in committee business during congressional working hours and not be assigned duties other than committee business are retained. However, the rule is amended to recognize the existence of shared or associate staff who may be paid from both Member clerk hire as well as committee funds. In such cases, the chairman must certify that their committee work is commensurate with their pay. It is the intent of this rule to permit a chairman to require by committee rule or policy that a supervising Member first certify the same to the chairman if a staff member is not working directly under the chairman.

The new rule also makes clear that the employment of such shared or committee staff is subject to such terms, conditions, or limitations as may be established by the Committee on House Oversight.

Sec. 102. Truth-in-Budgeting Baseline Reform: Subsection (a) amends House rule XI, clause 2(1)(3), relating to the contents of committee reports, to require that cost estimates submitted for reports on measures providing new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding for the program (or programs), to the appropriate levels under current law.

Subsection (b) inserts similar language in clause 7(a) of rule XIII, relating to cost estimates in committee reports (other than those of the Committees on Appropriations, Rules, House Oversight, and Standards of Official Conduct).

These provisions apply to individual pieces of legislation and not to the budget in its entirety. The changes as they relate to discretionary spending authorizations will require that the cost estimates show the entire amount being authorized by current law. In virtually all instances this will be the entire amount of the program because the authorization will be either extending an expired authorization (in which case the current law is zero) or expanding an existing authorization (in which case the current law for expansion will be zero). Therefore, the rule will require that cost estimates for all legislation providing discretionary spending authorization show the entire amount being authorized. Cost estimates for discretionary appropriations will likewise show the entire amount being appropriated.

The rule as applied to entitlement legislation will require that the cost estimate show the entire amount of spending estimated to occur due to the proposed legislation as well as the amount estimated under current law. This is a change from the previous method of scoring entitlement legislation which only showed the change from current law. Thus, if proposed entitlement legislation provides a lower rate of increase in spending than current law, the cost estimate will show that spending is increasing under the proposed legislation whereas previously the cost estimate would have shown only a reduction from current law.

Sec. 103. Term Limits for Speaker, Committee and Subcommittee Chairmen: Subsection (a) amends rule I ("Duties of the Speaker") by adding a new clause 8 at the end which prohibits any person from serving as House Speaker for more than four consecutive terms (excluding any service for less than a session of Congress), beginning

with the 104th Congress. The eight year limit is consistent with the spirit of the current two-term limit on Presidents, with the exception of the term "consecutive."

While the rule cannot be made binding on future Congresses, since each has the constitutional authority to make its own rules, it does set a standard to go by which has been encouraged and agreed to by the new Speaker in the 104th Congress.

Subsection (b) amends clause 6(e) of rule X which currently provides that all vacancies on House standing committees shall be filled by election by the House from nominations submitted by the respective party caucus or conference. The new sentence provides that no Member may serve as the chairman of the same standing committee or subcommittee for more than three consecutive Congresses, beginning with the 104th Congress. The purpose of this new limitation is not merely to allow other Members to assume leadership responsibilities sooner, but more importantly to prevent stagnation or too close a relationship to develop between committee leaders and the interests they oversee at the expense of balanced oversight and legislation.

Sec. 104. Proxy Voting Ban: Subsection (a) amends House rule XI, clause 2, which currently permits proxy voting in committees, by prohibiting the use of proxies by any Member on any measure or matter before a committee. Subsection (b) simply makes a conforming change in clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI by striking a reference to proxy voting.

The main purpose for this change is to ensure greater participation in committee deliberations and decisions so that the legislative product will be more representative and developed than if produced by a few members present. The overall aim of many of the committee reforms is to restore committees as the legislative workshops of the House.

This rule does not apply to House-Senate conference committees which operate under joint rules agreed to by a particular conference. Conference committees, for instance, do not require an actual meeting to sign the report (though they must hold at least one meeting at some point)—only a majority of conferees from each House to sign the report.

Sec. 105. Committee Sunshine Rules: Subsection (a) amends clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI, relating to open meetings to require that meetings which are open to the public shall also be open to the broadcast and photographic media. It also requires that meetings may only be closed by majority vote, with a majority present, if it is determined that matters to be disclosed would endanger national security, compromise sensitive law enforcement information, tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House. The subsection also strikes a provision allowing for a meeting to be closed to discuss internal budget or personnel matters.

Under present House rules, a committee must vote to approve coverage of a meeting by radio, television and still photography. And, a meeting may be closed for any purpose by majority vote.

Subsection (b) amends clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI, relating to open committee hearings, to require that any hearing open to the public is also open to the broadcast and photographic media and may only be closed by majority vote, a majority being present, for the same reasons stated in the open meeting rule above.

The present House rule requires a majority vote to open a hearing to the broadcast and

photographic media. It also prohibits closing a meeting except for all of the specified reasons above except one: the new rule adds the condition relating to the disclosure of "sensitive law enforcement information."

Unchanged is the present rule provision permitting a majority of a committee hearing quorum (which could be as few as two members if a committee has adopted such a quorum requirement as permitted by House rules) to vote to close a hearing either to discuss whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger national security or, in the case of an investigatory hearing, would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person (see clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI); or if a majority of the same hearing quorum makes a determination at an investigatory hearing that testimony or evidence to be disclosed would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

Subsection (c) amends clause 3(d) of rule XI, relating to the broadcasting of committee meetings or hearings, by striking the clause that makes coverage by the audio and visual media "a privilege made available by the House." This reflects the new requirement that public meetings and hearings are automatically open to these media and does not require an affirmative vote of the committee.

Subsection (d) amends paragraph (e) of clause 3, rule XI, by eliminating the requirement that a committee must vote to permit audio and visual media coverage except as provided in paragraph (f)(2). Paragraph (f)(2), which permits a subpoenaed witness to demand that audio and visual coverage of that witness' testimony be prohibited, remains unchanged under the new rule. The subsection also provides that a committee or subcommittee may not limit television or photographic coverage to less than two representatives of each medium except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized.

Sec. 106. Limitations on Tax Increases: Subsection (a) amends clause 5 of rule XXI by adding a new paragraph (c) at the end requiring a three-fifths vote of the House to pass or agree to any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report carrying a Federal income tax rate increase. The three-fifths vote would be of those present and voting. This should be read in the context of section 214 of the resolution which requires an automatic rollcall vote in the House on the final passage of any bill, joint resolution or conference report carrying a Federal income tax rate increase.

Subsection (b) adds a new paragraph (d) to clause 5 or rule XXI prohibiting the consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report carrying a retroactive Federal income tax rate increase. For purposes of these rules the term "Federal income tax rate increase" is, for example, an increase in the individual income tax rates established in section 1, and the corporate income tax rates established in section 11, respectively, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Sec. 107. Comprehensive House Audit: This section is a free-standing requirement that the Inspector General of the House, during the 104th Congress, in consultation with the Speaker and the Committee on House Oversight, conduct a comprehensive audit of House financial records and administrative operations, be authorized to contract with independent auditing firms for such purposes, and report the results of the audit as provided in House rule VI ("Office of Inspector General"), which requires the submission

of any audit reports simultaneously to the Speaker, majority leader, and the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on House Oversight.

Sec. 108. Consideration of the "Congressional Accountability Act": Sec. 108 is a free-standing, special rule, permitting the consideration in the House, at any time after the adoption of the House rules' resolution, of H.R. 1 (104th Congress), a bill to make certain laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, if offered by the majority leader or a designee. The special rule provides for one hour of debate controlled equally by the majority and minority leaders, or their designees, and orders the previous question to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The bill would not be subject to amendment unless offered as part of amendatory instructions in the motion to recommit.

#### TITLE II. GENERAL

Title II consists of 23 additional sections under a single introductory paragraph adopting the rules of the 103rd Congress together with the further amendments contained in those sections. As such, the 23 sections would not be subject to a division of the question and separate votes. These would be a single vote on Title II following debate on it (and on any vote on a motion to commit).

Sec. 201. Administrative Reforms: Subsection (a) strikes from rule II references to the Doorkeeper as an elected House Officer (the office is abolished) and add the office of Chief Administrative Officer as a newly elected Officer of the House.

Subsection (b) amends rule III ("Duties of the Clerk") by adding two new clauses, 7 and 8, requiring the Clerk to make semi-annual reports on finances and operations of the Office, to the Committee on House Oversight, and to cooperate with the appropriate offices and persons conducting performance reviews and audits of the Office's finances and operations.

Subsection (c) amends House rules IV, V, and VI as follows:

Rule IV ("Duties of the Sergeant-at-Arms"), is amended to reflect the assumption by the Sergeant-at-Arms of certain duties and responsibilities previously under the Doorkeeper; to require semi-annual reports be made to the Committee on House Oversight regarding the finances and operations of the Office; and to require cooperation with appropriate persons in the performance of reviews and audits.

Rule V, previously relating to the "Duties of the Doorkeeper," is replaced by a new rule relating to the "Chief Administrative Officer" who shall assume many of the duties and functions previously vested in the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services (rule VI, clause 1, 103rd Congress). Specifically, the Chief shall have operational and financial responsibility for functions assigned by the Speaker and Committee on House Oversight, subject to their policy direction and oversight. In addition, the Chief shall make semi-annual reports to the Committee on House Oversight on the finances and operations of the Office, and cooperate fully with appropriate offices and persons conducting performance reviews and audits.

Rule VI, previously relating to the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services and the Office of Inspector General, is replaced by a new rule establishing the Office of Inspector General. The Office of Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services would be abolished by the adoption of this new rule.

As with the previous rule VI, clause 2, the Inspector General is to be appointed by the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader, acting jointly. The Inspector General would be subject to the policy direction and oversight of the Committee on House Oversight, and would be responsible for conducting periodic audits of the financial and administrative functions of the House and joint entities. The audit responsibilities of the previous Inspector General were confined to the financial functions under the Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services, the Clerk, the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Doorkeeper.

The new responsibilities are therefore broadened to include all financial and administrative functions of the House and joint entities. The existing reporting and consultation requirements regarding any audits would be retained. Specifically, the Inspector General would be required to report simultaneously to the Speaker, majority leader, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight any financial irregularities discovered, as well as on the final results of any audit.

Moreover, the Inspector General is required to report to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct any potential violations of House rules or laws applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities of any Member, officer or employee of the House. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct would retain existing authority to refer any possible law violations to the appropriate Federal or State authorities, subject to House approval, under clause 4(e)(1)(C) of rule X.

Subsection (d) eliminates clause 3(j) of rule X which established a bipartisan Subcommittee on House Oversight of the former Committee on House Administration for the purpose of receiving audit reports and exercising oversight of the Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, Doorkeeper, Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services, and the Inspector General. These responsibilities will be assumed by the full Committee on House Oversight.

Subsection (e) amends clause 4(d) of rule X, regarding the additional functions of the Committee on House Oversight, by making conforming changes reflecting the committee's new name and changes made in the other Offices of the House.

Sec. 202. Changes in the Committee System: This section rewrites clause 1 of rule X ("The Committees and Their Jurisdiction"), to reflect the abolition of three committees—District of Columbia, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Post Office and Civil Service—the transfer of their jurisdictions, and the renaming and jurisdictional changes in other standing committees of the House.

Specifically, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the national security aspects of merchant marine jurisdiction is transferred to the Committee on National Security (formerly Armed Services); the Coast Guard jurisdiction is transferred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure (formerly Public Works and Transportation); and the fisheries, marine, non-national security aspects of the merchant marine, oceanographic affairs, and endangered species jurisdictions are transferred to the Committee on Resources (formerly Natural Resources).

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight (formerly Government Operations), would assume the jurisdictions of the committees on District of Columbia and

Post Office and Civil Service, except for the Franking Commission which goes to House Oversight (formerly House Administration).

Approximately 20 percent of the jurisdiction of the former Committee on Energy and Commerce (renamed the Committee on Commerce by this resolution) would go to the following committees: primary jurisdiction over Glass-Steagall reform legislation to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services (formerly Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs); consolidation of food inspection jurisdiction to the Committee on Agriculture; railroad jurisdiction to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; Trans-Alaska Pipeline to the Committee on Resources; inland waterways jurisdiction to Transportation and Infrastructure; and consolidation of energy research and development jurisdiction under the Committee on Science.

The Committee on the Budget would gain certain jurisdiction over budgetary legislation from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Other committee names changes include: Economic and Educational Opportunities (formerly Education and Labor); and International Relations (formerly Foreign Affairs).

Sec. 203. Oversight Reform: Subsection (a) adds two new subparagraphs (d) and (e) at the end of clause 2 of rule X ("General Oversight Responsibilities"). Paragraph (a) requires each standing committee of the House, no later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, to adopt in open session, with a quorum present, its oversight plans for that Congress, and to submit them to the committees on House Oversight and Government Reform and Oversight.

Committees shall, to the maximum extent feasible, consult with other committees having related jurisdictions to ensure coordination and cooperation in formulating and implementing oversight plans; give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs or agencies operating under permanent authority; and ensure that all laws within their jurisdictions are subject to oversight review at least once every ten years.

No expense resolution could be considered for any committee which has not submitted its oversight plans to the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. Not later than March 31 of the first session of a Congress, after consulting with the Speaker and majority and minority leaders, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall publish the oversight plans of the various committees, together with any recommendations made by the joint leadership group to ensure the most effective coordination of the plans.

Paragraph (e) of rule X, clause 2, authorizes the Speaker, with the approval of the House, to appoint special, ad hoc oversight committees for the purpose of reviewing specific matters within the jurisdiction of two or more committees.

Subsection (b) of the resolution amends clause 1(d) of rule XI, which now requires committee to submit an activity report at the end of each Congress, to include in such reports separate sections on the committees' legislative and oversight activities, including a summary of the oversight plans submitted and actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plans, as well as any additional oversight activities undertaken by the committees.

It is the intent of this section to ensure that committees make a more concerted, co-

ordinated and conscientious effort to develop meaningful oversight plans at the beginning of each Congress and to follow through on their implementation, with a view to examining the full range of the laws under their jurisdiction over a period of five Congresses.

Sec. 204. Member Assignment Limits: Clause 6(b) of rule X, relating to committee memberships, would be amended by adding a new subparagraph (b) that would limit Members to no more than two standing committee assignments and four subcommittee assignments. The limitation would not apply to committee chairman and ranking minority members who serve as ex officio members of all subcommittees of their committees. Any exceptions to these limits must be approved by the House upon the recommendation of the respective party caucus or conference.

The term subcommittee is defined for purposes of this subparagraph as any panel (other than a special oversight panel of the Committee on National Security), task force, special subcommittee, or any subunit of a committee that is established for a cumulative period of longer than six months in a Congress.

It is the intent of this rule that any waivers by a party caucus or conference be specifically approved before it is presented to the House for consideration. If such party caucus or conference recommendations are specifically approved at the beginning of a Congress, the election of committees by the House will be considered as the requisite approval by the House of any exceptions to the committee limitation. However, any exceptions to the subcommittee limitation would have to be reported to the House from the respective party caucus or conference.

Sec. 205. Multiple Referral Reform: Clause 5(c) of rule X ("Referral of Bills, Resolutions, and Other Matters to Committees") is amended to require the Speaker to designate a committee of primary jurisdiction upon the initial referral of a measure to a committee. The Speaker would have the discretion to also refer the same measure to other committees in sequence (sequential referral), either upon its initial introduction or after the primary committee has reported, subject to time limits for reporting by the secondary committees; or to refer designated portions of the same measure to other committees (split referral); or to refer a measure to a special ad hoc committee consisting of committees with shared jurisdictions over the measure.

This rule change differs from the present referral rule in four significant respects. First, the designation of a committee of primary jurisdiction is designed to ensure greater accountability for legislation. Second, the rule eliminates so-called joint referrals which technically gave committees authority to consider the same portions of legislation as other committees (though referrals are always for consideration only of such provisions as fall within a committee's jurisdiction). Third, giving the Speaker discretion to make sequential or split referrals allows more flexibility than the current requirement that every committee having any jurisdiction over a measure, no matter how minor, must receive a referral. And fourth, the ability of the Speaker to designate a secondary committee for sequential referral purposes upon the initial introduction of a measure will allow that committee to proceed with its work on the measure immediately, if it wishes.

Nothing in this rule should be construed to prevent a secondary committee from reporting prior to the primary committee. However, it is the intent of the rule to the extent

possible, to allow the primary committee to report before a measure is scheduled for floor consideration, unless it waives its right to report or the Speaker exercises discretion to impose a time limit on the primary committee for reporting and it fails to meet the deadline, in which case it will be considered to have been discharged of the measure.

Sec. 206. Accuracy of Committee Transcripts: Clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI ("Committee Records"), is amended to require that committee transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

The current rule requires committees to keep a complete record of all committee action, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. It is the intent of the new rule to require that where stenographic transcripts are kept of committee meetings or hearings, they not be subject to substantive changes by either the persons making the remarks or by staff.

It is not the intent of this rule that all meeting and hearing transcripts be published. However, in those instances in which persons involved in a meeting or hearing are allowed to review and correct their remarks before publication of the transcripts, any corrections must be specifically authorized by that person and cannot alter the substantive content of the remarks. To the extent a person making remarks wishes to elaborate on any point, such substantive modifications should be treated the same as extensions of remarks on House floor speeches, i.e., they should be clearly delineated from remarks actually made by being printed in a typeface that is clearly distinguishable from verbatim remarks.

Sec. 207. Elimination of "Rolling Quorums": Clause 2(1)(2)(A) of rule XI is amended by striking the existing provision which establishes a presumption that a committee majority was actually present at the time a measure is reported if the records of the committee show that a majority of the committee responded on a rollcall vote on the question, and prohibits a point of order to lie in the House that a majority was not present unless the point of order was timely made in the House.

In so doing, the rule change restores the previous requirement that a "majority of the committee was actually present" at the time a measure was ordered reported. The fact that a committee orders a measure reported by voice vote without a quorum present, and no point of order is made at the time, does not prevent the point of order from being made in the House when the measure is called-up for consideration.

It should also be emphasized that the requirement that a majority be actually present at the time the measure is reported from a committee means that a majority must be contemporaneously assembled at the time the vote is taken. Unlike a House floor vote during which Members may come and go during the course of a vote, the committee quorum rule, absent the old "rolling quorum" latitude, means a committee can no longer simply leave a vote open until a sufficient number of Members have responded to their names. Prior to the "rolling quorum" rule, the Committee on Rules has decided against granting a rule when presented with evidence that a majority was not actually present when the measure was reported.

Sec. 208. Limitation on Committees' Sittings: Clause 2(i) of rule XI, which currently prohibits committees from sitting during a joint, House-Senate session or meeting, would be amended to prohibit any committees except the committees on Appropriations, Budget, Rules, Standards of Official Conduct, and Ways and Means, from sitting while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule. Special leave to sit could be granted unless ten or more members object to a unanimous consent request, or upon the adoption by the House of a motion offered by the majority leader. This restores the rule in existence prior to the 103d Congress, with the only exception being the addition of a privileged motion by the majority leader. It is anticipated that the Speaker will again promulgate guidelines as to when and under what circumstances special leave may be requested.

Sec. 209. Accountability for Committee Votes: Clause 2(1)(2)(B) of rule XI, which now requires that the results of any rollcall vote to report a measure be included in a committee report, would be amended to require that the names of those members voting for and against any amendment or motion to report a measure by rollcall vote be included in the committee report.

It is the intent of this rule to provide for greater accountability for record votes in committees and to make such votes easily available to the public in committee reports. At present, under clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI, the public can only inspect rollcall votes on matters in the offices of committees. It is anticipated that with the availability of committee reports to the public through electronic form the listing of votes in reports will be more bill-specific than earlier proposals to publish all votes in the Congressional Record twice a year.

Sec. 210. Affirming the Minority's Right on Motions to Recommit: Clause 4(b) of rule XI, which, among other things, prohibits the Committee on Rules from denying a motion to recommit as provided in clause 4 of rule XVI, would be amended to clarify and ensure that such right includes the right to offer amendatory instructions, otherwise in order under the rules, in a motion to recommit, if offered by the minority leader or a designee.

Exempted from this guarantee would be the motion to recommit a Senate bill or resolution for which the text of a House-passed measure has been substituted. This exemption recognizes that the minority would already have had the opportunity to offer a motion to recommit with instructions on the original House-passed measure being substituted for the Senate measure.

It is the intent of this rule to restore the original purpose of clause 4(b) when it was adopted in 1909 to give the minority a final opportunity to offer an amendment of its choosing in a motion to recommit prior to the final passage of a bill.

Sec. 211. Waiver Policy for Special Rules: Clause 4 of rule XI, relating to the Rules Committee, is amended by adding a new paragraph (e) at the end to require that whenever the Rules Committee reports a resolution providing for the consideration of a measure, it shall, to the maximum extent possible, specify in the resolution any House rules being waived against the measure or against its consideration.

It is the intent of this rule that Members be fully informed as to what potential violations of House Rules are involved in considering a bill. This in turn will require committee chairmen to determine in advance of

their Rules Committee appearance what waivers they will seek, and to be prepared to explain and defend those waivers before the Rules Committee. It is the ultimate intent of the rule change that Committee will be more careful prior to reporting a measure to ensure against any rules violations in the bill or report.

While the failure of the Rules Committee to specify waivers in a rule would not give rise to a point of order against a special rule that waives all points of order, it is expected that the Rules Committee will, in all but the most time-sensitive situations, endeavor to determine what specific waivers are required and to detail them in the rule.

Sec. 212. Prohibition on Delegate Voting in Committee of the Whole: Subsection (a) amends rule XII ("Resident Commissioner and Delegates") by striking clause 2 which now entitles the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and each Delegate to the House to the same powers and privileges in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union as other House Members.

Subsection (b) amends clause 1 of rule XXIII ("Of Committees of the Whole House") by striking "Resident Commissioner, or Delegate" as being eligible for appointment by the Speaker to chair the Committee of the Whole.

Subsection (c) amends clause 2 of rule XXIII by striking paragraph (d) which provided for an immediate re-vote in the House whenever the votes of the Resident Commissioner and Delegates were decisive to the outcome of a vote in the Committee of the Whole.

Sec. 213. Accuracy of the Congressional Record: Rule XIV ("Of Decorum and Debate") is amended by adding a new clause 9 requiring that the Congressional Record be a substantially verbatim account of remarks made during debate. Members could only authorize technical, grammatical and typographical corrections. Unparliamentary remarks could only be deleted by permission or order of the House. However, Members may still insert undelivered remarks so long as they are delineated by a different typeface. Breaches of the rule could be subject to investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Sec. 214. Automatic Rollcall Votes: Rule XV ("On Calls of the Roll and House") is amended by adding a new clause 7 to require an automatic rollcall vote on the final passage or adoption of any bill, joint resolution, or conference report, making general appropriations, increasing Federal income tax rates, or on final adoption of a budget resolution or a conference report thereon.

Sec. 215. Appropriations Reforms: Subsection (a) amends clause 2(d) of rule XXI ("On Bills") by providing that motions to rise and report an appropriations bill after the bill has been read for amendment shall only have precedence if offered by the majority leader or a designee. Under current rules, so-called limitation amendments not specifically contained or authorized in existing law, may only be offered if the motion to rise is not offered or is rejected after other amendments to the bill have been disposed of. The intent of the new rule is to permit the offering of limitation amendments at the end of the reading, subject only to a motion to rise offered by the majority leader or a designee.

Subsection (b) adds a new paragraph (e) to clause 2 of rule XXI to prohibit reporting any non-emergency matter in an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation under the Budget Act. The only exceptions are for provisions which rescind budget

authority, reduce direct spending authority, or reduce the amount for a designated emergency. While the Committee on Appropriations could evade this prohibition by giving an entire bill an emergency designation, it is the clear intent of this rule that no non-emergency items should be given such blanket coverage. Let exposed, as they should be, such non-emergency items would be subject to deletion if a point of order is made and sustained.

It is not the intent of this rule to make in order any amendments not otherwise in order under the rules. Thus, any amendments to rescind or reduce direct spending must be germane to the bill as reported or be given special protection by way of a special rule reported by the Rules Committee and adopted by the House.

Subsection (c) amends clause 2 of rule XXI by adding a new paragraph (f) to permit the offering of so-called offsetting amendments in appropriations bill. At present, appropriations measures are read for amendment by paragraph, meaning it is not possible to offer an amendment that is deficit neutral if it goes to paragraphs not yet pending. The new rule would allow the offering of such offsetting amendments en bloc and not subject to a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

When such an en bloc amendment is offered, and prior to the debate on it, the chair will ask whether there are any points of order against any portion of the bill covered by the amendment. If such a point of order is sustained, and the provision in the bill stricken, the amendment would no longer be in order as a proper offset.

To qualify as an offsetting amendment for purposes of this paragraph, the proponent must be able to demonstrate that the net effect of the amendment would not increase overall budget authority or outlays in the bill. Since appropriations bills only contain the amount of budget authority being appropriated, it should be kept in mind that the off-setting numbers may not be the same since the ultimate test is whether the amendment does not increase the deficit—and deficits are determined by outlays in a fiscal year, not by the amount of budget authority appropriated for a particular matter. It will therefore be necessary for the author of an offsetting amendment to work closely with the Congressional Budget Office to ensure that the bottom line amendment makes equivalent increases and decreases in outlays resulting from the changes in budget authority.

Subsection (d) amends clause 3 of rule XXI to require that the Committee on Appropriations include in its report a list of all appropriations contained in a bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law (except for classified intelligence or national security programs, projects or activities). Clause 3 already requires that committee reports include a listing of legislative provisions contained in the bill. Since the point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI lies against both unauthorized and legislative provisions, it is only reasonable that the report should contain information on both. It is the intent of this rule that the test of compliance will be whether the committee has made a good faith effort to include all unauthorized matters in its report that it is aware of. The inadvertent omission of an unauthorized matter in a committee report will not give rise to a point of order against the consideration of the bill, though a point of order would still lie against the provision in the bill.

Subsection (e) adds a new clause 8 to rule XXI to provide for the automatic reservation

of points of order against provisions in an appropriations bill at the time the report on it is filed. Under current rules, the points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI are against the reporting of any unauthorized or legislative provision in an appropriations bill. This means that, for a point of order to be valid, it must be raised or reserved at the time the measure is actually reported, that is, at the time the report is filed in the House. This has required that a minority representative of the committee accompany the majority member filing the report in order to reserve points of order at the time the report is filed. Under the new rule, it will no longer be necessary to reserve points of order at the time an appropriations bill is filed. Members' rights to later raise such points of order will automatically be protected.

Sec. 216. Ban on Commemoratives: Subsection (a) amends clause 2 of rule XXII ("Of Memorial, Bills and Resolutions") by prohibiting the introduction or consideration of any bill, resolution, or amendment which establishes or expresses any commemoration. For purposes of the new rule, a commemoration is defined as "any remembrance, celebration, or recognition for any purpose through the designation of a specified period of time."

The existing clause 2, which would be retained as paragraph (a), includes a similar prohibition against the receipt or consideration by the House of private bills, resolutions or amendments authorizing or directing the payment of money for certain property damages or for personal injury or death for which suit may be instituted under the Tort Claims procedure; for the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or for the correction of a military or naval record.

The new ban on date-specific commemorative measures or amendments applies to both the introduction and consideration of any measure containing such a commemorative. This is intended to include measures in which such a commemorative may only be incidental to the overall purpose of the measure. Such measures will be returned to the sponsor if they are dropped in the legislative hopper. The prohibition against consideration also extends to any measures received from the Senate which contain date-specific commemorative. While it does not block their receipt from the other body, it is intended that such measures would not be referred to the appropriate committee of the House or be considered by the House. Instead, they would simply be held at the desk without further action. Should such a commemorative be included in a conference report or Senate amendment to a House bill, the entire conference report or Senate amendment would be subject to a point of order.

While the ban does not apply to commemorative which do not set aside a specified period of time, and instead simply call for some form of national recognition, it is not the intent of the rule that such alternative forms should become a new outlet for the consideration of such measures. Thus, while they could be referred to an appropriate committee, it is not expected that such committees should feel obligated or pressured to establish special rules for their release to the House floor. Nor should it be expected that the Rule Committee should become the new avenue for regular waivers of the rule against date specific commemorative. Such exceptions should be limited to those rare situations warranting special national recognition as determined by the Leadership.

Subsection (b) is a free-standing directive to the Committee on Government Reform

and Oversight to consider alternative means for establishing commemorations, including the creation of an independent or Executive branch commission for such purpose, and to report to the House its recommendations thereon.

Sec. 217. Numerical Designation of Amendments: Clause 6 of rule XXIII ("Of Committees of the Whole") is amended to add a new sentence requiring that amendments submitted for printing in the amendments portion of the Congressional Record be given a numerical designation in the sequence submitted for a particular bill.

The clause already requires that amendments printed in the Record be allowed five minutes of debate for and against, even if the Committee of the Whole has voted to close debate on a particular section or paragraph, and that time has expired. It is the purpose of this further amendment to the rule to facilitate reference to such amendments for the convenience of Members and committee managers alike, and to encourage Members to utilize the pre-printing option for their amendments.

The new rule may also make it possible for the Committee on Rules to reference numerically designated amendments in special rules that structure the amendment process since the Congressional Record is often more readily available to Members and their staff than are Rules Committee reports.

Sec. 218. Pledge of Allegiance: Clause 1 of rule XXIV ("Order of Business") is amended to insert the Pledge of Allegiance as the third order of business each day in the House, following the approval of the Journal and preceding the correction of reference of public bills. This change codifies a practice in effect in the House since 1988.

Sec. 219. Discharge Petitions: Clause 3 of rule XXVII ("Change or Suspension of the Rules") is amended to require that the Clerk publish in the Congressional Record on the last day of House session each week the names of those Members who have signed a discharge motion during that week, and to make available on a daily basis, in an appropriate office, the cumulative lists of names of those Members who have signed pending discharge motions. Finally, the new rule directs the Clerk to devise a means for making such names on discharge petitions available to House offices and the public by electronic form.

In the 103d Congress, the House adopted a new rule making the names of Members signing discharge petitions immediately available for public inspection. However, the rule change did not specify how such publication was to be accomplished. This rule change codifies the current practice of daily availability of all motions and signatures in a House office, and the weekly publication of new signatures in the Congressional Record. The directive regarding making such lists available by computer is in line with other ongoing initiatives to make House documents generally available to the public through computer networks.

Sec. 220. Protection of Classified Materials: Rule XLIII ("Code of Official Conduct") would be amended by adding a new clause 13 requiring that any Member, officer or employee of the House take an oath or affirmation on non-disclosure of classified information prior to being given access to such materials. Copies of the executed oath would be retained by the Clerk of the House as part of the records of the House.

Sec. 221. Select Committee on Intelligence: Subsection (a) amends clause 1(a) of rule XLVIII ("Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence") to change the composition of the committee from 19 to 16 members, of whom not more than nine may be of the same political party.

Subsection (b) amends clause 1(b) of rule XLVIII, to substitute the Speaker for the majority leader as a non-voting ex officio member of the committee, along with the minority leader. The subsection also allows both the Speaker and minority leader to designate one of their leadership staff to assist them in their roles as ex officio members of the committee, with all the same rights, privileges, and requirements as if members of the select committee staff. The purpose of this clause is to allow designated leadership staff the same access to committee documents and materials, briefings, hearings, and meetings, without having to become committee staff members for such access. A conforming change is made by striking subparagraph (c)(3) of clause 7 which permits the Speaker to attend any select committee meeting and have access to any committee information.

Subsection (c) amends clause 1 of rule XLVIII to extend from three (in any five consecutive Congresses) to four (in any six consecutive Congresses) the number of consecutive Congresses any Member (other than the Speaker and minority leader) may serve on the select committee, and to permit a chairman or ranking minority member who attain those positions in their fourth terms on the committee to serve in those positions for an additional term.

Subsection (d) amends clause 2(a) of rule XLVIII to clarify the committee's jurisdiction to reflect current referral practices.

Sec. 222. Abolition of Legislative Service Organizations: This is a free-standing provision that prohibits in the 104th Congress the establishment or continuation of any legislative service organization (as the term is defined and authorized in the 103rd Congress). The Committee on House Oversight is authorized to take necessary steps to ensure the orderly termination and accounting for funds of any such LSO in existence on January 3, 1995. So-called LSO's are those organizations recognized through the House Administration Committee in the 103rd Congress which are allowed to utilize Member Clerk hire funds for the staffing of such special purpose organizations. It is the intent of this rule that the Committee on House Oversight will oversee the shut-down of such organizations in a manner to ensure the maximum accountability possible for any funds allocated for their operation. This is especially important in view of the comprehensive audit required by section 107 of the resolution.

Sec. 223. Miscellaneous Provisions and Clerical Corrections: Subsection (a) amends clause 5(b)(1) of rule I ("Duties of the Speaker") to expand the Speaker's current authority to postpone votes on certain matters for up to two legislative days to include the previous question votes on adopting a resolution, passing a bill, instructing conferees, or agreeing to a conference report. At present, the only previous question vote the Speaker may postpone is on a privileged resolution from the Rules Committee.

Subsection (b) establishes an Office for Legislative Floor Activities in the Office of the Speaker, and authorizes the Speaker to appoint and set the pay for floor assistants to assist him in managing legislative floor activity.

Subsection (c) amends clause 2(d) of rule XI by allowing the chairman of a committee to designate any member of the committee,

or of any subcommittee thereof, as vice chairman, to preside in the chairman's absence. The present rule specifies that the ranking majority member shall serve as vice chairman.

Subsection (d) amends clause 7 of rule XIV ("Of Decorum and Debate") to include in those provisions of prohibited activities on the House floor the use of personal, electronic office equipment, including cellular phones and computers. It is the purpose of this new rule to avoid the disruptions and distractions that can be caused by the sounds emitted from such equipment. As with any disruption to the decorum of House floor debate, it is anticipated that the Speaker could instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to take necessary steps to restore order.

Subsection (e) amends clause 5(b) of rule XV ("On Calls of the Roll and House") to permit the Speaker to reduce to five-minutes the vote that occurs following the vote on the previous question on any matter. The present rule confines this authority to the vote following the previous question vote only on a special rule from the Rules Committee.

Subsection (f) makes clerical corrections in clause 3 of rule III, "Duties of the Clerk" by inserting "and" prior to the last in a series of clauses; and in clause 2(1)(1)(B) of rule XI by striking a reference to subdivision (C) that had been previously repealed.

Subsection (g) is a free-standing provision that permits more than one prime sponsor on the first 20 bills and the first three joint resolutions introduced in the House in the 104th Congress. This is done to permit the Leadership to designate multiple-authors of certain priority legislation.

□ 1700

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I support many of the important rules changes being presented here today. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems strange to me that the first opportunity that the Republicans get, they start doing what they have complained about for years. They claim to be willing to open up this body's proceedings, but the first day's business is being conducted under closed rules. That means that any Democratic ideas, regardless of merit, will not even see the light of day. We will start this Congress with business as usual and a gag on the voice of Democrats. This is not the way to start the 104th Congress. The Republican resort to closed rules is as unbelievable as their last-minute defeat of lobby reform and the gift ban last year.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Saying that this is open debate just don't make it so."

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY].

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the new Members of this body the voters elected to change the way Washington works. Many of us campaigned on the issue of reform. I want to say to other new Members, "Don't get cold feet now. We're considering a lot of reforms here today, and I support many of them, but let's be honest.

These reforms don't go nearly far enough. They don't begin to address the real concerns of the American people."

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not angry at Washington because there are too many proxy votings in Congress. They are angry because there are too many lobbyists, too many lawyers and too many special interests with too much influence. They are angry because they see Members taking money and gifts from well-connected insiders and, in some cases, trying to use their offices to amass personal wealth.

This is supposed to be the day when we address the rules Members live by, yet in the entire Republican rules package we are considering today there is not a single amendment that addresses any of these issues. I would suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

"If you really care about changing the way Washington works—"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY] has expired.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 additional seconds to the gentleman from Missouri.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Are we not supposed to yield time in no less than 30-second increments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has control of the time.

Mr. BONIOR. Is that in the package that the gentleman is offering?

Mr. SOLOMON. No, but I will be glad to put it in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY] may now proceed for 15 additional seconds.

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

If you really care about changing the way Washington works, if you really want to show that the House of Representatives is not for sale, I urge you to say no to gifts, say no to personal gain in the people's House, and support the gift ban.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be voting to change the way the House operates in several ways, but it is not enough. Later, we will also be considering a bill to bring the Congress into compliance with many private sector laws that apply to the rest of the country.

Last Congress, Mr. Speaker, many of my Republican colleagues pointed to

the closed rules as an example of the tyranny of the majority. It is, therefore, disappointing that the Congressional Accountability Act, the first bill to be considered by this Congress, will be offered under a closed rule. Open rules allow the minority the opportunity to amend legislation and to allow all points of view to be heard. I was led to believe that the House will be operating under a more open system. Today, Mr. Speaker, it is not open.

Despite my disagreement with the rule on the bill, I intend to support the Congressional Accountability Act. This bill is no stranger to those of us who are Democrats because we offered it last year, and it passed last year before this 100-day blitzkrieg that we are going through. I believe extending employee protections is an important and meaningful step for Congress, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will extend that to all workers in the future.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for yielding this time to me, and I want to say many times I have voted against my side and voted for open rules, and how disappointed I am today to find out that we not only have a gag rule, but we have a choke rule because this side has been totally choked off from offering any kind of amendment or any kind of addition to the reforms. As I look at this reform package, I got to say it is reform-light.

□ 1710

Now, you know, there are some things in there, sure, they are easy, reform them. But the real thing I find people are angry about is the fact that this body operates like a coin operated legislative machine. They are real tired of the guys who have the most coins to put in being the only one to get the legislation out. We dealt with that last year. We passed a bill by 311 votes. We are trying very hard to get that in here.

We also do not deal with many of the other abuses that have gone on in this place. We already last year put everybody under the laws we pass for everyone else. So let us not put ourselves too hard on the back by doing that again, and let us move on to many other reforms we should be dealing with.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard all day that this is an historic day. For me and for the four other delegates, it is historic as well. Two years ago, for the first time ever, our names were added

to the official roster of this House. Today, the rules propose to erase those names.

The courts would not erase them. The courts said that the House could empower the Delegates. The courts said that Members could constitutionally democratize their own House. If the erasures occur, it will be by our own hand and by our own rules.

Oh, that is a bittersweet thing for the Delegates, especially for this Delegate, who represents 600,000 taxpaying citizens.

In 1993 I wrote a legal memorandum that erased for the first time in 200 years part of their plight—paying Federal taxes while having no representation on this floor. Today we are told, forget that. Go back to where you started.

Well, we cannot go back, Mr. Speaker. I ask my colleagues to take a leap of imagination with me and put yourself in my place. Suppose your constituents paid \$1.6 billion annually to the Treasury of the United States. Suppose your constituents were third per capita in Federal taxes in the United States of America. Suppose your constituents paid more taxes than each of six states.

How would you feel when you watched other Members vote on your taxes, and I mean local taxes, my friends, vote on your laws, and I mean local laws, my friends, because our local business comes before this House.

The vote to be erased means nothing to this body, but it means everything to the taxpaying citizens I represent. After all, a re-vote will be taken if delegate votes are determinative. You claim that you will democratize this House, and in some measure you will, but not in this measure.

I suspect that the denial today is not an act of meanness, but an act rooted in the partisanship of the past, rather than in the events in which you take such pride today. For you, this was a plot of the Democratic leadership. Forget that, my friends. It was my plot, my memo, my taxpayers.

My Republican friends, I say to you today that there is no need to return to the partisanship of the past now. You have won. Leave it be. Let it rest. Be as gracious in victory as you have been tenacious in earning that victory. Restore the vote to those who live in the houses, in the neighborhoods, and in the city of the great House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, editorial opinion from one end of the political spectrum to the other has been unanimous in support of my right to vote. I submit these editorials for printing in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Dec. 6, 1994]

#### TAXATION, REPRESENTATION AND THE DISTRICT

Two years ago, Republicans picked up 10 seats in the House of Representatives, despite the Democratic victory at the top of

the ticket. Not long thereafter, D.C. House Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton, who had no voting rights in the House, floated a proposal whereby she would be able to participate in all House votes taken in committee, including the committee of the whole, in which most of the House's important work is done, short of final passage of legislation. Soon, however, the four non-voting territorial delegates to the House—one each from Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands and American Samoa—got themselves included in the proposal as well. All five are Democrats, as it happens. And Republicans, with some justification, screamed bloody murder, accusing the Democrats of trying to regain the Democratic majority's rule-making powers half of what Democrats had lost at the polls.

The delegate-voting proposal was subsequently modified such that in votes by which legislation is sent to the floor of the House from the committee of the whole by less than a five-vote margin, another vote must be held without the participation of the five delegates. Republicans nevertheless sued, but federal courts ruled, correctly, that the House itself is constitutionally empowered to propagate such a rule for delegate voting.

Well, now there's a new congressional majority: Republican. So what to do about delegate voting? No doubt there will be substantial GOP sentiment for simply undoing what many regard as a blatant partisan powergrab. The matter is worth second thoughts, however.

Republicans take note, for this is an argument that ought to be dear to GOP hearts: There is a major difference between the situation of the District and that of the four territories. It can be summed up in one figure: \$1.6 billion. That is the total amount of federal income taxes paid each year by residents of the District of Columbia. It compares with \$0 from the four territories. And it is near the very top compared with congressional districts nationwide.

District residents deserve some consideration in exchange. Mrs. Norton's retention of her limited voting powers—which, by the way, hardly constitute "representation" commensurate with taxation—are worthy of serious discussion. And let's also begin the discussion about whether justice wouldn't be better served by a District whose government receives no federal payment—but whose residents are not taxed by the federal government, either.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 19, 1994]

#### THE THREAT TO D.C.'S HOUSE VOTE

Among the galaxy of rule changes expected in a Republican House of Representatives next January, one provision deserves to remain on the books. A House rule adopted early in the current Congress—unanimously opposed by House Republicans—allows D.C. Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton and representatives from four U.S. territories to vote in the House Committee of the Whole, where the bulk of the House's floor business is conducted. But now the House's new leadership says it will revoke the five delegates' limited voting rights. Mrs. Norton has vowed to fight the effort to take away her vote. She deserves to prevail.

The voting arrangement, which was Mrs. Norton's idea, was crafted to ensure the House stayed within constitutional bounds. Under the new rules and in accordance with the Constitution, the delegates do not enjoy full voting privileges. But consistent with the combination of limited powers they already have to introduce legislation, serve

and vote on standing committees and debate on the House floor, the House agreed to allow Mrs. Norton and her four colleagues to participate in one more committee—the Committee of the Whole.

To ensure the prerogatives of the House were not weakened, the House adopted a fail-safe device: a member can require that any Committee of the Whole-passed measure must be voted on a second time in the full House, where Mrs. Norton and the other delegates can't vote. So the arrangement is beyond legal or constitutional attack. That isn't only the judgment of the House. A U.S. district judge for the D.C. circuit also accepted the merits of the argument, as did the U.S. Court of Appeals.

There are, however, other compelling reasons for the House to leave the District's voting privileges intact. There is the matter of fairness. Unlike the inhabitants of the U.S. territories, District residents pay Federal income taxes, and on a large scale. The District ranks third per capita in taxes paid to Uncle Sam. Yet when matters critical to the District (which means every piece of legislation passed by the mayor and council) are before the full House, Mrs. Norton must stand by voteless as members from around the Nation register their will.

The voting arrangement, while severely limited in scope, does give Mrs. Norton the chance to register the will of more than 600,000 taxpaying Americans in House debate as she now does in her committee assignments. For victorious House Republicans, in their first exercise of power in 40 years, to take away Mrs. Norton's voting privileges is wrong.

[From the Roll Call, Dec. 22, 1994]

#### SAVE NORTON'S VOTE

Our first plea to the new GOP majority is likely to fall on deaf ears, but we'll make it anyway: Save DC Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton's vote on the floor. Unlike the other four Delegates who represent US territories in the House, Norton represents federal taxpayers, who pay in \$1.6 billion every year to the US treasury but now face the loss of even their symbolic vote in the House's Committee of the Whole.

Republicans have hated the Delegate voting rights since Democrats first granted them two years ago, and when the 104th opens on Jan. 4, they are fully prepared to take them away. But as Capitol Hill's only twice-weekly newspaper, we'd be crazy to agree. "No taxation without representation" still strikes a chord with us.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 31, 1994]

#### MORE COLONIALISM IN D.C.

Imagine your outrage if the state where you live were suddenly stripped of representation in Congress, even as that very same Congress dictated how local tax dollars were spent and ran local policy—right down to garbage collection.

The taxpayers of Washington D.C. don't need to imagine. Taxation without representation is an insult they live with every day. The incoming Republican Congress wants to add to this indignity by revoking the District's largely symbolic vote in the House of Representatives' Committee of the Whole. That is a colonist idea. Washingtonians and their Congressional Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton, are right to be fuming.

With a population of nearly 600,000, the District of Columbia has more people than Vermont, Wyoming or Alaska. But it does not have a voting representative in Congress.

Although District taxpayers contribute \$1.6 billion yearly to the Federal Treasury—more Federal taxes per capita than in all but two of the 50 states—Washingtonians must beg to use even their local taxes as they see fit. Congressmen from all over the country meddle in how locally raised taxes are spent.

Two years ago, House Democrats awarded symbolic floor votes to four previously non-voting delegates—from the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa—as well as to the resident commissioner from Puerto Rico. That arrangement allows delegates to vote when the House meets as a "committee of the whole," which is where it does most of its legislating. But in cases where the delegates' votes made the crucial difference in a close ballot, another vote would be taken without the delegates.

The incoming Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, would now strip the four delegates and the commissioner of any vote at all. The Republicans were right to resent the Democrats' transparent effort to add to their majorities, as well as the wasted time involved in having to repeat close votes. But surely Mr. Gingrich can see the difference between the District of Columbia and the territories. The District pays Federal taxes by the truckload; the territories contribute nothing.

The incoming Congress swept to victory by touting a new federalism, promising to make government work for Americans, not against them. Mr. Gingrich also promised to make the House more democratic. A truly democratic Congress can hardly justify denying the District one small voice in the body that controls its every move.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, to respond to the gentlewoman from Colorado, I yield 2 minutes to no one better than the majority whip, the gentleman from Sugar Land, TX, Mr. DELAY.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very interesting process we are going through. Just as we have had to learn to be the majority, I think the minority needs to learn to be the minority. The gentlewoman from Colorado is talking about we have gag rules and choke rules, and the gentlewoman from Missouri said we are not going far enough in reform. I need to remind the minority that they have had 40 years to do this, 40 years to do these kinds of reforms, and they chose not to do any of these.

I also should remind the minority when they were in the majority in just the last Congress, they did not put the gift ban nor lobbying reform in their rules of the House. They went through the normal legislative process, just as we want to go through the normal legislative process on a legislative package like the lobbying reform package. We do not want it in the rules.

But all that aside, when we were in the minority and you were in the majority, the first thing we would do would be to come to you with amendments to ask you to allow us to put the amendments in your packages. We received an 18-page amendment on your motion to commit about 2 minutes before we voted on it.

So if you will come to us and make your proposals to us, then maybe we

will accept them. But to just come and bring proposals to the floor without even checking with the majority is not going to get you very far.

Over 60 years ago, this House embarked on a legislative journey that became known as the New Deal. Today this House is beginning another journey. We are in the majority, you are in the minority. I hope that we can work together. I hope you will bring us your ideas, and maybe we can include them in the package. But do not just come up here and throw something out on the floor and expect us to accept them out of hand.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], whom I like very much and respect, he complained about the amount of time that we did not provide for him and his colleagues on the motion to recommit. I might suggest to him that we will be offering the same ban on gifts to lobbyists as well as the book royalty issue on the next motion to recommit, which will be down the road in about 5 hours. It is about 20 pages, and it should be sufficient time for you to digest it, understand it, and maybe you will accept it. So we hope you will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that while the American people were promised an opening day of sweeping reform and openness in Congress, they instead see the use of restrictive rules to prohibit Democrats from offering amendments to the new so-called reforms.

If today were truly the end of business as usual in Washington, we would be reading headlines about new progress in the fight to help Americans find and keep good jobs to provide for their families, not about \$4 million book deals.

Americans voted to make sure that Congress was not for sale. They voted against arrogance, the arrogance of cashing in on public office, of using the majority to require supermajority votes on certain issues, and for open rules that create the open debate we heard promised today in such glowing terms.

We have been denied the chance to make real news here today. I voted for the Democratic motion, which will be offered again. I hope it will be accepted by the Republicans this time to revise the rules to include a ban on gifts from lobbyists and a limit on the income which Members may receive from the royalties on book sales. That was the opportunity for real change. Republicans blocked them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York

[Mr. SOLOMON] has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has the right to close.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a reform we did make. Two-and-a-half years ago in the wake of the problems in the bank and the post office, I served as a member of a bipartisan task force which drafted House Resolution 423, an unprecedented effort to totally eliminate politics and patronage from the administration of the House support operations. I am saddened that on this day of reform, the new majority proposes a change to go back from professional management and businesslike personnel policies to the discredited patronage system.

□ 1720

However, that is what they are proposing and they have already started to implement it.

Let me remind Members of what we have accomplished. We have created a Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, with a mandate to sweep the House clean of waste and fraud and inefficiency. We have provided that both the majority and minority parties must agree on the selection of the director, so that only skill mattered, not politics.

Today we turn back from that in very short time, and we have already started with a totally partisan person to administer the House.

We had an inspector general who was going to report to a bipartisan subcommittee. That is all gone, so there is no more oversight in a bipartisan way of the things that happen in this House.

Mr. Speaker, 2½ years ago in the wake of the Sergeant-at-Arms Bank and the Post Office affairs, I served as a member of the bipartisan task force which drafted House Resolution 423, an unprecedented effort to totally eliminate politics and patronage from the administration of House support operations.

I am shocked and saddened that on this day of reform, that the new majority would propose in this package of rules changes to move back from professional management and businesslike personnel policies to the discredited patronage system. Yet that's what they are proposing and have already begun to implement.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind you what we had accomplished.

We created a Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services with the mandate to sweep the House clean of waste, fraud, and inefficiency. We provided that both the majority and minority parties must agree on the selection of the Director to ensure that only relevant experience and skills would

count, not the politics of those who applied.

Today the new majority proposes to turn the clock back to an era of one-party partisan control over everything in the House from the payroll clerks to the telephone operators.

And our reform did not stop there. We created an independent Office of Inspector General to be directed and reported to a new bipartisan Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight with equal representation from each party.

Today the new majority kills that bipartisan subcommittee and returns to a partisan oversight committee.

Is this reform?

Why is the new majority rolling back the bold and totally bipartisan approach to managing House support services? One can only speculate that they were only giving lip service to bipartisan professionalism. Now that they are in power, they are abandoning professionalism and grabbing for the spoils of victory.

I believe history will judge harshly those who eat their words from the past so easily without any sense of their hypocritical vote to return to the discredited spoils system.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rollback to the bad old days.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we begin work today, we have a clear understanding of our purpose for the next 100 days. We have the unique opportunity in this body to set partisan politics aside. The people have told us they want things done differently in the Congress.

They have given a new set of leaders a chance to make things happen, but they have also issued a firm warning to deliver and they are watching closely.

The rules package before us is an important first step in fulfilling our commitment to make this body accountable to those who sent us here. For example, applying the laws everyone else has to live under to Congress; an audit of the House books and reducing the number of committees and staff.

Our goals have been set, our agenda is clear, and now it is up to us to meet those goals and complete our agenda. These first 100 days are going to be hectic but with unity and bipartisanship, they can be historic as well.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if we believe in term limits on committee Chairs and limits on proxy voting, then we should vote for it. That is the majority way. That is the democratic way.

However, I draw the line when Members start to diminish the value of my

vote by requiring a 60-percent rule on anything. That is not the majority way. That is not democracy. That is not any way to treat a minority.

I would submit that it is un-American, it is unconstitutional, and the 60-percent rule by majority vote is un-American and unconstitutional. I ask you to vote against this idiocy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just caution the previous speaker about talking about things like un-American. The gentleman did vote for the Democrat rules package last year which required a two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Has the gentleman yielded himself time?

Mr. SOLOMON. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. I will stand out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York wish to yield time?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rules package before the House of Representatives, which is the fundamental first step toward restoring the accountability of this House to the American people.

To my colleagues who have recently participated in this debate on the other side, when the gentleman spoke of the diminishment, you begin to diminish your credible standing as a lady and gentleman in the House when you act as if you carry the mantle to an open process.

When I first came to this Congress 2 years ago, I was shocked to see the Congress being run as an undemocratic institution. The 103d Congress was a closed, mismanaged, undemocratic institution. The standing rules of the House were continually waived to avoid accountability.

Fortunately for the American people, that was yesterday. Today I am pleased that this House will adopt a provision that I have advocated requiring the committee chairmen to make every attempt to abide by the House rules and disclose provisions that do not meet those rules, therefore requiring a waiver by the Committee on Rules. By simply following the House rules, we will help bring much needed sunshine, accountability and fiscal responsibility to this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 2 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 1 minute and 15 seconds remaining.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has the right to close debate.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this morning 440 voting cards were issued.

Five did not work. I got one of those right here, courtesy of the new majority, which claims to be democratizing this body.

I rise in strong opposition to the new majority's rules that rescind the privilege of the Delegates voting in the Committee of the Whole. This is not an infringement of States' rights. The Delegate vote is purely symbolic. This is about the inclusion of 4 million American citizens who reside in the territories.

What the Republican majority of the Congress is saying to these American citizens is something that America would never say to the world. Would America tell Haiti, Eastern Europe, and Russia that in order to build a democracy, you first start by separating citizens based on tax status?

This country has broken down barriers of gender, race, poll taxes, in order to perfect the American ideal, and it is wrong to turn the clock back now.

By turning its back on the U.S. citizens on Guam and the other territories, Congress is sending a message that American citizenship is less important than the size of our wallets.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, some of the reforms we are voting today are good, and some I have problems with. The one I want to briefly focus on is the requirement that it will take a 60-percent vote to raise personal and corporate income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the current tax system in America is highly regressive. Tens of millions of working Americans and middle-income Americans are paying a higher percentage of their income in taxes than are millionaires. Corporations today in many instances that are very profitable, that are taking their jobs to the Third World, are not contributing their fair share in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we want a fair tax system, an equitable tax system, majority vote should rule in allowing the House of Representatives to raise taxes on the wealthy and on those corporations that are not paying their fair share of taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired for the minority.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 minute and 15 seconds.

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

Mr. Speaker, we want to expedite this as fast as we can. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out that coming next will be 20 minutes of debate on eight separate sections of title I of this bill. These are the significant changes in the rules over the rules that we have been operating under in the previous

Congress, which was the Democratic rules package.

Because these are significant changes, we have chosen to at least offer the opportunity to vote on each of the eight, and that is the debate that we will be starting on in just a few minutes.

I would just point out in closing that this is the most comprehensive, sweeping reform of this House that we have known in over 50 years. I would hope that the body would support the resolution, after we have finished debating the individual sections.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of the Rules Package for the 104th Congress. Last November, the American people sent a strong message that it was time for a change in the U.S. Congress. This important package is the first step toward that change. Implementation of the "Contract With America" will help to restore the people's trust in government. The American people want a Congress that is accountable for its actions, not one that hides behind the laws it passes. This resolution will provide for the most open Congress ever.

I believe it is important to show America that Congress can put its own house in order before dealing with the rest of the Nation's problems. This package will curb many of the abuses that occurred during the minority party's lengthy control of the House. During the campaign, each Republican candidate made a promise with the American people to change this institution. The Contract With America is about putting the people back in charge and not entrenched politicians.

This reform package contains 23 measures that will produce a more efficient and accountable U.S. House of Representatives. Committee staffs will be reduced by one-third, and in some cases obsolete committees will be abolished or merged into other committees. Additionally, the bill referral process has been revamped so that only one committee will now have primary jurisdiction over each piece of legislation. Term limits for committee chairman and the Speaker will also be imposed.

This package represents the most significant overhaul of the rules process since 1974. Virtually all committee business will now be accessible to the public and the media. The horrendous practice of proxy voting will end as will rolling quorums. Additionally, Members will be limited in the number of committees they may serve on, and all committee votes will become public record.

In addition to House procedure, this resolution is taxpayer friendly. Under this package, any income tax increase must now be approved by a three-fifths majority of the House of Representatives. The provisions relating to baseline budgeting and limiting tax increases will help to enforce fiscal discipline in the Congress.

After four decades of one party control, the American people have finally had enough. The American people deserve an open legislative process. Most people would agree that the Federal Government is too big and spends too much. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have long believed that big government is the answer. I do not. This rules package is

the first step in an effort to make government more efficient and more accountable.

The Contract With America will put an end to the tax and spend Congress of the last 40 years. The contract offers the American people an opportunity to restore the American dream that was lost. Most importantly, this package will rekindle the trust between the people and their elected representatives. I urge my colleagues to support the rules package.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the provision requiring a supermajority for certain tax increases. This provision is unconstitutional, sets a dangerous precedent and clearly demonstrates the Republican's intent to protect upper-income Americans at the expense of low- and middle-income families.

The "limitation on tax increases" provision would institute, for the first time in the history of Congress, a rule requiring a supermajority vote for the simple passage of legislation. Such a rule, however, runs contrary to the fundamental democratic principle of majority rule. The Constitution clearly specifies the exceptional cases in which a supermajority is required. Greater majorities can also be required for procedural motions, like curtailing debate or suspending the rules. Otherwise a simple majority is the requirement of the Constitution.

Although the Constitution does give the House the power to set its own rules, the courts have long made it clear that this does not mean the House has the authority to change the basic framework of the Constitution.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, requiring a supermajority vote on taxes sets a dangerous precedent that could be used to create similar requirements for other controversial issues. If Republicans can require a supermajority for tax increases, future rules changes would require a supermajority for such issues as increasing spending on defense.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the "Contract With America" which outlined the 10 legislative initiatives that the Republican candidates promised to introduce if they gained a majority in the House, included a provision to require a three-fifths majority in the House for approval of any tax increase. Now that Republicans are in the majority they have reneged on their contract and changed this provision to apply only to increases in the most progressive of taxes, income and corporate taxes. Increases in more regressive taxes such as payroll taxes and excise taxes, which hurt low- and middle-income Americans the most, could still be approved by a simple majority.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that during the 1980s, the Republican administrations followed a similar legislative agenda to the current Republican Contract of cutting taxes for the wealthy, increasing defense spending and trying to balance the budget. However, the deficit exploded as a result of these policies. Trying to recover some of the lost revenues, the Republican administrations increased these kinds of regressive taxes which continue to hurt middle-income Americans today.

By making the most equitable and progressive taxes subject to a supermajority vote, while allowing more regressive taxes, such as excise taxes, to be approved through simple

majority, the Republicans are creating rigid new fiscal policy and clearly indicating their intent to repeat the past of protecting wealthy Americans at the expense of working families.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of majority rule is the very essence of American democracy and must be protected by Members of Congress, not sacrificed for political purposes. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to vote against the supermajority provision which violates this essential principle.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the elimination of legislative service organizations [LSO's] in the House of Representatives.

As a member of several invaluable legislative service organizations [LSO's], I know firsthand the important role they have played in analyzing and promoting legislation to assist Members working together on common interests and in pursuit of common goals. In the case of the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] and the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, LSO's have enabled Americans who are significantly underrepresented in Congress to have a more united and more effective voice in the legislative process.

The impact of the Congressional Black Caucus has been dramatic as the CBC has sought to promote an agenda of equity and fairness for African-Americans across the country. The CBC was instrumental in passage of the Civil Rights Act, promoting sanctions against South Africa, leading the fight for disadvantaged business opportunities, expanding the earned income tax credit in the President's 1993 budget, pushing for more positive, preventative activities for youth in the crime bill, et cetera. Without the CBC, it is questionable whether such significant legislative strides could have been made so effectively.

The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues has had equally remarkable successes as a result of working together to further legislative goals of importance to women and families across the country. Historic changes have occurred as a result of the work of this important bipartisan LSO. Medical research practices at the National Institutes of Health were changed to better assist women, Federal contracting opportunities for women-owned businesses were improved, funding for fighting crimes against women and domestic violence was approved, the Safe Access to Clinic Entrances Act was passed, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating LSO's will hurt the many Americans who can't afford their own high-paid lobbyist to argue their cause. The Congressional Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, and the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, to name a few, all represent groups of Americans who are vastly underrepresented in the U.S. Congress. In our democratic Nation, all Americans deserve a voice in Congress and with the elimination of these valuable LSO's I am concerned that their voices will no longer be heard. And this, Mr. Speaker, is a reform which we simply cannot afford.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on this momentous occasion to speak to this House and the American people about the events that have unfolded since the historic November 8 election, and to celebrate the re-

forms we will enact today. What a difference a day makes.

As a Republican, my entire service as a Member of Congress has been in a House controlled by Democrats. In this time I have watched as House proceedings became more and more partisan, and decisions which could effect every American became more secretive and exclusive. I watched the number of committee staff nearly triple while the committees became dominated by special interests and unable to respond to public desires. Republican efforts to reform the system, open up the deliberation process, and clean up the sloppy internal management and corruption were met each time by Democratic arrogance and obstinacy.

On November 8, an overwhelming majority of Americans throughout our Nation rallied behind principles included in a Republican Contract with America, and demanded that reforms making Congress more accountable and effective be implemented. In the wake of that election day, the American people sent a new majority to Washington, a Republican majority, to answer that demand. I rise today to tell the American people we have heard your call. As we promised in our contract, today we begin to deliver.

While many of the provisions in today's reform package are changes Republicans have been promoting for decades, much of our proposal is the product of several weeks of hard work which began immediately after the election. In fact, the Republican Transition Team, on which I was proud to have served, began work almost immediately on changes to the structure and operations of the House. Under the Republican Open House proposal which we released in December, and is included in this package, major changes in the House's administrative operations will be adopted today. These include broadening the powers and staff of the House inspector general, and providing him authority to refer any possible violations to the House Ethics Committee, abolishing the Office of the Doorkeeper which is loaded with hundreds of patronage employees; and ensuring congressional compliance with Federal laws. A major accounting firm will also be hired to conduct a comprehensive audit of the House's finances which will be made public upon completion.

Requiring that Congress complies with the same Federal laws and regulations that apply to the private workplace has long been a goal of mine. In fact, last Congress I was an original cosponsor of legislation, the Congressional Accountability Act, identical to that included in today's resolution. The House passed a version of this act near the end of the 103d Congress, but the measure died because the other body failed to consider it.

Passage of this act underscores that no American should be immune from law or receive special treatment in its application. In addition, this act encourages all of us as legislators to continue to review the burdens that Federal laws place upon us as citizens. The laws which we apply to Congress today include the Civil Rights Act, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Employee Polygraph Protection Act, the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification

Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the United States Code on fair labor management relations.

Reducing the amount of congressional staff is also a cornerstone of our reform efforts today. As the ranking Republican of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee during the past Congress, I worked to substantially reduce the number of people in the Congress' employ. Unfortunately, Democratic intransigence prevented us from enacting anything more than a 4-percent reduction over 2 years. Today's resolution reduces the number of committee staff personnel alone by one-third, a total of 622, with a potential savings to the taxpayer of \$70 million over the next 2 years. How's that for a change.

Another cost-cutting measure included in today's package eliminates legislative service organizations. These Member caucuses which represent special interests cost the taxpayer \$5 million a year and take up a large amount of office space. In fact, elimination of the LSO's and their 97 staff positions along with the committee staff reductions may free up enough space so that we can sell off an entire House office building.

The Republican reform package we consider today also makes substantial changes to the present committee system by cutting three House committees and 25 subcommittees, limiting the terms of committee chairs and banning proxy, or ghost, voting. Not since 1947 has a standing committee of the House been eliminated. We'll take three, and if Members wish to vote on legislation in committee, they will have to be present. No longer will baron committee chairs wield the proxies of absent individuals who feel they have better things to do, defeating the efforts of committee members who do their work and care. Finally, committee meetings will be open to the public, ensuring fairness and accountability. We can all recall the day when Democrats in the House Ways and Means Committee voted for the controversial retroactive tax increases in the Clinton budget behind closed doors, barring the press and the public from their proceedings. Passage of this package will put an end to those shameful days. Under the Republican majority, the sun will shine in.

In the context of truth and accountability, Republicans have also included in their reform proposal a truth-in-budgeting requirement which will have an enormous impact on the public's understanding of Federal spending. Under past budget rules, an increase in spending was often called a budget cut if it wasn't more than inflation and other specified increases would cause. That's like saying we are reducing spending by not spending more than we already spend.

The new House rule stipulates that if you spend more money in one year than you spent the year before, it is an increase. Spending may rise because of an increase in inflation, but the fact is that it will be recognized as an increase. There will be no more Mickey Mouse budgeting. In this Congress, the truth will be told and the public will know.

The final provision of today's historic House reform package is one that will positively affect the lives of every American by making tax hikes more difficult. This Congress will require

a three-fifths vote of the House to pass any income tax rate increase and will prohibit retroactive taxation of income. This supermajority requirement is quite similar to restrictions voters have imposed on numerous State legislators, and stands in stark contrast to past Democrat rules which require a supermajority to cut taxes. Another beneficial aspect of this new rule is that any future Congress seeking to get around it would have to change or waive the rule, providing a warning sign of impending tax boosts.

Mr. Speaker, with this past election we saw the results of an American public outraged with the business-as-usual attitude of a Congress controlled by Democrats for 40 years. The message from an electorate tired of false messages and empty promises was clear—no more. Today's actions are the first step in fulfilling the promises made in our Contract with America, and represent more congressional reform than the public has seen in decades. They are not an end, but a beginning of a Congress more open, more accountable, and more responsible than ever. A Congress which will listen to the people, speak frankly in response, and spend no more than it needs to serve the people it represents.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the overall Republican House rules package. It makes many badly needed and long overdue reforms in the way this House operates. I believe those reforms will help Congress regain the confidence of the American people, something which has been lacking for far too long due to the complacency of previous Democratic congressional leaders. However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the provision in the package which would require a three-fifths supermajority to pass income tax rate increases.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution designates seven specific instances in which a supermajority is needed for Congress to take action. Those cases include override of a presidential veto and the Senate's approval of a treaty, among others. Other than those seven cases, however, the Constitution clearly establishes a Congress which operates on the basis of simple majority rule. I therefore have great reservations about whether such a provision should pass constitutional muster. This obviously, ultimately, would be a question for the judicial branch to be resolved in the course of litigation challenging the constitutionality of our rule. My vote for this change in our rules, then reluctance and while strongly supportive of the provision preventing retroactive tax increases, is made with great reservation regarding the constitutionality of the provision requiring a supermajority to pass income tax rate increases.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 6 adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress. This bill adopts many changes in the Committee system, particularly in the provisions of Rule 10 that govern the respective jurisdictions of the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

The language of proposed rule X governing the jurisdiction of the Banking and Financial Services Committee makes clear that the Banking Committee has primary authority to review legislation that governs bank securities

activities. The Rule draws an exception to that jurisdiction, however, that reflects the operation of existing law. The activities of any bank, any separately identifiable department or division of a bank, any affiliates of a bank, or any persons associated with a bank or affiliate, for example broker/dealers, municipal securities dealers, or mutual funds just to name three, that are regulated under the Federal securities laws, will continue to be subject to the primary legislative jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. This is what is referred to as functional regulation.

Furthermore, recognizing the particular nature of institutions whose deposits are insured by the Federal Government, there is an exception to this exception. The Banking Committee will share jurisdiction over these entities regulated under the securities laws with regards to legislative provisions that are intended to protect the safety and soundness of the depository institution.

I favor this approach to the jurisdiction of the respective Committees because it reflects an agreement reached by and between me and my two good friends, Speaker GINGRICH and Chairman LEACH. It is my hope that the wording of H. Res. 6 will result in an elimination of the bottlenecks that have prevented the House from passing comprehensive financial services reform legislation. It is of critical importance that the regulation of the financial services industry be reformed to allow banks to enter the securities business and brokers to enter the banking business on an equal footing. I look forward to cooperating with Chairman LEACH in enacting legislation to accomplish that goal during the 104th Congress.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rules package under consideration today. I urge my colleagues to support this package because it represent real reform. Reform I have been calling for since my first election 2 years ago. Reform the American people have been calling for—for far too long.

This Rules package contains reforms promised in the Contract With America and its passage will represent a promise kept—a refreshing change for Congress. Let each and every one of us here in Congress today recommit ourselves to keeping the promise made in the Contract With America. The American people will judge us by our success in meeting this commitment. Let us not fail their trust.

The process which developed this Rules package was remarkably open with all Members of differing seniority and differing perceptions having the opportunity to help draft this remarkable reform document. I salute the new Chairman of the Rules Committee, the Honorable GERALD SOLOMON, for his openness and dedication which produced this product.

I personally experienced Chairman SOLOMON's commitment to openness when I proposed a ban on commemorative. This Rules package prohibits the introduction or consideration of any amendment, resolution or bill that expresses any commemoration of any specified time period. The days will finally end when the Congress spends the people's time considering such legislation as "Mule Appreciation Day." Chairman SOLOMON welcomed my suggestion to prohibit commemorative legislation and committed himself to working with me on it. I am proud to have drafted the lan-

guage which served as the base for the legislative language included in the bill for consideration today.

I also want to express my thanks to my new freshman colleagues who have made the commemorative ban a reality. You freshman have provided us with the majority to pass this reform bill and you freshmen have made this proposal a priority by obtaining the Republican Conference's endorsement of a commemorative ban. Thank you all very much.

I am proud to have played a small role in developing this remarkable legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to keep our promises, to listen to the American people and to support genuine reform. My colleagues, please join me in voting "yes" for this vital legislation.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this agreement addresses the intent of the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget and the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight concerning the jurisdiction of each committee over the congressional budget process. It is not intended to address jurisdictional issues involving the budget process between the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Rules.

Paragraph (1)(d)(2) of rule X, relating to all concurrent resolutions on the budget and other measures setting forth budget totals for the United States, affords the Budget Committee legislative jurisdiction over the establishment and adoption of the congressional budget resolution, whether joint or concurrent. This extends to any statement setting forth a balanced budget as required by an amendment to the United States Constitution, or a capital budget or joint/capital operating budget, if mandated.

Paragraph (1)(d)(3) of rule X affirms the Budget Committee's primary jurisdiction over budget terminology and secondary jurisdiction over other elements of the congressional budget process, such as those currently provided for in the Congressional Budget Act. This includes: The budget resolution, timetable and accompanying report language; committee allocations; and the reconciliation process. This paragraph is not, however, intended to provide the Budget Committee with jurisdiction over the following: process changes in Federal rescission or impoundment authority; process changes in the submission of agency performance plans or reports, or agency regulatory plans, reports or reviews as part of the budget process; or process changes leading to the required adoption of a Federal capital budget or joint capital/operating budget which accounts for the fixed assets of the United States Government. In addition, this paragraph is not intended to provide the Budget Committee with jurisdiction over special funds, accounts or spending set asides created to reduce the deficit.

Paragraph (1)(d)(4) of rule X is intended to provide the Budget Committee with jurisdiction over measures to control spending, the deficit, or the Federal budget. The Budget Committee's jurisdiction will include the establishment, extension and enforcement of mandatory and discretionary spending limits; Pay-As-You-Go requirements for legislation that increases the deficit; and special budgetary mechanisms to control spending, the deficit or the Federal

budget. The Budget Committee will have jurisdiction over Federal sequestrations, including sequestration rules, special rules and exemptions. The Budget Committee is intended to have jurisdiction over the selection of programs subject to spending controls, the determination of the numerical level of those controls, and the enforcement of the controls.

Paragraph (1)(g)(4) of rule X is intended to retain the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight's legislative jurisdiction over: measures relating to process changes in Federal rescission or impoundment authority; measures relating to Executive agency budgeting, including the submission of agency performance reports or plans, or agency regulatory plans, reports or reviews as part of the Federal budget process; measures relating to Executive agency financial management; and process changes leading to the required adoption of a Federal capital budget or joint capital/operating budget which accounts for the fixed assets of the United States Government. In addition, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight retains jurisdiction over special funds, accounts and spending set asides created to reduce the deficit.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our work this year, let us remember that our first responsibility is not to the parties to which we belong, but the people we represent. It is for that reason that I rise in support of congressional reform and in support of several parts of the proposed rules package. I believe the majority has structured some important changes to the way we function, and those changes should not be rejected by Democrats simply because they are offered by Republicans. At the same time, we must be forever mindful that no Member in the Chamber has a premium on what's best for this Nation. We all have a contract with America.

What makes us a great Nation is the compassion we show for those who live in the shadows of life. We are strong because historically we have been able to make a place for all who live here, including those least able to help themselves—the young, the poor, the disabled. In this time of increased scrutiny, we must examine each and every program, but we must also consider each and every person affected by our changes. We must ask the question: Who is helped and who is hurt? And, at the end of each day, we must be honest about whether our actions helped the many in need or the few in clover. President Kennedy said it best, 34 years ago, when he stated:

A country that cannot help the many who are poor cannot help the few who are rich.

The contract to which each Member of this Chamber is bound, is to work in the best interests of the American people. On election day, we offered our services to this great country, and voters accepted our offer, from Rocky Mount, NC, to politically important New Hampshire, across the United States, past the vast stretch of Texas, to the Silicone Valley of California. We all have a contract with America.

That contract involves being open to the challenge of change. I support many of the reforms offered in this rules package, and I will vote for those reforms. We must get beyond partisan politics and move to the high ground of principle. This is a new day and a new time.

There are problems which we face that transcend party and politics. Teenage pregnancies stifle an entire community. Violence of any kind, whether driven by drugs or propelled by deep philosophical differences, cannot and must not be tolerated. Economic justice must ring true, this Congress. From the center-city youth, to the long-termed unemployed, to the small farmer who helps feed America, there are great expectations. No child should face hunger in this land of plenty. If welfare reform is to have any significance, we must combine with it a meaningful jobs program. With a meaningful jobs program, there would be less urgency for another crime bill. Instead of calls to "take back our streets", there should be calls to give our streets back to the average, hard-working, God-fearing citizen. Family reinforcement and restoration of the American dream must include all families, not just those with lots of money. If our citizens are secure, our Nation will be secure, more secure than Star Wars could ever make us. And, emphasis on our senior citizens is well-placed. From the sunrise of life to its sunset, Americans should feel safe and secure and well-served by Congress.

I too believe we can make our Government smaller, yet more efficient and more effective. That is why I applaud and will support several of the reforms offered by the majority.

But, real reform must include an end to gag rules. There are important amendments that would be offered, amendments designed to improve and perfect this rules package, but Members are muzzled because the majority has insisted on a closed-rule for this debate.

No Member can offer an amendment on the gift ban, for example. That is an issue that we debated and supported last Congress. If we are to be leaders, we must also lead in following the rules under which we are governed. In this House, we have resolved that no Member should be enriched beyond what the people pay. That resolve should not end with the Speaker, it should begin with him. One is left to wonder why, if they are truly interested in reform, the majority is determined to restrain the rest of us?

I will support term limits on the Speaker and committee chairs; the cost-saving provisions to eliminate certain committees and cut committee staff; the open government provision of a verbatim CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; the prohibition on committee assignments; the ban on proxy voting; and other streamlining measures. Those are thoughtful reforms that have been offered by the majority.

But, I will continue to stand up as part of the loyal opposition when I believe pomposity, audacity, and duplicity confront us. No party or person here has an exclusive on such things as family values and personal responsibility. Those are standards I absolutely hold dear. And no party or person should be able to take the right to speak and participate from any of us. Too many have sacrificed for that precious liberty. Let no one forget. We all have a contract with America.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rules change which would require a 60-percent majority to pass an income tax increase.

For over 200 years parliamentary rules of the House have conformed to the principles

established under the Constitution of the United States which provide for rule by the majority.

Majority has always meant one more than 50 percent of the House.

The Constitution originally recognized only five instances wherein a two-thirds vote was required: To impeach, override a veto, pass constitutional amendments, ratify treaties, and expel Members of the House. In no case was it contemplated that a 60-percent vote be required to pass legislation. Ordinary law-making has always required only a simple majority vote.

The Senate rule with regard to getting 60 votes to stop a filibuster is purely procedural. It is not a requirement to pass a bill. It is a requirement only to take it up. The House allows bills to come up under suspension of the rules with a two-thirds vote, but provides that failing that it may come up in regular order with a rule.

The rules that govern the operation of the House cannot supercede the U.S. Constitution. The House cannot by a majority vote alter the force and effect of the U.S. Constitution and how it has been interpreted for the past 200 years. To change that requires a constitutional amendment.

The new majority of the House that has well pleaded its case of fairness, should follow its own advice.

Of course with the Republicans in charge of the agenda in the House, it is not likely that an income tax increase will come to the floor for a vote. That being the case there will not likely be a test of this supermajority rule under their tenure. And of course since this is only a Rule of the House of Representatives, when the Democrats return as the majority party this rule can be expunged.

It is highly irregular to allow a fundamental change in how a bill becomes law to be effected by a change in the rules of the House. This circumvents history, tradition, and parliamentary precedents, all of which form the basis of the provisions in the Constitution of the United States which set out when and only when a supermajority would be required. That is the only logical interpretation and explanation as to why the Constitution bothered to set down the instances when such super majorities would be in order. If it was intended that the Congress could alter these at will each time the Congress convened a new term then it would certainly not have taken the time to make this explicit in five cases.

Quite the contrary, the writers of the Constitution knew the mischief that supermajority votes, the so-called minority rights protections, could do to the governing of our country. To assuage the small States they deliberately created the Senate with the guarantee of two votes no matter the size or lack of population. But in the House majority rule concepts had to be safeguarded as fundamental to the true definition of the "peoples' House." To abrogate the rule of simple majority and create a super minority in the House as well would greatly alter the balance of power and dilute the voting power of each Member.

The Constitution is the fountain and spirit of our democracy. Its foundation should not be uprooted by procedural rules changes designed for political gamesmanship where it is

clear that under no circumstances with this majority will there be any likelihood that an income tax increase bill will be reported to the floor.

I urge this House to uphold the Constitution and vote down this blatantly political maneuver intended to depict all who stood up for the Constitution to be those who would vote for an income tax increase.

It is tyranny when the majority sacrifices the principles of the Constitution to make a political point.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rules change which would require a 60-percent majority to pass an income tax increase.

For over 200 years parliamentary rules of the House have conformed to the principles established under the Constitution of the United States which provide for rule by the majority.

Majority has always meant one more than 50 percent of the House.

The Constitution originally recognized only five instances wherein a two-thirds vote was required: To impeach, override a veto, pass constitutional amendments, ratify treaties, and expel Members of the House. In no case was it contemplated that a 60-percent vote be required to pass legislation. Ordinary law-making has always required only a simple majority vote.

The Senate rule with regard to getting 60 votes to stop a filibuster is purely procedural. It is not a requirement to pass a bill. It is a requirement only to take it up. The House allows bills to come up under suspension of the rules with a two-thirds vote, but provides that failing that it may come up in regular order with a rule.

The rules that govern the operation of the House cannot supercede the U.S. Constitution. The House cannot by a majority vote alter the force and effect of the U.S. Constitution and how it has been interpreted for the past 200 years. To change that requires a constitutional amendment.

The new majority of the House that has well pleaded its case of fairness, should follow its own advice.

Of course with the Republicans in charge of the agenda in the House, it is not likely that an income tax increase will come to the floor for a vote. That being the case there will not likely be a test of this supermajority rule under their tenure. And of course since this is only a Rule of the House of Representatives, when the Democrats return as the majority party this rule can be expunged.

It is highly irregular to allow a fundamental change in how a bill becomes law to be effected by a change in the rules of the House. This circumvents history, tradition, and parliamentary precedents, all of which form the basis of the provisions in the Constitution of the United States which set out when and only when a supermajority would be required. That is the only logical interpretation and explanation as to why the Constitution bothered to set down the instances when such super majorities would be in order. If it was intended that the Congress could alter these at will each time the Congress convened a new term then it would certainly not have taken the time to make this explicit in five cases.

Quite the contrary, the writers of the Constitution knew the mischief that supermajority votes, the so-called minority rights protections, could do to the governing of our country. To assuage the small States they deliberately created the Senate with the guarantee of two votes no matter the size or lack of population. But in the House majority rule concepts had to be safeguarded as fundamental to the true definition of the "peoples' House." To abrogate the rule of simple majority and create a super minority in the House as well would greatly alter the balance of power and dilute the voting power of each Member.

The Constitution is the fountain and spirit of our democracy. Its foundation should not be uprooted by procedural rules changes designed for political gamesmanship where it is clear that under no circumstances with this majority will there be any likelihood that an income tax increase bill will be reported to the floor.

I urge this House to uphold the Constitution and vote down this blatantly political maneuver intended to depict all who stood up for the Constitution to be those who would vote for an income tax increase.

It is tyranny when the majority sacrifices the principles of the Constitution to make a political point.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield back the balance of my time, and expect to go on to title I of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for initial debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 5 the question is divided among each of the eight sections of title I and title II, and the previous question is ordered on each portion of the divided question.

Section 101 is now debatable for 20 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1994 I pledged to my constituents that we would restore accountability and responsibility to the U.S. House of Representatives. Today we embark on that journey. The American people were sincere in their demand for change for this country, and their Government in particular.

In response to this clarion call for a change, the 104th Congress will not just change its politics, but more importantly, we will restore the bonds of trust between the people and their elected representatives. If we are to change the Federal Government as the American people have asked us to do, then we must begin with ourselves. We can not and must not ask any department or branch of Government to do anything that we are not willing to do ourselves.

It will take a smaller Congress and committee structure that can act decisively to accomplish all of the things

that will be necessary to fulfill our Contract With America in the next 99 days.

A streamlined Congress is integral to an efficient Congress. When this debate is over, this bill passed, committees eliminated, and committee staff reduced, I am confident that the House of Representatives will be a more effective and efficient institution.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, a vote for the three-fifths tax proposal is a vote to keep the gravy train running for fat cats and millionaires. It will make it more difficult to lift the burden off those who need tax relief most, working Americans.

Under this proposal, it will be much tougher to touch the \$200 billion a year in corporate welfare that big business is handed through tax loopholes and tax exemptions, and tax fairness will be harder to achieve because this proposal will put a virtual lock on tax cuts that the super-rich received in the 1980's.

The new majority should be embarrassed that it is promoting a middle-class tax break while pushing changes that will make it more difficult to obtain tax fairness.

I urge a "no" vote for this misguided proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is in control of the time. Does he wish to yield?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time.

On November 8, 1994, the American people sent a loud, clear directive to Washington, DC.

The people have demanded a smaller Government that runs more efficiently and costs less money.

The American people know that wasteful, inefficient Government spending, leading to huge deficits and debts, is not an acceptable legacy to leave our children and our grandchildren.

This rule change does three significant things:

First and most important, it fulfills promises made by myself and many of my colleagues to the American people. This starts the long process of restoring the integrity of this institution that was envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Second, this rule forces Members of Congress to set an example for the rest of Government. This institution can and will be run more efficiently.

Third, this rule will save the taxpayers of this Nation millions of dollars annually.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve our country as a part of this Congress. This privilege brings with it an awesome responsibility that I take very seriously.

If we in this Congress are to bring about the significant changes demanded by the American people, we must start with ourselves. That is why today I speak in support of this rule change designed to do what the people have demanded—make a smaller Government that runs more efficiently and costs less.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks by applauding the majority for a host of the reforms that they have put forward for us to consider here today. Among them, the reductions in committee staff, banning proxy voting, and limiting the tenure of chairmen. I think many of these proposals are moving this Congress and this country in the right direction.

I am disappointed, however, in an area where there is a glaring omission and a gaping inconsistency and I would hope that we could dialog here on the floor even though it is a closed rule to see if you might be receptive to some type of cooperation on this in the future.

I have introduced legislation in the previous Congress, H.R. 1945, that was cosponsored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] on your side, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and many others that would have taken excess funds from our personal offices when we saved them and applied those directly to the U.S. Treasury so that we can reduce the deficit.

I have returned over \$650,000 in the last 4 years. I think many other Members in this body have done better than I have done and should be applauded for those efforts. But I would hope that this contingency fund would be addressed in this proposal. I would hope that you would be receptive to addressing this in a fair and judicious manner here today or explain why it was not addressed in this rule change.

Here is something that is important to the American people. As small businesses are tightening their belts, farmers are trying to make decisions to invest now or cut back for investments later, families are sitting down at the end of every month to make decisions on their budgets, and many of us are cutting back on our personal staffs, why can there not be a provision in this bill to allow that money to go directly to the U.S. Treasury? That might encourage other Members to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

Mr. ROEMER. Do I get an answer, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman gets time on his side, I will be happy to respond, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is recognized to yield time.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, a key ingredient of the new Republican majority's rules package is the elimination of approximately 30 subcommittees in the House of Representatives. There were 101 House subcommittees in the 103d Congress. Today, under the new Republican majority in the 104th Congress, the House will function with 30 percent fewer subcommittees.

Fewer subcommittees will help to consolidate decision-making and impair the ability of special interests to dominate the agendas of committees. The end of proxy voting in subcommittees will mean that Members of Congress must show up to work and vote in person. Further, Members will be limited to serving on no more than four subcommittees and, when those subcommittees meet, the public will be invited.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee reforms that the House will vote on today will mean fewer staff, less taxpayer money expended on duplicative and unnecessary staff and office expenses, less bureaucracy, less gridlock, less special interest power, and more accountability to the voters. These reforms are long overdue, and they deserve our support.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, just to add to what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has just stated and to make the point that the reduction in subcommittees and full committees was started in the last Congress by the Democratic Party. We eliminated 16 subcommittees in that Congress again and we also, as Members know, eliminated 4 committees in that Congress as well.

What is happening today is not new but in some instances is welcomed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that in this package, there is really less than meets the eye. There is not very much wrong with it. The problem is not what is in the package but what is not in the package.

The problem is that after every one of these reforms is passed, the lives of the average American will not be made very much better. And so any claims that the millennium has arrived because we have passed something like this are grossly overstated. It is not

that it is bad, it is just that the claims for it are exaggerated.

Let us go through them one by one. Cutting committee staff by one-third. Fine. But what about the millions of Americans who either do not have jobs or the tens of millions with job insecurity?

Baseline budgeting. Great. But you have still got to cut. You cannot just change the baseline.

Term limits for committee chairmen. It does not matter how long they stay. It is how good they are. If they are good, they should stay a long time. If they are bad, three terms is too many.

Opening all meetings to the public. That is already done.

Three-fifths voting for tax increases. Well, does this mean that we are going to see taxes simply reduced on the rich? What about saying that we should not reduce taxes on people who make above \$250,000 without three-fifths so it is harder to reduce taxes on the very rich and we can make sure the tax cuts go to the middle class who we are supposedly all talking about?

□ 1740

Audit of the House, no problem. Finally, the remainder of the rules package is all rather trivial.

So the bottom line, my colleagues, is very, very simple. This package is a small step forward, fine. I welcome it and I will vote for much of it. But anyone who goes away saying the millennium has arrived, that this is a revolution or that the average citizen in Peoria, IL, or in Yakima, WA, is going to be better tomorrow because this package has passed is sadly mistaken.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

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

Mr. Speaker, to cut committees, whether it is a profit margin in a business or whether it is the burden of closing bases or the infrastructure this has taken away from the central source, or whether it is from the Education Committee. I would say to the distinguished Whip we only get about 23 cents out of every \$1 down to education. I have a head of a committee that is in charge of about \$30 billion, but if I have \$1 billion for say child nutrition, and I divide that into 52 States, and every city in that State has services, then I have 40 programs for children's nutrition, and all of those have a bureaucracy which takes away the benefit.

What I am trying to do is get the money down to the children and into the classrooms and pay for the teachers. Let us eliminate the bureaucracy. If Head Start works, let us get it fully funded. If child nutrition works, let us fund it. But what we need to do is to eliminate the middleman, and in this

case the Federal employees, the staff that is taking away and causing tax dollars and, yes, Federal pensions down the line, let us eliminate them and I think that will help.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to my friend from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], I have not had the chance to congratulate him. He is a new Member from our State, and I congratulate him on his election and for being with us today, and for the outstanding way he is handling this portion of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH], another new Member.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak today on the first day in the midst of what probably appears to most Americans as partisan gamesmanship. I do, however, think there is something sinister about one particular part of this reform package, and that is on this that has been called a historic day that there are Members of this Congress who are going to cast a vote to deny the U.S. citizens in the District of Columbia and in the territories their voice and their vote on the floor of this House.

Being a Congressman from Philadelphia where we see people talk about it being the birthplace of our democracy, I would not want to be silent at a moment like this. I think that it is wrong. I think as we think about the taxpayers here, and the young people in Guam and the other territories who have fought and died for the freedoms of this land, for any of us to feel comfortable with casting a vote to take away their voice on this floor, that is wrong.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I became a Member of the 104th Congress to develop a sincere way of changing Congress as we have known it throughout these years. Part of that change includes shrinking the bureaucracy within Congress itself.

In 1950 this body functioned with 93 committees and subcommittees. Today there are 185 committees and subcommittees, twice as many as in 1950.

Between 1945 and 1993 the number of committee staff grew from 159 employees to 2,231, an increase of more than 1,300 percent.

The American people demand that Congress lead the way in reducing the size of Government. The people of the First Congressional District in Kentucky and all over this country want an efficient and responsive Government. But good government does not necessarily have to mean big government.

That is why I stand here today to support reform proposals to reduce committee staff by one-third, to elimi-

nate three standing committees and 25 subcommittees. I urge Members' support.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Michigan, Mr. DAVID BONIOR, for his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that as the new minority the Democrats, in terms of complaining about process, have failed to really address one of the more fundamental reforms which is clearly in front of them. Long before we wound up winning we said that this institution should give first, that one of the things we should do is cut back on the size of committees. We tried a number of initiatives when you folks were in the majority and we failed miserably.

We simply said we are going to cut staff by one-third. Is one-third a rational number? Is it going to cause real problems? We have discovered that it is not very difficult to cut by one-third. We are cutting staffing by one-third. We are probably going to do better than that, actually, as we assign the numbers to the various committees.

We also shrank the number of committees. Did we shrink enough committees? Did we eliminate enough committees? We do not know. What we said was at the outset we would cut them by one-third. That is our initial offer. I believe by the end of the 104th we are going to find that we can do better than that. Democrat Members are complaining because we do not do more. Why did they not do it when they had the chance?

The gentleman from Indiana mentioned the contingent fund. He needs to know his party eliminated the contingent fund as an appropriation item several Congresses ago. The rules changes also eliminate references to the so-called contingent fund in this section as well as in the section regarding the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Oversight. No change, however, is intended regarding the Committee on Oversight's jurisdiction over the accounts that comprised the contingent fund. Similarly regarding privileged reports, the Committee on Oversight will continue to have leave to report at any time on matters of expenditure of the accounts that comprised the contingent fund, such as the committee funding resolution.

The gentleman from Indiana wanted to know why if he saved money out of his account it could not be returned to the Treasury. I will tell the gentleman that I am sympathetic with that posi-

tion, but it is much more difficult than that, because in the past the Appropriations Committee did not fund 100 percent of the expenditures available to Members. They funded about 90 percent of it, assuming Members would not spend the 100 percent amount. If the gentleman spent 85 percent, he was funding those who spent 95 percent, and therefore if every Member spent the maximum amount available to them, in fact, that fund would be overspent. So in reality the Member does not get a pile of money out of which they spend. There is a general amount available. The Members draw on that amount, and that amount is significantly less than the total amount available for all Members to spend.

I am more than willing to work with the gentleman in trying to resolve the problem of Members who husband their resources in a meaningful way, having it go to a worthwhile cause more so than someone else who is more profligate with the taxpayers' money. I am open to any suggestions and am more than willing to work with the gentleman from Indiana to carry out the goal and the thrust of his concern, and that is to make sure that Members who husband the taxpayers' resources somehow get rewarded instead of being fodder for those who overspend.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy with the gentleman's cooperative spirit here, but would say he is willing to tackle the committee staff reductions, and I applaud that and will vote for that, but we should also tackle the personal staff issue. For Members like myself and many others who have returned \$650,000 through the years, we do not want that money spent on other Members going over their mail accounts.

□ 1750

When you decipher what you have just said, we want to be able to have that money go to the U.S. Treasury, and a simple sentence in this provision, if it was not a closed rule, could say unspent personal office funds shall be directed to the U.S. Treasury out of our accounts.

Mr. THOMAS. I would tell the gentleman that, as the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration in the last Congress, I have worked over the years to make sure that the Members' accounts were not only more flexible but that there was not more spending than was necessary. As the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, which is the continuation of the former Committee on House Administration, your concern about Members' accounts is going to be addressed by this new majority, and legislation is being drafted as we speak

to get to a problem which we have both shared under the previous majority, we tried to get them to change over and over again and they would not. We are going to.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed House rule to impose a supermajority—60 percent of Members voting—requirement for tax rate increases. I believe this proposed rule is inconsistent with the oath we took earlier today to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution clearly states that decisions of the Congress are to be based on majority rule. This proposed House rule is in clear violation of the constitutional principle of majority rule which is at the core of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress will consider fundamental issues about taxing and spending. Such decisions are the central responsibility of a democratically elected Congress.

This proposed rule is designed to stack the deck against tax increases for the wealthiest Americans while at the same time imposing no such requirement for increased user fees or excise taxes, which disproportionately affect low and middle income Americans. As a result, progressive taxation would require a supermajority while regressive taxation would not. The Republican Party has a long history of acting to protect the wealthiest Americans at the expense of average Americans. This proposal is Republican business as usual.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE,

Williamstown, MA, January 3, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GINGRICH: As a fellow historian and political scientist, may I urge you not to go ahead with the proposal to amend rules to require a three-fifths vote to increase income tax rates.

As a matter of principle, majority rule lies at the heart of our democracy. It is the most representative process; and departure from it grants authority to a minority—the antithesis of democratic society.

As a matter of practicality it is the most representative process that also permits decisive action, under a two-party system.

As a matter of propriety, bypassing majority rule would set a precedent for any minority to hold the majority hostage—today on tax hikes, tomorrow on economy bills, etc. It is dangerous for one side to use an improper weapon against the other side, encouraging each side to use it in the future, to the detriment of the general welfare.

Sincerely,

JAMES MACGREGOR BURNS,  
Woodrow Wilson Professor of  
Government, Emeritus.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, people all over this country now are contemplating going on a diet after feasting during the holiday season. I think it is only appropriate that this body consider doing the same thing.

Two years ago there were some 2,231 House committee staffers. That is more than five committee staff people for every Member of this body.

In the next few months we are going to be asking the American people to go on a diet as we seek to reduce Federal spending and cut back on Federal programs that affect them. Have you ever seen an advertisement for a weight loss program where the spokesperson was overweight? How can we, with any sense of responsibility, talk about a balanced budget and deficit reductions unless we first show some responsibility in reducing the size of House committee staffs and, in the process, save approximately \$30 million per year in the process?

I rise in support of this proposal.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. I applaud the House for undertaking these proposals, many of which I campaigned for and many of which I support and will support today.

But I have to agree with my colleague from Indiana that I think we should include his legislation to make some of these cuts real.

Unlike my colleagues in the majority, I have gone beyond supporting cuts in committee staff to making cuts in my personal staff, and that is hard to do as a new Member. I think it is important, and like my new colleague from Kentucky who spoke from the other side of the well said today, it is important we show the American people we are willing to lead on cutting the deficit. I have taken that; the gentleman from Indiana has offered legislation which would do that, and I think we should include it.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, the remainder of my time.

Today we will put an end to confusing, overlapping committee jurisdictions. Three full committees and 25 subcommittees will be eliminated; today we will cut staff 34 percent, saving the taxpayers almost \$45 million.

I am pleased to be part of the beginning of this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on section 101 of the resolution.

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 12, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	DeLay	Holden
Allard	Deutsch	Horn
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Archer	Dickey	Houghton
Army	Dicks	Hoyer
Bachus	Dingell	Hunter
Baesler	Dixon	Hutchinson
Baker (CA)	Doggett	Hyde
Baker (LA)	Dooley	Inglis
Baldacci	Doolittle	Istook
Ballenger	Dorman	Jackson-Lee
Barclay	Doyle	Jacobs
Barr	Dreier	Jefferson
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (WI)	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Bartlett	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Barton	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bass	Ehlers	Jones
Bateman	Ehrlich	Kanjorski
Becerra	Emerson	Kaptur
Bellenson	Engel	Kastch
Bentsen	English	Kelly
Bereuter	Ensign	Kennedy (MA)
Berman	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bervill	Evans	Kennelly
Bilbray	Everett	Kildee
Bilfrakls	Ewing	Kim
Bishop	Farr	King
Bliley	Fawell	Kingston
Blute	Fazio	Klecicka
Boehlert	Fields (LA)	Klink
Boehner	Fields (TX)	Klug
Bonilla	Filner	Knollenberg
Bonior	Flake	Kolbe
Bono	Flanagan	LaFalce
Borski	Foglietta	LaHood
Boucher	Foley	Lambert-Lincoln
Brewster	Forbes	Lantos
Browder	Ford	Largent
Brown (CA)	Fowler	Latham
Brown (FL)	Fox	LaTourette
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Laughlin
Brownback	Franks (CT)	Lazio
Bryant (TN)	Franks (NJ)	Leach
Bryant (TX)	Frisa	Levin
Bunn	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Bunning	Funderburk	Lewis (GA)
Burr	Furse	Lewis (KY)
Burton	Gallely	Lightfoot
Buyer	Ganske	Linder
Callahan	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Calvert	Gekas	Livingston
Camp	Gephardt	LoBlondo
Canady	Geran	Lofgren
Cardin	Gibbons	Longley
Castle	Gilchrest	Lowe
Chabot	Gillmor	Lucas
Chambless	Gilman	Luther
Chapman	Gonzalez	Maloney
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Manton
Christensen	Goodling	Manzullo
Chrysler	Gordon	Markey
Clay	Goss	Martinez
Clayton	Graham	Martini
Clement	Green	Mascara
Coble	Greenwood	Matsui
Coburn	Gunderson	McCarthy
Coleman	Gutierrez	McCollum
Collins (GA)	Gutknecht	McCrery
Collins (IL)	Hall (OH)	McDade
Combest	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Condit	Hamilton	McHale
Conyers	Hancock	McHugh
Cooley	Hansen	McInnis
Costello	Harman	McIntosh
Cox	Hastert	McKeon
Coyne	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Cramer	Hayes	McNulty
Crane	Hayworth	Meehan
Crapo	Hefley	Menendez
Creameans	Hefner	Metcalf
Cunningham	Heineman	Meyers
Danner	Herger	Mfume
Davis	Hilleary	Mica
de la Garza	Hinchee	Miller (CA)
Deal	Hobson	Miller (FL)
DeFazio	Hoekstra	Mineta
DeLauro	Hoke	Minge

Mink	Richardson	Stump
Moakley	Riggs	Stupak
Mollinari	Rivers	Talent
Mollohan	Roberts	Tanner
Montgomery	Roemer	Tate
Moorhead	Rogers	Tauzin
Moran	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Murtha	Rose	Tejeda
Myers	Roth	Thomas
Myrick	Roybal-Allard	Thompson
Nadler	Royce	Thornberry
Neal	Rush	Thornton
Nethercutt	Sabo	Thurman
Neumann	Salmon	Tiahrt
Ney	Sanders	Torkildsen
Norwood	Sanford	Torres
Nussle	Sawyer	Torricelli
Oberstar	Saxton	Towns
Obey	Scarborough	Trafficant
Olver	Schaefer	Tucker
Ortiz	Schiff	Upton
Orton	Schroeder	Vento
Oxley	Schumer	Visclosky
Packard	Scott	Volkmer
Pallone	Seastrand	Vucanovich
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Waldholtz
Pastor	Serrano	Walker
Paxon	Shadegg	Walsh
Payne (NJ)	Shaw	Wamp
Payne (VA)	Shays	Ward
Pelosi	Shuster	Waters
Peterson (FL)	Sisisky	Watt (NC)
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs	Waxman
Petri	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Pickett	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Pombo	Slaughter	Weller
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)	White
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Portman	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Poshard	Smith (WA)	Wilson
Pryce	Solomon	Wise
Quillen	Souder	Wolf
Quinn	Spence	Woolsey
Radanovich	Spratt	Wyden
Rahall	Stark	Yates
Ramstad	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rangel	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Reed	Stockman	Zeliff
Regula	Stokes	Zimmer
Reynolds	Studds	

NAYS—12

Abercrombie	Fattah	Meek
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Collins (MI)	Hilliard	Williams
Dellums	Johnston	Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Clinger	Frelinghuysen	Velazquez
Cubin	Roukema	

□ 1811

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

So section 101 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, with regard to rollcall vote number 6 on section 101 of House Resolution 6, I would like to clarify that I voted in support of the reforms to reduce the number of committees, subcommittees and number of staff. However, I was just informed that my vote was not officially recorded on the vote board. I wish to make clear that I voted "yea" on this vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed rollcall vote No. 6, requiring committee staff reductions of 33 percent. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

I strongly support section 101 of the House Rules committee reducing committee staff by

one-third. As chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, I feel this is a reasonable provision that allows Congress to set an example while saving tax dollars. Although the Government Reform and Oversight Committee absorbed the Government Operations, District of Columbia, and Post Office and Civil Service Committees, we have successfully managed to cut the committee's staff by nearly 50 percent without jeopardizing its capacity to carry out its legislative and oversight functions. I support this measure because it sends a strong signal to the American people that we are serious about making the Federal Government cost less and work better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Section 102 is now debatable for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

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

Mr. Speaker, my parents raised me to tell the truth. They taught me that hiding behind misleading words was the same as telling a lie, and as our Nation is threatened by the debt as it spirals out of control, and as I look at my two small boys, I realize that they, and maybe even their children, will have to pay for our refusing to meet our responsibilities.

The question before us, though, is what do we do about it? One of the things we can do today is pass this rules change.

As my colleagues know, for years we heard about budget cuts, yet spending keeps growing bigger. Why is that? Well, in the past, Mr. Speaker, the way Congress worked was that, if we had \$150 billion of proposed new increases and made it \$50, we called that a savings of \$100. My colleagues and I know that's an addition of \$50. That is the equivalent of my going down to the corner bait and tackle shop in Murrells Inlet, SC, looking at a rod on sale for \$50 that is normally priced at \$150, and saying, "OK, I'll buy it." I walk home, walk into the house and say, "Jenny, I just saved the family a hundred dollars."

She says, "What are you doing with a new fishing rod?"

I hold it up and say, "It was priced at \$150, and I bought it for \$50. I saved the family a hundred dollars."

She says, "Absolutely not. You just spent \$50."

Mr. Speaker, passing this action is what the American public wants. It is essential if this House is going to be honest with the American people, and I strongly urge every Member of the House to support this small step toward common-sense budgeting.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we all want to cut the budget, we all want to reduce the deficit, we all want our constituents to pay less taxes. But eliminating baseline budgeting is not the way to go. The budget baseline predicts future spending in Government programs, Federal programs. It is, of course, an account of inflation. But it also registers population changes, the business cycle, interest rates, to name just a few variables.

□ 1820

It is not just the indexing of inflation. For example, the baseline for Medicare includes not only an inflation adjustment, but the estimate of how many people reach each year 65 years old. For example, we must know and have to plan for when the baby boomers meet 65 as an age and they go on Medicare. It is very significant that we understand these numbers.

The increase in defense spending, that has been proposed is before us. But couple this with an elimination of baseline budgeting, and it would result in unprecedented cuts in discretionary spending. The people that we represent have a right to know what this means.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reconsider this proposal and to instead continue to implement the realistic, practical ways, that we have preached in the past. Baseline budgeting works. We know where we are coming from, we know where we are going. I urge my colleagues not to eliminate baseline budgeting as we do the budget in this upcoming fiscal year.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we vote on the first step necessary to end the Alice in Budgetland spending practices that have wasted the American people's tax dollars and threaten our children's future. Congressman SANFORD's leadership in introducing the Truth in Budgeting Baseline Reform will require Congress to live according to the same spending rules that govern the American people.

Before today, the budget process assumed that spending would increase from year to year, regardless of new laws. Under the old rules, the starting point, or baseline, for how much Congress spent on a program in 1996 would be how much was spent in 1995 plus inflation. It's no wonder that we ran up \$4.5 trillion in debt.

Under this budget-speak, government officials claimed to propose spending cuts when they really increased spending. Because the baseline included inflation, spending cuts actually meant

less of an increase in spending, but no real cuts. The American people have decoded Congress' budget-speak and demanded change.

The 104th Congress today has an opportunity to make history. I encourage my colleagues to pass the Truth-in-Budgeting Baseline Reform to force Congress to spend hardworking taxpayer's money under the same rules that guide the American people.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and urge its passage.

This measure requires that Congressional Budget Office [CBO] cost estimates in committee reports compare total estimated funding for a program with current spending, so we know what the real increases are.

But let's be clear, this is only a change in the numbers that must be used in committee report language. It is not a change in the existing CBO baseline—nor alone will this change actually cut spending.

I hope in the coming weeks that the new congressional leadership will bring legislation to the Floor to require the use of an actual year spending baseline. Such a change—which was proposed in the last Congress and received my strong support—could significantly alter our budgeting process and reduce spending by tens-of-billions of dollars. In addition, I hope the new leadership will expedite consideration of other budget process reforms like the Deficit Reduction Lockbox, which can significantly reduce our budget deficit.

There may be a change in the partisan numbers in the Congress, but the budget deficit math has not changed. Working together in bipartisan fashion to sustain the recent significant downward reduction of the deficit will be major test of the credibility of this new Congress. That work begins today.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple matter dealing with baseline budgeting versus the truth in budgeting which we are trying to get done here. I think the American public needs to understand with what we are dealing. In our baseline budgeting now we add inflation, we add demographic increases, we add differences in programs that may come along. But the bottom line is we do not look at the same dollars we had the year before.

It is tough to balance a budget in Washington, DC. We have authorizations, we have appropriations, we have authorizations, we have appropri-

tions, we have the debt which we have to pay. We borrow from the Social Security trust fund. We have something called tax expenditures, which is really a way of saying that we are reducing the amount of money we are going to collect. And the time has come to get this to the point where we understand it.

If we go to truth in budgeting, we are going to be like every household in the United States of America, we are going to be like every business in the United States of America, we are going to be like virtually every other governmental budget in the United States of America. We are going to take the numbers from the year before and we going to build our budget to that. If we have to add to it, so be it, we will add to it. But we will not be misleading the American people. We will know that any reduction below the baseline or current severance level is a real cut or increase, and that is what we have to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will all support this as the beginning of better budget practices in the United States of America.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today begins dramatic change in how Government operates. For the first time in decades, we will start talking straight with the American people about the Federal budget.

Every American family who must meet a budget understands that an increase in spending means you spent more money than last year. Not so here in Washington. Back in 1974 the Congress decided to adopt baseline budgeting—an arcane concept that allowed Government to grow on autopilot for two decades. Here in Washington an increase in Federal spending is considered a cut in spending unless it exceeds the estimated increase in cost. That's like the perennially overweight man who figures he'll gain 30 pounds this year—and when it turns out he only gained 10 he announces he's lost 20 pounds.

But today, Mr. Speaker, all that deception stops. From now on, an increase in spending will be called an increase in spending. If we spend \$1.4 trillion this year and plan to spend \$1.5 trillion next year, we'll call that exactly what it is—a \$100-billion increase in spending. Sounds simple, but here in Washington it is revolutionary.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to oversell what we are trying to do here today. What essentially we are talking about is presentation. And presentation is important, it is like language. If you do not communicate

in terms that people can understand, they get very confused. And this is the first small step at being able to explain to the American people precisely what we are doing with spending.

Now, when you are talking about discretionary spending, that is not the confusing part of this whole budget process, because there is no assumption that we will spend more next year than the previous year as driven by law. But when you are talking about entitlements, if you assume you are going to spend \$7 on a Medicaid program and the next year you are going to spend \$10 instead of \$13 on a Medicaid program, the presentation now shows that as a \$3 cut. What we wanted to say is last year we spent \$7 and this year we are going to spend \$10. We do not want to list it in terms of the difference. We want to list it in terms of the total amount of dollars being spent. We think that is a far more accurate way of presenting things.

I do not think the minority, and that is the first time I have had a chance to say that this year, "the minority," I do not think they have any real objection to that.

I want to say to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], that I in fact do intend to come with a real proposal that would repeal baselines and get us to this concept of zero-based budgeting without an assumption that every year we have to spend more.

The bottom line is, this is the first step toward providing a more simple way for Americans to understand how their money is being spent, and it is a very important step that we need to make on this first day.

□ 1830

I would urge the House to approve this legislation. Let us make the first step toward communicating with the American people in terms that they can understand.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this amendment, but it has nothing to do with truth in budgeting and all the other rhetoric I hear on how we put budgets or appropriation bills together. Every appropriation bill that comes to the floor shows last year's appropriation, this year's appropriation, and normally, the President's request, no baseline.

When we consider what has happened historically to budgets, we do look, and one measurement is what has happened to actual changes in dollars in programs from year to year. We also look at what has happened in appropriations and spending in relationship to inflation. We also at other times look at the relationship of expenditures to the gross national product. They are all legitimate analyses of what is happening to the Federal budget.

Somehow my Republican friends seem to think that we should never consider the impact of inflation on Federal spending. Any family that looks at their budget, if their salary is frozen for a number of years, and the cost of food goes up, the cost of clothing goes up, the cost of gasoline goes up, it is obvious that they have fewer dollars to purchase fewer goods and services.

The same is true of the Federal Government. We measure them in a variety of ways, and my friends on the other side like particularly to use inflated baseline when we talk about defense. The truth is that defense budget authority peaked in 1985. Adjusted for inflation, it has been cut by 35 percent. Unadjusted for inflation, it has been cut by 10 percent.

I tend to hear when we get that debate, my friends on the right use the baseline number, my friends on the left use the unadjusted baseline. The truth is both are active.

This is a harmless amendment, but it does not do anything significantly different. It is not a new truth in budgeting amendment.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to accomplish a great thing for the American people. We are going to stop using phony numbers in the Federal budget process. We are going to require that the Congressional Budget Office makes its financial projections the same way that American families and American businesses do.

If we propose to spend more taxpayer money on a program in 1995 than we spent in 1994, we will have to call it a spending increase. Politicians will be forced to use the English language with the same meanings that working Americans do. Ultimately, when politicians can no longer deceive voters with words that lie, when politicians can no longer claim as spending cuts what are in fact spending increases, when politicians can no longer pretend that a 20-percent increase in domestic spending over the next 5 years is deficit reduction, as the Clinton administration has for the past 2 years, then voters can make their own evaluations of programs, of budgets, and ultimately, of the politicians who create them, with the clarity and the confidence that they need to make independent, intelligent, and informed choices.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of section 102 of the rules package which addresses baseline budgeting. As a member of the Budget Committee, I have strongly advocated the

elimination of baseline budgeting and supported passage of the Full Budget Disclosure Act last August which accomplished that goal. This change in the House Rules reflects a provision contained in that bill, which passed the House although it failed to clear the Senate.

The use of a baseline in calculating the national budget is confusing at best, and downright fraudulent at worst. With this rule change we will simply rely on actual prior year spending levels, for comparison purposes, when calculating spending increases or decreases for the next fiscal year. This is logical, sensible, and a proposal worthy of strong bipartisan support. I urge a "yes" vote on this provision.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the previous chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], has indicated correctly that this is a good start, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has indicated he is going to introduce the bill that is going to go all the way. This is not truth in budgeting, but at least it is truth in the way we report the budget to the American people, not pretending that there is a deficit reduction when actually there is a spending increase.

Ultimately, we are going to get our bill that this House passed through the Senate, and it is going to become law. That is the ultimate goal of this first step.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 2 minutes to close debate.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here in support of abolishing the practice of baseline budgeting, which is the accounting gimmick by which for so many years Congress has called a spending increase a cut. This really has gone on just last year.

Just this past year Republicans proposed reforming the State Department, a regular target of reform. Under this reform proposal, actual spending on State Department functions would have increased by \$25 million year to year, but the opponents of the reform cried "foul." They said, "You are spending less money, you are slashing the budget of the State Department by \$77 million." One person's increase is another person's cut. There is no common denominator.

How does this work? Let me demystify it. We just finished New Year's Day and a lot of people spent time in front of their television sets eating take-out pizza.

Let us imagine last year on New Year's Day you ate five pieces of pizza. This year, it was so much fun last year, you decided to eat 10 pieces of pizza. Your friends told you that would be truly piggish, you ought to cut back, so you settle on seven.

Under baseline budgeting you can claim to have slashed your pizza consumption by 30 percent because you are only having 7 pieces instead of the 10 that you want.

What we are going to say in this reform is, you are increasing your pizza consumption 40 percent. Be honest with yourself. You are having seven this year instead of the five you had last year.

That is real budgeting, real figures, something the American people can understand.

Thomas Jefferson once noted "He who permits himself to tell a lie once finds it much easier to do so a second and a third time. The falsehood of the tongue leads to that of the heart, and in time, depraves all good dispositions."

Mr. Speaker, Jefferson was right. The baseline is a lie. It is one that has eaten away at the credibility of this Congress. It is time we repeal the practice forthwith. I am delighted to be here urging my colleagues to vote aye on this important reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on section 102 has expired. The question is on section 102 of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 6, not voting 6, as follows.

[Roll No 7]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Chrysler
Ackerman	Boehner	Clayton
Allard	Bonilla	Clement
Andrews	Bonior	Clinger
Archer	Bono	Clyburn
Armye	Borski	Coble
Bachus	Boucher	Coburn
Baesler	Brewster	Coleman
Baker (CA)	Browder	Collins (GA)
Baker (LA)	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Combest
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Condit
Barclay	Brownback	Conyers
Barr	Bryant (TN)	Cooley
Barrett (NE)	Bryant (TX)	Costello
Barrett (WI)	Bunn	Cox
Bartlett	Bunning	Coyne
Barton	Burr	Cramer
Bass	Burton	Crane
Bateman	Buyer	Crapo
Becerra	Callahan	Cremins
Bellenson	Calvert	Cubin
Bentsen	Camp	Cunningham
Bereuter	Canady	Davis
Berman	Cardin	de la Garza
Bevill	Castle	Deal
Bilbray	Chabot	DeFazio
Bilirakis	Chambless	DeLauro
Bishop	Chapman	Dellums
Bliley	Chenoweth	Deutsch
Blute	Christensen	Diaz-Balart

Dickey Jackson-Lee Oberstar  
 Dicks Jacobs Obey  
 Dixon Jefferson Oliver  
 Doggett Johnson (CT) Ortiz  
 Dooley Johnson (SD) Orton  
 Doolittle Johnson, E. B. Owens  
 Dornan Johnson, Sam Oxley  
 Doyle Johnston Packard  
 Dreier Jones Pallone  
 Duncan Kanjorski Parker  
 Dunn Kaptur Pastor  
 Durbin Kasich Paxton  
 Edwards Kelly Payne (NJ)  
 Ehlers Kennedy (MA) Payne (VA)  
 Ehrlich Kennedy (RI) Pelosi  
 Emerson Kildee Peterson (FL)  
 Engel Kim Peterson (MN)  
 English King Petri  
 Ensign Kingston Pickett  
 Eshoo Kleczka Pombo  
 Evans Klink Pomeroy  
 Everett Klug Porter  
 Ewing Knollenberg Portman  
 Farr Kolbe Poshard  
 Fattah LaFalce Pryce  
 Fawell LaHood Quillen  
 Fazio Lambert-Lincoln Quinn  
 Fields (LA) Lantos Radanovich  
 Fields (TX) Largent Rahall  
 Filner Latham Ramstad  
 Flake LaTourette Rangel  
 Flanagan Laughlin Reed  
 Foglietta Lazlo Regula  
 Foley Leach Reynolds  
 Forbes Levin Richardson  
 Ford Lewis (CA) Riggs  
 Fowler Lewis (GA) Rivers  
 Fox Lewis (KY) Roberts  
 Frank (MA) Lightfoot Roemer  
 Franks (CT) Linder Rogers  
 Franks (NJ) Lipinski Rohrabacher  
 Frelinghuysen Livingstone Ros-Lehtinen  
 Frisa LoBiondo Rose  
 Frost Lofgren Roth  
 Furse Longley Roukema  
 Gallegly Lowey Roybal-Allard  
 Ganske Lucas Royce  
 Gejdenson Luther Rush  
 Gekas Maloney Sabo  
 Gephardt Manton Sanders  
 Geren Manzullo Sanford  
 Gibbons Markey Sawyer  
 Gilchrest Martinez Saxton  
 Gillmor Martini Scarborough  
 Gilman Mascara Schaefer  
 Gonzalez Matsui Schiff  
 Goodlatte McCarthy Schroeder  
 Goodling McCollum Schumer  
 Gordon McCrery Scott  
 Goss McDade Seastrand  
 Graham McDermott Sensenbrenner  
 Green McHale Serrano  
 Greenwood McHugh Shadegg  
 Gunderson McInnis Shaw  
 Gutierrez McIntosh Shays  
 Gutknecht McKeon Shuster  
 Hall (OH) McKinney Sisisky  
 Hall (TX) McNulty Skaggs  
 Hamilton Meehan Skeen  
 Hancock Meek Skelton  
 Hansen Menendez Slaughter  
 Harman Metcalf Smith (MI)  
 Hastert Meyers Smith (NJ)  
 Hastings (FL) Mfume Smith (TX)  
 Hastings (WA) Mica Smith (WA)  
 Hayes Miller (CA) Solomon  
 Hayworth Miller (FL) Souder  
 Hefley Mineta Spence  
 Hefner Minge Spratt  
 Heineman Mink Stark  
 Herger Moakley Stearns  
 Hilleary Mollinari Stenholm  
 Hinchey Mollohan Stockman  
 Hobson Montgomery Stokes  
 Hoekstra Moorhead Studds  
 Hoke Moran Stump  
 Holden Morella Stupak  
 Horn Murtha Talent  
 Hostettler Myers Tanner  
 Houghton Myrick Tate  
 Hoyer Neal Tauzin  
 Hunter Nethercutt Taylor (MS)  
 Hutchinson Neumann Taylor (NC)  
 Hyde Ney Tejada  
 Inglis Norwood Thomas  
 Istook Nussle Thompson

Thornberry Volkmer Wicker  
 Thornton Vucanovich Williams  
 Thurman Waldholtz Wilson  
 Tiahrt Walker Wise  
 Torkildsen Walsh Wolf  
 Torres Wamp Woolsey  
 Torricelli Ward Wyden  
 Towns Waters Wynn  
 Traficant Watt (NC) Young (AK)  
 Tucker Weldon (FL) Young (FL)  
 Upton Weldon (PA) Zelliff  
 Velazquez Weller Zimmer  
 Vento White  
 Viscolsky Whitfield

## NAYS—6

Collins (MI) Hilliard Nadler  
 Dingell Kennelly Waxman

## NOT VOTING—6

Clay DeLay Salmon  
 Danner Funderburk Yates

## □ 1854

Mr. MINETA and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So section 102 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed Rollcall no. 7 regarding the reform of baseline budgeting. I was with the Republican Whip, TOM DELAY, and because my beeper malfunctioned I was not aware that a vote was taking place. Had I been on the floor, I would have voted "aye" on Rollcall no. 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Section 103 of the resolution is now debatable for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand here today as a new Member of this House as we embark upon a momentous change programmed to reform the Congress and our Government. The people of the State of Washington have sent me here to participate in this historic Congress which begins its first day specifically fulfilling the pledge of the Contract With America by reforming our own workplace before we enact other reform measures.

## □ 1900

As part of this great beginning, I rise today in strong support of section 103 of the contract for a new House, which will limit the Speaker to four consecutive terms and committee and subcommittee chairmen to three consecutive terms.

Today term limits are not thought of as radical or controversial and, indeed, many States have enacted some kind of term-limits legislation including my

home State of Washington. What makes our actions today extraordinarily novel is our willingness to change practices of the past by decentralizing the House's power structure away from committee chairmen with virtually lifetime appointments in favor of individual Members. This reform is also at the heart of the strategy for conservative governance that we will pursue in the first 100 days of this new Congress as we seek the devolution of authority from Federal lawmakers and bureaucrats back to individual citizens, a reenergized civil society, if you will.

No more will the House of Representatives be charged with stifling public debate and restricting innovative ideas. In the watershed November elections, the citizens of our Nation conferred upon us the authority to seriously reduce the size and scope of Government.

Mr. Speaker, more than 200 years ago, after his great victories in the Revolutionary War, Gen. George Washington won the admiration of the world by resigning his commission and demonstrating his commitment to democracy. In this great tradition of selfless leadership, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes to adopt the resolution to limit the terms of the Speaker and committee chairmen and subcommittee chairmen to demonstrate to the American people our commitment to democracy.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, this evening we have the opportunity to implement a reform that is being demanded by America. Term limits of committee chairs and subcommittee chairs is something that has arrived in terms of American political thought. This is not directed towards any particular committee Chair or subcommittee Chair. However, it is a part of trying to constantly improve and renew the American political process.

Imposing term limits on those that serve in leadership capacity will broaden the base of experience and expertise of people that provide the all-important leadership in this institution. By rotating the leadership, we are turning it over. We are bringing in fresh blood new ideas, new ways of thinking. We can be more responsive to the needs of America. We can also avoid the parochial service that has occasionally occurred when a person is focused on his narrow area.

It also breaks down what might be characterized as cozy relationships that can build up over an extended period of time, and assures that we have the freshness, the openness, and the access that all Members need in order to fully participate in the process of this

institution, and most effectively represent the interests of their congressional districts and the interests of America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is an important bipartisan effort, and I appreciate the opportunity that we now have this evening to cast a vote on this and hopefully implement this as a reform in our body.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being given the time to speak on the important issue of term limits for committee chairmen. It is an issue in which I have been involved for over 2 years and am pleased that we now have the opportunity to consider and pass this fundamental and much-needed reform.

The current system of unlimited terms for committee chairmen created an unjust situation in Congress, for up until the recent elections, power had become far too concentrated and entrenched. A handful of Members were able to dictate the legislative agenda, frequently based on efforts to protect committee turf or consolidate power of chairmen. Consequently, the committee structure became mired in a stagnant existence completely out of touch with the American people.

Republicans have long recognized the problems with unlimited terms for committee chairmen. In December 1992 I introduced a rule to the Republican rules package to limit the ranking minority members to three terms as ranking member of a committee. The rule was adopted by the Republican Conference and was called by the New York Times and the Washington Post the Linder rule.

Now the Republicans have gained the majority in the House of Representatives. It is time for the whole House to adopt this rule and limit the terms of all committee chairmen to three consecutive terms.

Adopting this measure would help put an end to the cozy relationships with special interests, enhance free flow of new and innovative ideas and bring an end to an iron-fisted ruling in Congress by a very few people.

I am gratified that this limit on the tenures of committee chairmen is included in the rules package of the 104th Congress. I believe that it truly represents the fundamental change in the status quo that the American people voted for last November 8.

I urge its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of ambivalence about this particular provision.

If the majority party, the Republican Party, wants to limit the terms of its

chairs and the Speaker, that is their business. I would just make a historical reference, which is that the Democratic Party has not had problems limiting terms when those Chairs have proven or fallen short of the performance standards that we felt we needed to set. For instance, I know that in my lifetime here I have seen the year when three full committee Chairs were removed from their positions by the action of the Democratic Caucus. I have seen in other Caucuses lesser numbers of Chairs removed because, for whatever reasons, the caucus felt that they were not performing the job as well as they could or perhaps there was someone else that needed to perform it.

Be that as it may, if the Republican Party feels that it needs to have some kind of hard, ironclad agreement because it will not take the steps that are really necessary for all of us to take because there are times you do need to suck it up and just go out and say to somebody, "The time is over; you are not doing the job that we expect of you."

But as I say, if the majority party wants to do that, that is its business.

I suppose I do have one concern. The concern is this: If this is true term limits, and it is term limits of three terms of committee Chairs, then I do not understand why the Speaker receives a fourth term. Because why is the Speaker treated differently than the committee Chairs? Because this is a closed rule, we are not able to offer the amendment that would say that everybody is in the same boat, everybody is limited in the same manner, and there is also something I do not understand. If later many Members decide to enact or try to enact a term limit on Members that would be 6 years, am I led to believe then the Speaker can serve longer than the Members serve?

At any rate, these are questions not answered in this and, because this is a relatively closed rule, we are not able to offer an amendment to square that and to bring it to some sort of logical nexus.

At any rate, as I say, we in the Democratic Party have removed Chairs when we felt it was necessary. Now it is felt that apparently there needs to be some kind of ironclad limitation.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, at the opening of the 103d Congress, upon my initiative, Republicans proposed to limit the time a Member could chair a committee. Democrats rejected this initiative, which would have applied to their Chairs. Today, Republicans again offer term limits for Chairs—of committees and subcommittees—and it will now apply to us, the new majority party.

This initiative will do much of what congressional term-limiters want to accomplish: it will break up the long-term power fiefdoms of committee and subcommittee Chairs that often lead Members to be elected over and over again when otherwise they would have been retired. It will mean a Chair will have just 6 years to work his or her agenda, then move on.

But, it will leave to the people the final decision as to whether a Member should continue to represent them in Congress, where our founders believed that decision should be left under the Constitution.

It will mean a far more dynamic body, one less in thrall to special interests, one more attuned to the interests of the Nation as a whole.

I suspect the Democrats will strongly support this initiative now that it applies to Republican Chairs. It is only sad that they could not have supported it 2 years ago and been leaders in reforming this body rather than obstructors.

□ 1910

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Does the gentleman from West Virginia seek recognition?

Mr. WISE. At this time Mr. Speaker we have no additional speakers.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an incoming subcommittee chairman to strongly support term limits for all committee and subcommittee Chairs. As with all reform measures before Congress, it is essential for us to lead by example.

Most Americans support term limits. My home State of Massachusetts recently passed a voter referendum for term limits. In the same spirit of government reform, I rise in strong support for limiting the terms of committee or subcommittee chairmen.

In the past, too much power resided in the hands of committee chairmen to shape and mold legislation to their personal liking.

Some Chairs had become entrenched in their positions of power for 10, 14, or more years, sometimes fulfilling their own parochial interests over the greater good of the Nation. By enacting term limits for these Chairs, we will insure that the legislative process will truly be open to new ideas because it will be open to new leadership. This House has already limited membership on two committees, the Budget Committee and the Intelligence Committee. This step will extend that to limiting how long Members may serve as a Chair of a committee. The results of the November election sent a loud and clear message for real change in Washington. We can answer that signal by voting for this proposal.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina. [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with two observations for my colleagues. One is, what incredible progress on the term limit effort. Who would have thought 2 years ago, when I came to this body, that we would be voting today on a rule that would limit committee chairmen to three 2-year terms. What incredible progress for the term limit effort, and I have to say, too, it is very important as an indication of what is in this Contract for America and the exciting things we can do if we stick to the contract.

The second observation I have for any Members who are somewhat questioning whether we need to do this, a look at the statistics about the average stay of the Members of the leadership of the old Congress. According to the Term Limits Legal Institute, the average American keeps his or her job 6 years. The average Member of Congress keeps his or her job 10 years. But the average Member of the leadership in the old Congress kept his or her jobs for 28 years.

That is why we need to limit committee chairmen to three 2-year terms, and that is why we have got a historic opportunity right here, right now, to have real reform in this House.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, we are talking about term limits today, and the majority party, like the gentleman from West Virginia, who yielded to me, I have no problem with the majority party limiting the terms of their chairmen, but I think this goes to the heart of the issue: that we have an arbitrary term limit on any office.

Are we going to limit a chairman or chairwoman simply to three terms simply because they are doing their job correctly? This is an issue that this House will deal with whether we are talking about Members, chairmen of committees, Members of Congress, or anything else. But I would hope, as a Democrat, as the minority, we might be able to go even further and, in some cases, even limit the terms of the majority party chairmen to one term at this time.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. We have one speaker left, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington has the right to close, and I expect the Chair would like me to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let me tell you why.

It has been my privilege to serve on the House Appropriations Committee now for 10 years, and during that period of time I have tried my best to become well versed with the challenging information and the legislation that we are forced to consider each year as we pass the appropriations.

I have also had the honor of serving for 2 years as chairman of a subcommittee which the gentleman from Washington is going to serve on now, the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

That subcommittee, one of the smaller appropriations subcommittees, appropriates \$67 billion a year. We have three staff people. I can literally tell you that it takes years to get your arms around the Department of Agriculture, with 125,000 employees spread all over the world, and the Food and Drug Administration, with its massive responsibility.

I felt, after several years of service there, that I was prepared to take over the chairmanship. I think that with the then-ranking minority member, JOE SKEEN of New Mexico, we did a good job. We cut back on some wasteful spending, we saved some money for taxpayers, we were able to get beyond the bureaucratic background noise and yet down to the business of really appropriating in a responsible manner.

Now, of course, because of the verdict of the voters on November 8, our roles have changed. JOE SKEEN of New Mexico will be chairman of the subcommittee, and I will be ranking minority member. I will look forward to working with him.

The point I am trying to make is this: Experience on the subcommittee prepared me to do what the voters sent me to Washington to do, to take a look at a complex and large appropriation and to try to lead a bipartisan effort to deal with it. Should my colleagues in the House of Representatives on the Democratic side have reached a decision that I was unworthy of that job, they could have removed me in any Congress. That, I think, is the appropriate way to approach this.

To establish artificial limits for service as committee Chair or subcommittee chairman or service in the House of Representatives I think is grossly unfair.

Experience counts for every aspect of life; it counts in the Congress.

I think artificial limits are wrong, and I oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I have left.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of change, I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that so many have started out by saying that, "I am not going to use my time," and then of course we know the inevitable story. Well, I am not going

to use all my time except simply to ask, I am still waiting for an answer to my question, which is: Why is it that the Speaker has a 4-term limitation, committee Chairs have 3 terms? If there is an abuse or possible abuse of power with 3 terms for committee Chairs, certainly the Speaker, with the power that the Speaker's Chair has, whoever the Speaker might be of whatever party, we ought to limit that in the same nature as well.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to address what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] said as to why the Speaker is given 8 years and the subcommittee chairmen 6. The reason why that was designed that way is simply because the Speaker is next in line after Vice President to the Presidency, and it conforms with the concept of two 4-year terms of the President of the United States. That is the rationale that went into that.

The reason for the 6-year term limit for committee chairmen is simply that that seemed to us to be the right number. It may be a little arbitrary, maybe it could have been 8, maybe it could have been 4. The point is we need to limit the length of time somebody serves as committee chairman. That is the single most important limit we are placing here, even more important than limiting the Speaker, in my judgment. It was perhaps one of the most important reasons why we have debated over the years that we need term limits. Most Americans realize, when you give power to a committee chairman or a subcommittee chairman for a long period of time, you are giving very serious power to one individual who can abuse that power. Many do not, but somebody can.

The control that a committee chairman has is vast. He controls, often, whether a bill ever leaves his committee to come to the floor of the House for a vote. He controls a lot of the substance that goes into the bill before that bill comes out of a committee or leaves the committee in the first place.

□ 1920

And in a conference between a bill that has passed the House and the Senate, between those two bodies, the committee chairman has a great deal to say with what is in the final product, an awful lot to say. In addition to that, a committee chairman is in charge of oversight functions. There are hearings that are held by the committees that he determines which ones are held to look into whether it is the FBI, or the Drug Enforcement Administration, and in the case of my Committee on the Judiciary it may be oversight hearings like Whitewater in

Banking or whatever. A committee chairman, the right committee chairman, can do a great job for a long period of time. The wrong committee chairman can abuse that power, and, yes, somebody can remove him, but it does not happen very often.

And the bottom line is:

For the health of this Nation it is much better to alternate who are the committee chairmen of various committees and subcommittees over a reasonable period of time, and 6 years, it seems to us, is very, very reasonable under these circumstances. There are a lot of very talented men and women among our 435, and I urge a "yes" vote. It is a very important resolution, probably the most important one tonight that we will vote on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). All time for debate on section 103 of the resolution has expired.

The question is on section 103 of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 74, answered "present" 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—355

Allard	Chabot	English
Andrews	Chambliss	Ensign
Archer	Chapman	Eshoo
Armey	Chenoweth	Everett
Bachus	Christensen	Ewing
Baesler	Chrysler	Farr
Baker (CA)	Clayton	Fawell
Baker (LA)	Clement	Fields (TX)
Baldacci	Clinger	Filner
Ballenger	Coble	Flake
Barcta	Coburn	Flanagan
Barr	Collins (GA)	Foley
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Forbes
Barrett (WI)	Condit	Ford
Bartlett	Cooley	Fowler
Barton	Costello	Fox
Bass	Cox	Frank (MA)
Bateman	Cramer	Franks (CT)
Bereuter	Crane	Franks (NJ)
Bevill	Crapo	Frellinghuysen
Bilbray	Creameans	Frisa
Bilirakis	Cubin	Frost
Bishop	Cunningham	Funderburk
Bliley	Danner	Furse
Blute	Davis	Gallegly
Boehkert	de la Garza	Ganske
Boehner	Deal	Gekas
Bonilla	DeFazio	Geren
Bono	DeLauro	Gibbons
Brewster	DeLay	Gilchrest
Browder	Deutsch	Gillmor
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gilman
Brown (FL)	Dickey	Gonzalez
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Gonzlatte
Brownback	Doggett	Goodling
Bryant (TX)	Dooley	Gordon
Bunn	Doolittle	Goss
Bunning	Dornan	Graham
Burr	Doyle	Green
Burton	Dreier	Greenwood
Buyer	Duncan	Gunderson
Callahan	Dunn	Gutierrez
Calvert	Edwards	Gutknecht
Camp	Ehlers	Hall (OH)
Canady	Ehrlich	Hall (TX)
Cardin	Emerson	Hancock
Castle	Engel	Hansen

Hastert	McCarthy	Scarborough
Hastings (WA)	McCollum	Schaefer
Hayes	McCrery	Schiff
Hayworth	McDade	Schroeder
Hefley	McDermott	Schumer
Hefner	McHale	Scott
Heineman	McHugh	Seastrand
Henger	McInnis	Sensenbrenner
Hilleary	McIntosh	Shadegg
Hinchey	McKeon	Shaw
Hobson	McKinney	Shays
Hoekstra	Meehan	Shuster
Hoke	Metcalf	Sisk
Holden	Meyers	Sisk
Horn	Mica	Skeen
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Slaughter
Houghton	Mineta	Smith (MI)
Hunter	Minge	Smith (NJ)
Hutchinson	Mink	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Molnar	Smith (WA)
Inglis	Moorhead	Solomon
Istook	Moran	Souder
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Spence
Jacobs	Myers	Spratt
Johnson (CT)	Myrick	Stearns
Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Stenholm
Johnson, Sam	Neal	Stockman
Johnston	Nethercutt	Studds
Jones	Neumann	Stump
Kanjorski	Ney	Stupak
Kasich	Norwood	Talent
Kelly	Nussle	Tanner
Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Tate
Kennelly	Orton	Tauzin
Kim	Owens	Taylor (NC)
King	Oxley	Tejeda
Kingston	Packard	Thomas
Klecaska	Parker	Thornberry
Klug	Pastor	Thornton
Knollenberg	Paxon	Thurman
Kolbe	Payne (VA)	Tiahrt
LaFalce	Peterson (FL)	Torkildsen
LaHood	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
Lambert-Lincoln	Petri	Towns
Lantos	Pickett	Traficant
Largent	Pombo	Tucker
Latham	Pomeroy	Upton
LaTourrette	Porter	Volkmier
Laughlin	Portman	Vucanovich
Lazio	Poshard	Waldholtz
Leach	Pryce	Walker
Levin	Quillen	Walsh
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Ward
Lightfoot	Ramstad	Waters
Linder	Reed	Waxman
Lipinski	Regula	Weldon (FL)
Livingston	Richardson	Weldon (PA)
LoBlundo	Riggs	Weller
Lofgren	Roberts	White
Longley	Roemer	Whitfield
Lowe	Rogers	Wicker
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Williams
Luther	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson
Maloney	Rose	Wolf
Manton	Roth	Woolsey
Manzullo	Roukema	Wyden
Markey	Royce	Young (AK)
Martinez	Sabo	Young (FL)
Martini	Salmon	Zelliff
Mascara	Sanford	Zimmer
Matsui	Saxton	

NAYS—74

Abercrombie	Fazio	Moakley
Ackerman	Fields (LA)	Mollohan
Becerra	Foglietta	Montgomery
Bellenson	Gedensson	Murtha
Bentsen	Gephardt	Oberstar
Berman	Hamilton	Obey
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Borski	Hilliard	Pallone
Boucher	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Pelosi
Clyburn	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Coleman	Kaptur	Rangel
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Reynolds
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Rivers
Conyers	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Dingell	McNulty	Sanders
Dixon	Meek	Sawyer
Durbin	Menendez	Serrano
Evans	Mfume	Skaggs
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Skelton

Stark	Torres	Watt (NC)
Stokes	Velazquez	Wise
Taylor (MS)	Vento	Wynn
Thompson	Visclosky	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Dellums

NOT VOTING—3

Clay Harman Yates

□ 1936

Mr. PALLONE and Mr. JEFFERSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So section 103 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 8 on H.R. 6, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

□ 1940

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILIRAKIS). Pursuant to the rule, section 104 of the resolution is now debatable for 20 minutes.

The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer yet another fundamental change to the way business is done in the House of Representatives.

Every one of us was elected by our constituents to do a job. Having a job means showing up for work every day—as most working Americans are required to do—and actively carrying out the duties to which we are assigned.

The process of voting by proxy violates this basic responsibility. By allowing for proxy voting in the first place, it was never intended that: Representatives should stop representing; that they should never go to committee hearings; that they should never hear the testimony provided for them to make informed decisions; that they should never hear the critical evidence that might help them form opinions; and finally proxy voting was never intended that committee chairs should hold enough proxies to determine the outcome of legislation—regardless of the testimony, the evidence, the views of other Members, or the fact that some Members may have never bothered to attend a single committee meeting.

Proxy voting, or ghost voting as it is sometimes referred to, allows a committee chair to do whatever he or she wants to do.

I would think this practice of proxy voting would be offensive to those Members who faithfully attend committee meetings and listen carefully to the testimony offered and the evidence presented so they can cast an informed vote. A vote, unfortunately, which is cast in vain because no matter what was said, the Chair holds enough proxies to do whatever he or she wants.

This is not a responsible way to legislate and the people who elected us have every right to expect more.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one reason today that we are introducing this historic package of fundamental reforms, including the elimination of proxy voting, it is to let the American people know that the 104th Congress will begin to legislate responsibly and with total accountability.

I submit to you that it is necessary to eliminate proxy voting.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this proposal, and I commend the gentlewoman for leading the effort on it this evening. As she pointed out, I think correctly, in the real world if you work in a factory or you work in an office, you have to show up for work. You cannot send a proxy. It should be no different for Members of Congress in their committee assignments.

However, while I support this provision, I do not think it, frankly, goes far enough. I would like to talk a little bit about the issue of committee ratios here.

For many years Republicans have argued, and very well, I might add, the makeup of the House committees should reflect the party ratios in the House; that is, if one party controls 60 percent of the House, then they should get 60 percent representation on the committees in this institution.

Republicans have repeatedly offered amendments to make this simple rule a principal rule of the House. The Republican rules package in the 103d Congress required that party ratios in each committee must reflect party ratios in the House.

In fact, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] offered the same amendment to the congressional reform bill later in the year. The amendment was offered yet again by the gentleman from California [Mr. DRIER] when the Committee on Rules considered the congressional reform bill in October of last year, just 4 months ago.

In the Senate, the other body, the new Republican majority has adhered to this basic principle in allocations of committee slots for Democrats in the new Congress. In the House, however,

Republicans have not only abandoned their previous amendments on fair ratios, but they have already violated the principle they championed as recently on this floor and in the Committee on Rules as 4 months ago. They began by stripping dozens of Democrats of their committee assignments, a tactic never employed when Democrats controlled the House. We always made room. We never asked a sitting Republican on a committee to leave. We always somehow accommodated them, expanding the committee by putting temporaries on it.

Not so, not so in this Congress. Then they announced the committee ratio plan, in which not a single House committee actually meets the clearly articulated test for fairness.

On the major committees, and they are all major, but on the committees that people look to on important fiscal matters, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations, I would say those two committees and the Committee on Rules, the ratios were way above the 53/47 split we presently have in the House of Representatives. In fact, on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations, they got 60 percent instead of 53.

They might say, "When you were in power you did the same thing." We may have gone a percent or 2 or 3 above. We never went 7 or 8 percent above, which means a lot of seats on those respective committees.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman and my colleagues for offering this amendment on proxy voting, but I must be honest and say that it does not really go far enough. If we really wanted to go far, we would adopt the language of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], and we would adopt the proposals that were advocated by the gentleman from California [Mr. DRIER] and others on that side of the aisle to keep committee ratios balanced in relation to the rest of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, proxy voting is as American as apple pie. We have millions and millions of votes cast by proxy all the time.

Private industry, which we are so fond of replicating, uses proxy voting all the time. Americans understand proxy voting. They understand that decision-makers who have numerous obligations sometimes use proxy voting as a convenience. They trust certain people and allow them to vote by proxies on very important matters that affect their lives.

I am not going to quarrel, however, with a Majority that wants to limit their own flexibility and their own ability to conduct some awesome business matters here that are the province

of the Majority by insisting on eliminating proxy voting. If they want to do that, I am not going to really quarrel with them.

I am going to discuss, instead, something else that is as American as apple pie, and that is voting by simple majority vote.

Later on we are going to discuss a three-fifths requirement, a requirement that three-fifths of the Members must approve of any income tax increase. I want to say that is very un-American. That runs against the grain of the Constitution, and the general way Americans conduct business. What they are doing is empowering a minority of people to block any legislation.

The House has 435 voting Members. Some simple arithmetic. There are 435 voting Members. A simple majority is 218. Three-fifths of the House is 261, instead of 218. Two-fifths of the House is 174 votes.

By requiring that there must be a three-fifths vote to pass any legislation, we empower that two-fifths to block the legislation.

A simple majority requirement such as is being proposed dilutes the power of every Member's vote by allowing the House to be controlled by the two-fifths, 174 out of 435, two-fifths can choose to withhold their votes and they control the process. That is not democracy. Instead of control by 218 Members, we will yield control to 174. That means that if you set this precedent tonight on taxes, and I am not in favor of voting to increase the income taxes of Americans. We have plenty of ways to save money in the budget and not have to increase taxes. We should stop the freeloading farmers, end farm subsidies, end Farmers Home Loan mortgages, we should stop building *Seawolf* submarines which have closed down overseas bases in Japan and Germany. There are ways to save billions of dollars and not have to increase taxes, but this sets an unfortunate precedent. This empowers a minority.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the arguments presented above, I would like to note the following: Requiring a supermajority vote for tax increases is unconstitutional because it delivers a fatal blow to majority rule. It gives a minority of Members the ability to stop a specific type of legislation. Indeed, today marks the first time in this country's history that a majority in the House has attempted to usurp so much power.

Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution states that the "House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen . . . by the People of the several States." In *Wesberry v. Sanders*, the Supreme Court interpreted that portion of the Constitution as meaning that "as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." The rule before us would severely violate this one man, one vote principle by diluting the vote of every citizen. The more power that is funneled into the hands of the few, the less remains in the hands of the many.

Moreover, the Constitution clearly enumerates the instances in which a supermajority is required. If the Framers had intended that submajorities be used in other instances, they would have explicitly stated so.

While the Constitution does state that the House can write its own rules, the House and its leaders are not given carte blanche. Therefore, in the past, Congress has required supermajority votes only for procedural motions, such as the two-thirds vote required in the House to consider a rule reported the same day. Similarly, motions in the House to suspend the rules and pass a bill are procedural in nature; if such motion is defeated, a bill may be reconsidered in the House under a normal rule and passed by a simple majority.

Requiring a supermajority vote for tax increases also would set a perilous precedent that could be used to create similar requirements for other controversial issues. Which type of legislation would be next on the chopping block? Will any bill that increases education funding require a three-fifths vote for passage? Will any bill that relates to a woman's right to choose an abortion be subject to a three-fifths vote?

Voltaire wrote, "One despot always has a few good moments, but an assembly of despots never does." This certainly is not a good moment for my Republican colleagues. Of all the accusations that have been made about the Democrats' exercise of power during our 40-year tenure in the majority, nothing even comes close to rising to this level of the abuse of power. It is tyranny of the majority, pure and simple. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is proxy voting or ghost voting. It is a bad habit that has grown to be a serious disorder in the process of this institution. I notice that apparently no one is willing to defend proxy voting, because I certainly have not heard any defense from the other side of the aisle, so I guess the time has come to get rid of proxy voting or ghost voting and we thank very much what I think I am hearing correctly, is the support from the other side of the aisle so I think we can expect a very large vote to do away with this procedure which has not done credit to this institution since it has been a bad idea and since it has been abused so badly. I think we all know it, I do not think there is any particular point in overstressing, finding nobody supporting it, so why do we not just agree with it and get rid of it?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I congratulate her for her effort.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time is available on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BILIRAKIS]. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, in addition to authoring our Nation's Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote what are supposed to be the rules of this House. His Manual of Parliamentary Practice was written in 1797, and for nearly 200 years, has by law provided the basis for our House rules.

That is why I rise today in support of the Proxy Voting Ban in the House Republican Rules Package. If Jefferson knew that absent or tardy members of the House were routinely allowing other members to cast their votes for them in committee by proxy and that this ghost voting has been used to block legislation while ducking individual responsibility, he would object. He would wonder by what justification we could so stand the rules of this House which he wrote on their head.

Although House rules strictly prohibit one member of Congress from casting votes for another on the House floor, proxy voting was in fact the norm in many committees in the last Congress. In 1993, for example, proxy votes were cast on virtually every bill marked up in the House Committees on Energy and Commerce; the Judiciary; and Public Works and Transportation.

Ghost voting not only promotes absenteeism and sloppy bill-drafting, it allows party leaders and committee barons to control the fate of legislation by simply pulling votes out of thin air. It is like having 6 jurors sit through a trial, hear all the evidence and reach a verdict—only to have the jury foreman pull out 6 more votes from his pocket and cast them to overrule the others.

Last year, I introduced legislation to require the House to follow Jefferson's rules. One of Jefferson's overriding concerns was that each member of Congress would be held responsible for his or her own vote.

This rules change will end the abuse of our most important and valuable commodity, our vote. Simply put, under this change, if a member does not show up for work, he does not get to vote. I urge an "aye" vote for this important Republican reform.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, although every vote in the whole House is always important, votes in committee carry even greater proportionate weight. As such, committee votes should be cast by Members themselves, not by committee colleagues.

Yet Capitol Hill practice in the past has been to allow proxy votes in committees. This has meant one Member was voting not just for himself but for absentees.

Proxy holders, often the committee leadership, would vote for other Members who were elsewhere, possibly at another committee meeting voting the proxies of still more absent Members.

Enough already. Let the Member who votes in committee be in committee. The American way is one person, one vote. Votes in congressional committees no longer should be by proxy, they should be in person. That is what will happen as soon as tomorrow. All it takes is approval of this proposal to change our rules. Let the reform go on as we keep faith with our promise in the Contract with America to change the way Congress does business. The American people will be the winners.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment, Section 104, the ban on proxy voting. As the Speaker knows in the chair who serves on the Committee on Veterans Affairs, we have not had proxy voting for a number of years. It has worked very, very well. We have good attendance at our committee meetings, subcommittee meetings and when we have a vote, we almost have 100 percent voting on that amendment, on that bill.

We do not support proxy voting. We have not had it for 20 years in our Committee on Veterans Affairs, one of the most important committees in this Congress, and I certainly hope we would adopt this amendment.

I would hope that the people on this side, most of us over here on the other side are supporting this amendment, and you would not call for a vote and we could move along and get out of here a little earlier.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, we just heard the gentleman from California refer to Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson loved Monticello but he never hesitated to spend 4 days riding horseback to come to Washington to personally fulfill his responsibilities.

When we call on young men and young women to defend this Nation against foreign interests by placing our young men and women in harm's way, they do not have a choice. They must take themselves physically and personally to the call of their Nation. They cannot send a proxy.

What we ask of them we must ask of ourselves. Mr. Speaker, that is accountability.

The people of this great Nation expect us personally to represent them and their views and to be held accountable, to be in the line of fire and not

behind the door with a proxy coming through the keyhole.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker this evening on this particular issue. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

□ 2000

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. I believe that as we all are issued our brand new cards today, and each one of us has a sparkling new card that we insert into the boxes in this Chamber, these cards have been personalized, individualized, and secured so that it is only the Member that it is issued to that can cast the precious vote, the privileged vote to represent their constituents in this body.

I talked to Members and I remember my freshman year in 1991 when I cast my first vote and continue to feel it a privilege casting votes in this body. It is against our rules and we have very strict measures when somebody else tries to cast this vote in this body. I think that it should be the same measures that we take in our committees, so that we do not have proxy voting in our committees.

Richard Fenno, a pundit and scholar on Congress, says that the business of Congress is done in its committees. That does not mean we legislate more, that means we do the job of oversight more to be accountable to our constituents. I think this card helps ensure that on the House floor, and I think this new rule helps ensure that in our committees.

This is a good measure to ban proxy voting and I commend Members to vote for this measure.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wyoming [Mrs. CUBIN].

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for eliminating the misguided, but long-held, congressional practice of allowing absentee proxy votes to take place in committee.

Putting an end to these absentee proxy votes is a crucial part of fulfilling our pledge to the American people to create a more open and truly representative Congress. It is an important early step along the path of momentous change and reform that will put the people's government back on the right track.

Like many of my colleagues, I am opposed to this practice which allows an individual to cast a vote in committee on behalf of another member. The people of this country have the right to expect and demand that those of us in Congress carry out the job we sent here to do—namely, make the tough choices and cast our votes in person.

Furthermore, I have an additional, and somewhat unique, reason for objecting to proxy voting. I am the lone

representative in the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of Wyoming.

I do not want a California proxy vote cancelling my vote.

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the comments of the gentlemen from Mississippi, but hope that he understands that we in the 104th Congress promised in the Contract With America to have a recorded vote on each provision today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILIRAKIS). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for as much as 2 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we bring this House back to orthodoxy by eliminating the vote by proxy. In any language, everyone in America knows that the heart and soul of the legislative process is resting with the committee and the committees' work in the Congress of the United States. Subcommittee, full committee, task force, it is the guts of the legislative process that happens beyond the walls of this Chamber, and the final action taken on this floor is really tinsel, it is show time, all of the work, all of the deliberation, all of the amendments, all of the drafting, all of the crafting already having been accomplished in the halls of the committee system itself.

The gentleman from Mississippi and others who have spoken so eloquently know that we as trustees of the card that allows us to vote on the floor of the House cannot transfer it to anyone else. As a matter of fact, it is a violation of the law, a criminal violation if any Member should transfer his or her card to someone else to vote that vote on the floor.

Is it not an irony that that is a crime, but we permitted for so many years someone to vote a dozen or two dozen votes in committee with ghost riders in the sky elsewhere in the Capitol while a bill is being crafted, amended, and finally passed in committee.

I recommend it not just because we have in the contract with the American people the banning of proxy voting, but because the American people recognize that this is a fraud on the legislative process. We tonight end it for all time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on section 104 of the resolution has expired.

The question is on section 104 of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 13, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Davis	Hefner
Ackerman	de la Garza	Heineman
Allard	Deal	Hergert
Andrews	DeFazio	Hilleary
Archer	DeLauro	Hilliard
Armey	DeLay	Hinchee
Bachus	Deutsch	Hobson
Baesler	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Baker (CA)	Dickey	Hoke
Baker (LA)	Dicks	Holden
Baldacci	Dixon	Horn
Balenger	Doggett	Hostettler
Barca	Dooley	Houghton
Barr	Doolittle	Hoyer
Barrett (NE)	Dornan	Hunter
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	Hutchinson
Bartlett	Dreier	Hyde
Barton	Duncan	Ingalls
Bass	Dunn	Istook
Bateman	Durbin	Jackson-Lee
Beceera	Edwards	Jacobs
Bellenson	Ehlers	Jefferson
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Bereuter	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Berman	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Bevill	English	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Ensign	Jones
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Bishop	Evans	Kasich
Billey	Everett	Kelly
Blute	Ewing	Kennedy (MA)
Boehlert	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Boehner	Fattah	Kennelly
Bonilla	Fawell	Kildee
Bonior	Fazio	Kim
Bono	Fields (LA)	King
Borski	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Boucher	Flitner	Kleccka
Brewster	Flake	Klitck
Browder	Flanagan	Klug
Brown (CA)	Foglietta	Knollenberg
Brown (FL)	Foley	Kolbe
Brown (OH)	Forbes	LaFalce
Brownback	Ford	LaHood
Bryant (TN)	Fowler	Lantos
Bryant (TX)	Fox	Largent
Bunn	Franks (CT)	Latham
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	LaTourette
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Laughlin
Burton	Frisa	Lazio
Buyer	Frost	Leach
Callahan	Funderburk	Levin
Calvert	Furse	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Gallegly	Lewis (GA)
Canady	Ganske	Lewis (KY)
Cardin	Gekas	Lightfoot
Castle	Gephardt	Linder
Chabot	Geren	Lipinski
Chambliss	Gibbons	Livingston
Chapman	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Chenoweth	Gillmor	Lofgren
Christensen	Gilman	Longley
Chrysler	Gonzalez	Lowe
Clay	Goodlatte	Lucas
Clayton	Goodling	Luther
Clement	Gordon	Maloney
Clinger	Goss	Manton
Clyburn	Graham	Manzullo
Coble	Green	Markey
Coburn	Greenwood	Martinez
Coleman	Gunderson	Martini
Collins (GA)	Gutierrez	Mascara
Combest	Gutknecht	Matsui
Condit	Hall (OH)	McCarthy
Cooley	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Costello	Hamilton	McCrery
Cox	Hancock	McDade
Coyne	Hansen	McDermott
Cramer	Harman	McHale
Crane	Hastert	McHugh
Crapo	Hastings (FL)	McInnis
Crémeans	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh
Cubin	Hayes	McKeon
Cunningham	Hayworth	McKinney
Danner	Hefley	McNulty

Meehan	Quinn	Stenholm
Meeke	Radanovich	Stockman
Menendez	Rahall	Stokes
Metcalfe	Ramstad	Studds
Meyers	Rangel	Stump
Mfume	Reed	Stupak
Mica	Regula	Talent
Miller (CA)	Reynolds	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Richardson	Tate
Mineta	Riggs	Tauzin
Minge	Rivers	Taylor (MS)
Mink	Roberts	Taylor (NC)
Moakley	Roemer	Tejeda
Mollinari	Rogers	Thomas
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Thompson
Montgomery	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Moorhead	Rose	Thornton
Moran	Roth	Thurman
Morella	Roukema	Tiahrt
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Torkildsen
Myers	Royce	Torres
Myrick	Rush	Torricelli
Nadler	Sabo	Towns
Neal	Salmon	Trafficant
Nethercutt	Sanders	Tucker
Neumann	Sanford	Upton
Ney	Sawyer	Velazquez
Norwood	Saxton	Visclosky
Nussle	Scarborough	Volkmer
Oberstar	Schaefer	Vucanovich
Obey	Schiff	Waldholtz
Olver	Schroeder	Walker
Ortiz	Schumer	Walsh
Orton	Seastrand	Wamp
Owens	Sensenbrenner	Ward
Oxley	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Packard	Shadegg	Waxman
Pallone	Shaw	Weldon (FL)
Parker	Shays	Weldon (PA)
Pastor	Shuster	Weller
Paxon	Siskis	White
Payne (NJ)	Skaggs	Whitfield
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Wicker
Pelosi	Skelton	Wilson
Peterson (FL)	Slaughter	Wise
Peterson (MN)	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Petri	Smith (NJ)	Woolsey
Pickett	Smith (TX)	Wyden
Pombo	Smith (WA)	Wynn
Pomeroy	Solomon	Young (AK)
Porter	Souder	Young (FL)
Portman	Spence	Zeliff
Poshard	Spratt	Zimmer
Pryce	Stark	
Quillen	Stearns	

NAYS—13

Collins (IL)	Frank (MA)	Vento
Collins (MI)	Gejdenson	Waters
Conyers	Kaptur	Williams
Dellums	Lambert-Lincoln	
Dingell	Scott	

NOT VOTING—2

Johnston	Yates
----------	-------

□ 2020

So section 104 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut). Section 105 of the resolution is now debatable for 20 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CREMEANS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CREMEANS].

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

Today I offer an amendment numbered section 105 to the House rules mandating public access to committee

proceedings. The American people have spoken. Less than 2 months ago I was chosen to represent over a half million Ohioans, and today I become their Representative to this body.

Those Ohioans have every right to know what I do here, and this amendment guarantees that right.

It is appropriate that today, with what is expected to be the largest viewing audience of a House proceeding ever, we allow the watchful eye of the public into our committees as well.

No longer will House business be allowed to take place behind locked and closed doors. From this point forward the public will have the right to view our activities.

Our democracy is built upon having choices. On November 8 we each were chosen by the people to be here today. This amendment simply provides those same men and women with the knowledge of what choices each of us made while we were here.

They deserve to know nothing less.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the House of Representatives is supposed to be the people's House. This is where the business of the American people is conducted, and the more sunshine that we can shine on these Chambers and these committee rooms, the better off the American people will be.

The days of backroom deals are over. We make decisions in this building every day that affect every man, woman, and child in this country, and I think the American people have a right to see those decisions being made. But it is also time to shut out the influence of special interests.

I support this amendment, and I commend those who are offering it, but I do not think it is enough merely to open all meetings to the public. We should be held accountable for all aspects of public life, and that means all political contributions should be disclosed as well. We are required by law to disclose the names of the people who contribute to our political campaigns, and we do. But there are some organizations which have an influence on this body which refuse to disclose who they contribute to, where they get their money from, and I think it is time to change that as well.

Let me give you one example: There is an organization called GOPAC, which, by some accounts, has played a role in electing over 200 Members of this institution. Over the past 9 years, GOPAC has raised between \$10 million and \$20 million. Many of these contributions come from people who have a direct interest in Federal legislation. We do not know who these people are, where this money came from, because GOPAC has not disclosed the list of its past contributors.

With deals like this, is it any wonder that the American people think that this Congress is for sale? I think the public has a right to know who these people are, and we should open our meetings and GOPAC needs to open all of its meetings.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, is this germane to section 105 of the bill that we are debating, this discussion?

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, if I could finish my remarks, I will address my colleague's comments because I think they are good comments. I think it is directly germane.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The remarks should pertain specifically to this portion of the resolution adopting the rules.

Mr. BONIOR. This portion of the bill deals with open meetings, and that deals with open Government. And if we are going to have open Government, we should make sure that the contributions of the people are reviewed, that we know where they come from, especially as they affect legislation. It seems to me if GOPAC has nothing to hide, then they should have nothing to be afraid of. If GOPAC will not come clean and will not open their books, I think the American people have a right to ask, "What are they trying to hide?"

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is not germane.

□ 2030

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is not germane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We will proceed. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CREMEANS] is recognized.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska, the home State of the national champion Nebraska Cornhuskers [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of item No. 5, the sunshine rule for committees, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CREMEANS] for the kind gesture about the Nebraska Cornhuskers and the national championship we just won.

My colleagues, on November 8 the American people sent a clear message to Congress: "No more business as usual, no more backroom deals, no more conducting the people's work in secrecy. Enough is enough."

This measure puts an end to business as usual and ushers in a new era of openness and accountability.

What it requires is simple—from now on all committee and subcommittee meetings will be open to the public and media, except in extraordinary circumstances involving national security or personnel matters.

As my colleague from the State of Washington has said, "The days of the smoke-filled room and closed doors are over." It's time to open the doors, throw open the windows, and let the glorious light of representative democracy shine in.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am all for this. I was not aware that there were many meetings that were not open. Most of the Members I know generally try to get the press to come to their meetings rather than keep them away, but I think it is important that we do this because we not only govern ourselves, we set an example, and I think it is important for us to pass this by a big vote and set an example of openness.

Now my friend referred to GOPAC, and he should not have, apparently under the rules, talked about the substance. But what is important is the example we will set. There are political organizations controlled by Members of this House that are not open. What better way to encourage them to do the right thing? What better way to tell the people of GOPAC that they should be open than for us to follow that same rule?

So, let us set the example, and let GOPAC profit by our example, and let those who are so worried that we would even discuss it on the floor of the House—

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman skates very nicely on thin ice.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much for his acknowledgment of defeat on this issue. We can talk about openness. The point is—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would ask for an additional 30 seconds since I yielded to Tonya Harding over there.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I will say I meant that in a purely metaphorical sense, but let me say I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the example of openness we set here is important. Let GOPAC and every other political organization con-

trolled by Members of the House follow the example because certainly no Member of the House would want to be considered so inconsistent as to vote that we will open meetings that no one wants to come to and then at the same time conceal information that people want to know about. The principle of openness is important. Let us hope that it sets a good example.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], who in his first term led the protest against closed-door meetings.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CREMEANS] for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, when I first got here I came from the State of California, and I represent the State of California where we do have open meeting laws, and we are required to conduct our business in the open, and, as the previous gentleman said, that he was not aware of very many meetings that we have that are closed to the public, but one of the first things that I ran into here as a new Member was a meeting that was closed to the public, and that was the Committee on Ways and Means markup of the tax increase of 1993 which was closed down to the public where not only the public and the press, but other Members, had to leave the room.

Madam Speaker, the argument that was given to me at the time was that Members who are on the panel, on the committee at the time, needed to feel free to speak their mind and to vote their conscience, and that if the public were in the room, they would not be allowed to do that. That is exactly why we need this rules change to pass, so that the public knows exactly what is going on.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], our caucus chairman.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] to come back to the microphone because I would like to ask him about this. I have a copy of a letter which he signed along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and a number of other Members saying, "Let's close the gift loophole for foundations, LSO's and caucuses." This was October of 1993. One of the justifications for this request was to require all Member-affiliated foundations to disclose contributors. Public disclosure of contributions will ensure the integrity of Member-affiliated foundations and silence any criticism that special interest contributions are being made to influence Members of Congress.

I wonder if the gentleman can tell me what difference there is between this worthy instinct that caused him to sign this letter and the situation that applies with GOPAC.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, I think that it is pretty simple. The LSOs were using taxpayer money, and what we were afraid of—

Mr. FAZIO of California. These are the foundations that get—

Mr. POMBO. If the gentleman will let me answer, I will tell him. It was combining. This was my concern, combining, commingling, official money with outside money, and that was my concern, and that is why I signed onto the letter.

Mr. FAZIO of California. The gentleman's request was to get the foundation grants.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has expired.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], who served as cochairman of the Republican freshman class reform task force in the last Congress.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the sunshine rule. The Republican freshman class of 1992 made open meetings a top priority in our reform efforts when we took office 2 years ago. Those of us who came here from States with sunshine laws were shocked to learn that committee chairmen could lock out the American people for almost any reason. We were appalled when a meeting was closed to the public because tax increases were being discussed.

My home State of Florida, the Sunshine State, has some of the toughest open meeting laws in the country. Local and State government improved because of those laws.

It is time to shine a light under the done here at the U.S. Capitol. We can never forget that we work for the American people, and what we do here we do for them.

This rule will ensure the doors remain open, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas (Mrs. LAMBERT LINCOLN).

Mrs. LAMBERT LINCOLN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As has been said earlier in this debate, the best place to dry laundry is still in the sunshine, and the sunshine is still the best place for Congress to air our discussions about legislation.

As we look to the committee structure to help us in deciding, forming, developing, and perfecting legislation, it is very critical for us to keep those

meetings open and open to the public, the very people who pay our salaries and who are directly affected by the laws that we passed. They should certainly be welcome to see Congress in its action.

Congress in committee is certainly Congress in action, and that is where I feel like it is most important as we look to the committee structure as well as the conference reports, the conference committees, to make sure that they do remain open to the public. Debate over these decisions should be held in the public eye.

That is why I strongly support this proposal. This will not threaten our national security interests, because we found that classified information will still be protected, and that is why I support this legislation in opening up to the very people of the public that which we are here to do on their behalf.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], who led the fight for similar legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, in the 1970's, nearly every State in the Union enacted sweeping open public meetings laws. Inspired by Florida's sunshine law and spurred by citizens' organizations such as Common Cause, legislatures across America opened the meetings of virtually every State and local public body to the public.

Congress responded only partially to this demand for reform. It left a gaping loophole in its rules that allowed committee meetings to be closed by simple majority vote for any reason or for no reason.

It is high time for Congress to be subject to the same open meetings requirements that have applied for more than 20 years to the zoning boards and the boards of education in the smallest communities in New Jersey and across the Nation. Justice Louis Brandeis was right when he said sunlight is the best disinfectant. It is time for us to join the 50 States and the communities of this Nation and open our doors and open our windows and let the sun shine in.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I salute the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership to fight on this, because he is right. Government is not a fungus, it can thrive in sunshine. But the point I think the gentleman was trying to make, too, that is connected to this is that the voters are not stupid, and they also know that some of the issues they see that will now be discussed in sunshine and have been in many meetings already, but what they

are going to see in the sunshine, they know those deals may have been cut somewhere else. And that is why you have to let the sunshine in a little brighter.

I think it goes back to the original concept I was talking about of the coin operated legislative machine. If you only get to see what is coming out of the machine, you are only seeing half of the machine. And that is why many of us are very disappointed tonight. We do not have an opportunity to amend this so that we can add sunshine as to what went into the machine, who was putting the coins into the machine, and is there a connection.

I think the gentleman from Michigan made an excellent point, and I only hope next time we get a chance to make an amendment so we see sunshine everywhere.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a new Member from the Buckeye State, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY].

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Ohio and neighboring Congressional District for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I want to stay to the subject matter, because obviously from this side tonight it has strayed I believe from the original intent of what we are talking about, which is sunshine. And with our good parliamentarian BOB WALKER, I don't want to have him rule me out of order, so I am not going to talk about Ralph Nader and his hidden monies, and some of the labor unions and how they have monies, and I come from a labor area that may not necessarily have to be right out in the open sunshine.

I want to stick to the subject matter, which I think we have to do, and that is the fact of talking about the influence of the lobbyists. The lobbyists are there to present people's points of view that they represent back in our districts, but it should be done out in the open.

I was a participant in a closed conference committee when I chaired the Senate Finance Committee in Ohio. We finally came into the 21st century and our colleagues opened the process up in the State. All the States have, and it is time we come into the 21st century. I believe what we are trying to do here everybody does agree with, and urge support.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I yield one and a half minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think we ought to be clear as to what we are talking about here. In my experience I have seen very few, in fact, no closed meetings.

There is a very important concept known as the elephant stick. The ele-

phant stick is a stick that a man carries. It is not Tonya Harding's stick, it is the one that you carry around Dupont Circle, and people say, "What are you doing with that stick?" And the answer is, "Well, it is to keep away all the elephants." They say, "Well, there aren't any elephants at Dupont Circle." Then you say, "My stick works."

Now, my friends on the other side have got a lot of elephant sticks tonight. They are banishing nonexistent elephants at a fast and furious pace. If they want to take credit for it, that is fine. But I have to tell you that these closed meetings they talk about are widely a figment of their imagination.

But I am concerned about openness in this regard: I was told we were going to have a new way of operating. Is it the plan, and I will be glad to yield to any member of the leadership on the other side, is it the plan to finish this rule, and then take up another separate important bill, the compliance bill, at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and then do nothing tomorrow?

Is that the new way of legislating, that we will take up the important question of compliance and its related issues at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, keeping people here on overtime, and then tomorrow have nothing to do at all?

If that is in fact the plan on the other side, I hope the leadership will tell us that, so some of us can suggest we ought to finish this bill, go home for the night, and come in tomorrow and then act on the compliance bill in the sunshine, not at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield one minute to my fellow classmate from the Commonwealth of Virginia the gentleman from Virginia. [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Madam Speaker, I have been in local government for 15 years where we were subject to sunshine laws, and I believe that total access for the public and the media at committee meetings will end once and for all the controversial practice of shutting the doors to meeting rooms and barring the public to facilitate backroom deals with special interests.

This did happen, this is one elephant on May 6th, 1993, when the Democratic majority excluded the public while the Committee on Ways and Means considered a \$270 billion tax increase.

Madam Speaker, meetings to prepare tax bills should be open to the public, as should other legislation that is being drafted, and these other committee meetings should be open as well. Open meetings will discourage backroom deals and increase congressional accountability. The committee sunshine reforms are long overdue. We apply these reforms to many parts of the Executive Branch. It is time we apply them to Congress as well.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and neighbor from Ohio, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my Ohio neighbor for yielding.

Madam Speaker, when I came to Congress in a special election in 1993, the very first measure that I cosponsored was something called the Congressional Sunshine Act. As many in this Chamber will recall, that was to be part of the great reform movement of the 103d Congress. The reforms never happened.

I am very pleased we have the opportunity tonight to act on this measure. I am very pleased to see we have some new converts, who had the chance to cosponsor this bill last year and chose not to.

Madam Speaker, the Sunshine Act was the first bill I cosponsored because it seemed indefensible to me, that with the exceptions listed in this rule, there is a need to hold hearings behind closed doors. What are we afraid of? What scares us so much about public scrutiny?

In a free and open society, shouldn't Congress—the People's House—take the lead in providing access? In giving assurances to our constituents that they'll have a bird's eye view of what is going on in their government?

As we all know, many of the most critical public policy decisions are made at the committee level; we've got to ensure that the American people—the people who sent us here—are part of that process. No reform is more important to a more accountable Congress.

I'm pleased that this measure has finally been given the chance to see the light of day. Now, let's vote to shine that light—freedom's torch—on our own proceedings.

□ 2050

As we all know, the most critical public policy decisions around here are made at the committee level. They affect all Americans. We have to ensure that the American people, the people who sent us here, are part of that decisionmaking process. No reform is more important, I believe, Madam Speaker, to accountability than this measure.

I am pleased this measure has finally been given the chance to see the light of day. Now let us shine that light, freedom's torch, on all of our proceedings.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just conclude by suggesting that this is a good amendment that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CREMEANS] has suggested. I think it is time, I said earlier, that we let the sunshine in on all of our workings in this institution and our committees, but I again invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to

let the sunshine in on those who have contributed through GoPAC to those campaigns.

I think with important legislation coming before us so quickly in this session, and there will be significant legislation that we will have before us in the next 90 days, it is important that the American people understand who contributed, how much, when they contributed, and in what States. We do not have that information now. Every other political campaign committee has to disclose. GoPAC should be no exception.

I would encourage and urge my colleagues in calling for revelations of their contributions. It seems to me that if GoPAC has nothing to hide, then it should have nothing to be afraid of. If GoPAC will not come clean and will not open their books, I think the American people have the right to ask what GoPAC is hiding.

Mr. CREMEANS. Madam Speaker, to close the debate on this vital rule change, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], who led the charge on the issue in the last Congress, fighting for a Sunshine Act in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank all the people who have helped on the Sunshine Act. This is a wonderful moment for many of us, a real moment of true reform.

Almost 2 years ago, Representative RICH POMBO and the Republican freshmen and I spearheaded a freshman Republican class project to put an end to closed-door sessions where public business was done in private. Specifically, and I want to inform the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], we had been outraged when the then chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] escorted the public and the press out of a committee meeting and closed the meeting so no one would see Democrats voting to raise taxes retroactively, while every single Republican opposed them.

As the only freshman on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, it was then my privilege to continue to push this item in the last Congress, but the majority in the last Congress was not friendly to reform. Madam Speaker, the Sunshine Act and other important reforms were bottled up in committee and stalled to seeming death.

However, those reforms did not die. Instead, they are being enacted today by a new majority, and this sunshine rule is the direct descendent of our effort 2 years ago. Now finally the rules will be changed. The public now has the right to see the public's business being conducted. After all, Madam Speaker, the public pays for the process. They should be able to view the process.

Now on this opening day, as reforms begin, let the public watch their public

servants. Let the press report events based on eyewitness accounts. Let the television cameras be our eye on the process, when we cannot be here in Washington, DC.

Madam Speaker, let the sunshine in. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut). All time has expired. The question is on section 105 of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 431, nays 0, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—431

Abercrombie	Clement	Foglietta
Ackerman	Clinger	Foley
Allard	Clyburn	Forbes
Andrews	Coble	Ford
Archer	Coburn	Fowler
Armye	Coleman	Fox
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Frank (MA)
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Franks (CT)
Baker (CA)	Collins (MI)	Franks (NJ)
Baker (LA)	Combest	Frellinghuysen
Baldacci	Condit	Frisa
Ballenger	Conyers	Frost
Barcia	Cooley	Funderburk
Barr	Costello	Furse
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Gallely
Barrett (WI)	Coyne	Ganske
Bartlett	Cramer	Gejdenson
Barton	Crane	Gekas
Bass	Crapo	Gephardt
Bateman	Creameans	Geren
Becerra	Cubin	Gibbons
Bellenson	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Bentsen	Danner	Gillmor
Bereuter	Davis	Gilman
Berman	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Bevill	Deal	Goodlatte
Billbray	DeFazio	Goodling
Billrakis	DeLauro	Gordon
Bishop	DeLay	Goss
Bliley	Dellums	Graham
Blute	Deutsch	Green
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Greenwood
Boehner	Dickey	Gutierrez
Bonilla	Dicks	Gutknecht
Bontor	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Bono	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Borski	Doggett	Hamilton
Boucher	Dooley	Hancock
Brewster	Doolittle	Hansen
Browder	Dorman	Harman
Brown (CA)	Doyle	Hastert
Brown (FL)	Dreier	Hastings (FL)
Brown (OH)	Duncan	Hastings (WA)
Brownback	Dunn	Hayes
Bryant (TX)	Durbin	Hayworth
Bryant (TX)	Edwards	Hefley
Bunn	Ehlers	Hefner
Bunning	Ehrlich	Heineman
Burr	Emerson	Heger
Burton	Engel	Hilleary
Buyer	English	Hilliard
Callahan	Ensign	Hinchee
Calvert	Eshoo	Hobson
Camp	Evans	Hoekstra
Canady	Everett	Hoke
Cardin	Ewing	Holden
Castle	Farr	Horn
Chabot	Fattah	Hostettler
Chambliss	Fawell	Houghton
Chapman	Fazio	Hoyer
Chenoweth	Fields (LA)	Hunter
Christensen	Fields (TX)	Hutchinson
Chrysler	Flner	Hyde
Clay	Flake	Inglis
Clayton	Flanagan	Istook

Jackson-Lee	Minge	Seastrand
Jacobs	Mink	Sensenbrenner
Jefferson	Moakley	Serrano
Johnson (CT)	Mollinari	Shadegg
Johnson (SD)	Mollohan	Shaw
Johnson, E.B.	Montgomery	Shays
Johnson, Sam	Moorhead	Shuster
Johnston	Moran	Sisksy
Jones	Morella	Skaggs
Kanjorski	Murtha	Skeen
Kaptur	Myers	Skelton
Kasich	Myrick	Slaughter
Kelly	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Kennedy (MA)	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (RI)	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Kennelly	Neumann	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Ney	Solomon
Kim	Norwood	Souder
King	Nussle	Spence
Kingston	Oberstar	Spratt
Kleczka	Obey	Stark
Klink	Olver	Stearns
Klug	Ortiz	Stenholm
Knollenberg	Orton	Stockman
Kolbe	Owens	Stokes
LaFalce	Oxley	Studds
LaHood	Packard	Stump
Lambert-Lincoln	Pallone	Stupak
Lantos	Parker	Talent
Largent	Pastor	Tanner
Latham	Paxon	Tate
LaTourette	Payne (NJ)	Tauzin
Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Lazio	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Leach	Peterson (FL)	Tejeda
Levin	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Pickett	Thornberry
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Thornton
Lightfoot	Pomeroy	Thurman
Linder	Porter	Tiahrt
Liptinski	Portman	Torkildsen
Livingston	Poshard	Torres
LoBlundo	Pryce	Torricelli
Lofgren	Quillen	Towns
Longley	Quinn	Trafficant
Lowe	Radanovich	Tucker
Lucas	Rahall	Upton
Luther	Ramstad	Velazquez
Maloney	Rangel	Vento
Manton	Reed	Visclosky
Manzullo	Regula	Volkmer
Markey	Reynolds	Vucanovich
Martinez	Richardson	Waldholtz
Martini	Riggs	Walker
Mascara	Rivers	Walsh
Matsui	Roberts	Wamp
McCarthy	Roemer	Ward
McCollum	Rogers	Waters
McCreery	Rohrabacher	Watt (NC)
McDade	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McDermott	Rose	Weldon (FL)
McHale	Roth	Weldon (PA)
McHugh	Roukema	Weller
McInnis	Roybal-Allard	White
McIntosh	Royce	Whitfield
McKeon	Rush	Wicker
McKinney	Sabo	Williams
McNulty	Salmon	Wilson
Meehan	Sanders	Wise
Meek	Sanford	Wolf
Menendez	Sawyer	Woolsey
Metcalf	Saxton	Wyden
Meyers	Scarborough	Wynn
Mfume	Schaefer	Young (AK)
Mica	Schiff	Young (FL)
Miller (CA)	Schroeder	Zeliff
Miller (FL)	Schumer	Zimmer
Mineta	Scott	

NOT VOTING—2

Gunderson	Yates
-----------	-------

□ 2107

So, section 105 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Section 106 of the resolution is now debatable for 20 minutes. The gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman at this time for an amendment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. WATERS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her inquiry.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk in this section. This is a section that increases the vote requirement for raising taxes from a simple majority to a three-fifths majority. I wish to protect Social Security from being cut by a simple majority. Why can I not add this amendment at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman should be advised that under the rule that amendment is not in order at this time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, last year's budget debate proved how easy it is for Congress to impose higher taxes and increased spending on the American people. Today we take a significant step toward making tax increases infinitely more difficult.

The goal of this new rule is twofold. First, it will require three-fifths majority vote for tax increase measures and amendments. Additionally, it will place a prohibition on retroactive tax increases.

Had the three-fifths requirement been in effect during the 103d Congress, the Clinton tax increase would not have passed. Instead of it passing by only one vote and with the support of only one party, a clear bipartisan consensus would have been required.

The retroactive tax increases, which added insult to injury, would not have been possible had the new rule been in effect. Taxes would not have been raised for 8 retroactive months for millions of hard working Americans, small business owners and senior citizens.

If Members believe Americans are undertaxed, they will not favor these proposals. But if they believe, as I do, we must be cautious about tax increases and they were appalled by the spectacle of last-minute deals which accompanied the 1993 tax increase, they ought to support this reform.

The largest tax increase in American history was passed August 5, 1993, by just one vote and with no bipartisan support. That will not happen in this new Congress. A tax increase enacted could only happen in the future if it

has the broad support of Democrats and Republicans working together when all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for bringing this amendment to our attention.

As you know, this amendment to the House Rules provides for a three-fifths or 60 percent vote as a necessity to pass any income tax increase. I first introduced this concept in the form of a rule change on Tax Freedom Day, May 8, 1991. I recognized then, as I do now, that our choices in methods used to balance the budget involve two very difficult types of decisions. First, do we raise taxes, or second, do we hold down spending to bring the budget into balance?

History shows quite clearly that when faced with those two difficult options, this House has historically opted to increase taxes. Why? Simply because it has always been the easier of the two.

For example, in 1990, in the name of deficit reduction, the House leadership went off to Andrews Air Force Base with President Bush and his staff and, in the name of deficit reduction, arrived at an agreement to increase taxes to once and for all put this deficit problem behind us. It didn't work.

So then, in 1993, once again in the name of deficit reduction, this time led by President Clinton and the Democrat leadership, Congress foisted the biggest tax increase in this country's history upon the American people to once and for all get the deficit reduction problem behind us. It didn't work either.

The fact of the matter is that, in 1990, the Andrews Air Force Base tax deal was put together because we had projected a horrendous \$170 billion deficit by 1995. Today, after two tax increases and our failure to hold down spending, the deficit at this year's end is projected to be \$180 billion, that's right, \$10 billion more than had been projected previously in 1990.

Once again, I point out that this is after the two largest tax increases in our country's history. We're not fooling anyone. Congress has always taken the easy way out and we have never solved our deficit problem by raising taxes.

The problem, as one Joint Economic Committee study shows, is that for each dollar in tax increases we have historically increased spending by \$1.59. Therefore, it is clear that the route of least resistance, increasing taxes, has not worked. This rule change will tend to put better balance in that process.

Some have indicated a concern regarding the constitutionality of this measure. Let me put those concerns to rest. I would like to quote from an article that appeared in the Washington

Times on December 20, 1994 by Bruce Fein.

Supermajority voting rules are constitutional and legislative commonplaces. \* \* \*

The U.S. Supreme Court blessed the constitutionality of supermajority restraints on the tax and spending propensities of government in *Gordon vs. Lance* (1971). At issue were provisions of West Virginia laws that prevented political subdivisions from incurring bonded indebtedness or increasing tax rates beyond limits fixed in the West Virginia Constitution without the approval of 60 percent of the voters in a referendum election. Writing for the majority, Chief Justice Warren Burger stressed the political incentive for prodigality when the cost can be saddled on future generations without any political voice: "It must be remembered that in voting to issue bonds voters are committing, in part, the credit of infants and of generations yet unborn, and some restriction on such commitment is not an unreasonable demand."

The burden of federal income tax rate increases, unlike bonded indebtedness, must be fully borne by current voters. But they typically are targeted at a minority slice of the electorate, such as those increases championed by the Clinton administration and enacted by the 103d Congress. And the revenues generated by tax rate increases are characteristically dedicated to spending programs that benefit voters who escaped the tax increase—for example, food stamps, Medicaid, welfare, housing, job training, education, and farm subsidies. Mr. Solomon's 60 percent supermajority voting rule for tax rate increases is thus a healthy corrective to the natural inclination of simple majorities to fasten an unfair proportion of the costs of government on minorities. The same is true regarding Mr. Solomon's recommended ban on retroactive rate increases that invariably mult a small percentage of the electorate.

Support this rule change. It is an essential element in restructuring our fiscal process.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the *RECORD* the article from the *Washington Times* of December 20, 1994 entitled "Solomon's Wise House Discipline" on this subject, as follows:

[From the *Washington Times*, Dec. 20, 1994]

#### SOLOMON'S WISE HOUSE DISCIPLINE

(BY BRUCE FEIN)

House Rules Committee chairman-designate Gerald Solomon deserves laurels for proposed rule changes that would counteract the propensity of legislators to levy unfair or oppressive taxes to fund run-away spending. Mr. Solomon will recommend to the 104th Congress rules that would prohibit retroactive increases in federal income tax rates, and would require at least 60 percent House majorities to approve prospective rate jumps.

These types of procedural checks on majoritarian foolishness or over-reaching are neither unconstitutional nor novel; they represent praiseworthy efforts to overcome skewed political incentives that systematically divorce government taxes and spending from public sentiments or the nation's future welfare. Indeed, the House and Senate should require supermajorities to approve legislation that would increase tax levies of any sort (not just federal income tax rates), increase federal government spending, or impose substantial spending mandates on states, localities or private enterprise.

Supermajority voting rules are constitutional and legislative commonplaces. For instance, two-thirds majorities in both houses of Congress are required to override a presidential veto or to propose constitutional amendments, and a two-thirds Senate vote is required to ratify treaties or to convict of an impeachable offense. Many state constitutions prohibit or tightly circumscribe the power of the legislature to levy new taxes or to increase bonded indebtedness. And U.S. Senate rules require supermajorities to end filibusters or to waive balanced budget requisites for proposed legislation. Thus, the Uruguay Round GATT implementing bill necessitated a 60 percent majority to waive the Senate's balanced budget rule.

The U.S. Supreme Court blessed the constitutionality of supermajority restraints on the tax and spending propensities of government in *Gordon vs. Lance* (1971). At issue were provisions of West Virginia laws that prevented political subdivisions from incurring bonded indebtedness or increasing tax rates beyond limits fixed in the West Virginia Constitution without the approval of 60 percent of the voters in a referendum election. Writing for the majority, Chief Justice Warren Burger stressed the political incentive for prodigality when the costs can be saddled on future generations without any political voice. "It must be remembered that in voting to issue bonds voters are committing, in part, the credit of infants and of generations yet unborn, and some restriction on such commitment is not an unreasonable demand."

The burden of federal income tax rate increases, unlike bonded indebtedness, must be fully borne by current voters. But they typically are targeted at a minority slice of the electorate, such as those increases championed by the Clinton administration and enacted by the 103rd Congress. And the revenues generated by tax rate increases are characteristically dedicated to spending programs that benefit voters who escaped the tax increase—for example, food stamps, Medicaid, welfare, housing, job training, education and farm subsidies. Mr. Solomon's 60 percent supermajority voting rule for tax rate increases is thus a healthy corrective to the natural inclination of simple majorities to fasten an unfair proportion of the costs of government on minorities. The same is true regarding Mr. Solomon's recommended ban on retroactive rate increases that invariably mult a small percentage of the electorate.

Experience teaches that spending bills are characteristically spendthrift. The reasons are twofold: The benefits are ordinarily concentrated and stimulate strong lobbying efforts by the beneficiaries while the costs are ordinarily diffuse. The logarithmic rocketing of Social Security spending illustrates that political phenomenon. It speaks volumes that in 1988 when Congress enacted a catastrophic health insurance law for Medicare recipients fully funded by risk-based premiums, the elderly immediately screamed for and obtained its repeal because they believed the benefits were not worth the price if they were the payors. In other words, Medicare recipients would oppose the expansion of Medicare spending if they were required to bear the cost. Spiralling government spending also is politically attractive because a hefty portion of the cost through budget deficits can be fastened\* \* \*

[From the *Washington Times*, Dec. 20, 1994]

#### TAX INCREASE LIMITATIONS

If the tax and spend profligacy of Congress seemed confined to some special, urgent, and transitory national need, then the justifica-

tion for supermajority voting rules would be weak. But the profligacy seems endemic to contemporary politics; the federal budget has invariably been in deficit for a quarter of a century, and has become so habitual to lawmakers that deficits less than \$200 billion are oxymoronically styled "austerity."

Federal mandates that require states, localities, or private enterprise to incur substantial costs to provide benefits to constituents or employees should also confront supermajority voting rules. They are more alluring to Congress than the most charming temptress; the mandates gain the federal lawmakers popularity with the beneficiaries while escaping the unpopularity of increased taxes to cover the costs of service.

The justifications for the presidential veto elaborated by Alexander Hamilton in *Federalist 73* equally support the wisdom of Mr. Solomon's proposed rules of legislative self-restraint. Hamilton praised the veto as a "salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to guard the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, or of an impulse unfriendly to the public good . . ." Acknowledging that the veto might prevent the enactment of good laws, he rejoined: "[T]his objection will have little weight with those who can properly estimate the mischief of that inconstancy and mutability in the laws, which form the greatest blemish in the character and genius of our governments. They will consider every institution calculated to restrain the excess of lawmaking . . . as much more likely to do good than harm. . . ."

Mr. Solomon's proposed supermajority voting rule for tax rate increases is a commendable self-imposed legislative complement to the constitutional veto power designed to block improvident laws. Indeed, the rule should be broadened to reach all bills that would raise taxes or spending. It should be remembered that the Constitution itself is a testament against simple majoritarian rule; it thus smacks of obtuseness to interpret that anti-majoritarian charter as militating against congressional self-restraint in lawmaking.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California. [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment I have at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the amendment is not in order, and the gentlewoman is not recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment at this time. The gentlewoman has been recognized to speak on the section that is under debate.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the American people I would like them to pay attention, watch closely. I have an amendment to offer now but I cannot.

Republicans ran saying they wanted to open up the congressional process. Now they are in charge, but look what has happened. Today we have no chance to offer our proposals to change House rules.

If Republicans believe it is fair to require a three-fifths majority to raise taxes, why can I not offer an amendment to require the same majority in

order to protect Social Security? I am ready to offer it today, but I cannot. The Republicans will not allow this debate today.

If the American people voted for change, I am not sure that is what they are getting. This type of reform is not what the people had in mind last November, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to protect seniors, many of whom live in fear of losing their only income source. If Republicans want to use the rules to further their political ends, we Democrats would like to use that means to protect senior citizens.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. I urge my colleagues to re-read the U.S. Constitution, the history of the Constitutional Convention, and the Federalist Papers. Madison, Jefferson, Hamilton and Jay were correct. The right decision was made and incorporated into our Constitution. All bills are adopted by simple majority of both Houses except for overriding a Presidential veto impeachment, and amending the Constitution. This resolution would create the requirement of a supermajority to pass legislation not specified in the Constitution. Notwithstanding the fact that this is a bad idea, it is also unconstitutional.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

□ 2120

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

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that on this first day of a Republican Speaker in 40 years, a Speaker who is a learned historical and a college professor of history, who spoke eloquently of Ben Franklin and the checks and balances and the Great Compromise that was necessary to allow us to build a Constitution that has lasted for 208 years, it is ironic our Speaker is willing to lead Members, including 73 new Members, over a constitutional cliff. He knows this greatest of constitutions clearly specifies five instances where a supermajority is necessary for a decision.

Except for the ultimate penalty of removing a Member of the branch who has been duly elected by the people in his or her district, all of those other four represent veto override, treaty ratification, impeachment, ratification or rejection of a personnel or action by a coequal branch.

It is ironic for all of the years that the Senate, the other body, has required a supermajority to close debate. They never dared to suggest that once debate was closed it took more than a simple majority, one-half plus one, to make the decision.

And the ultimate irony, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican majority does not need to do this. They have the majority. They can simply vote "no" and accomplish what is there.

So one can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that section 106 is a deliberate effort to attack the Constitution which is so strongly lauded here and which we all took an oath to uphold.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, what a long way we have come in dealing straight with the American people.

Less than 17 months ago, this body cast aside basic fairness and imposed unprecedented retroactive tax increases. American taxpayers were aghast to learn that the tax increases were made effective to a date before President Clinton had even assumed office!

Today, we are restoring credibility with the American people. If this proposed rule is adopted, it will be against the rules of the House to consider any legislation that contains a retroactive tax increase.

In the last Congress, I authored House Resolution 2147 to incorporate this "taxpayer-protection" provision in our House rules. All told, 165 of our colleagues either cosponsored that resolution or signed Discharge Petition No. 11.

Today, thanks in no small part to Chairman SOLOMON, we are finally getting our chance to adopt this rule change.

Mr. Speaker, last summer, while not speaking on the wisdom of retroactive taxes, the Supreme Court gave Congress a green light to raise taxes in this patently unfair manner, putting all tax-paying Americans at risk of having their own fiscal houses thrown in disorder.

It is not only appropriate—but absolutely necessary in light of the Court's ruling—that the House take this action to stop retroactive taxes.

I urge all of my colleagues, in a bipartisan way to vote for this important reform. The American taxpayers deserve nothing less.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, civilization depends upon civility, and civility rests upon an implicit trust that we each abide by a shared sense of bounds, of what is within the rules. Each of us must be able to expect of the others that we will play by the rules, and not play with the rules.

The proposed rule does violence to this essential aspect of a civil society. It is a proposal to go beyond the bounds, to play with the rules, instead of by them. And in a most uncivil way, it would abuse the discretion given this

House by the Constitution to determine the rules of its proceedings, by using the rules of the House to subvert part of the Constitution: the principle of majority rule that is central to the operation of the legislative branch.

The Republicans say this proposed rules change makes the difference between them and the Democrats clear. True. But it is not the difference they assert.

Republicans say this rule change makes it clear that they are opposed to tax increases. But this rule has much more to do with the Constitution than with taxes.

What it really makes clear is that for the sake of political posturing the Republicans are willing to trample on the Constitution which has guided us for 206 years.

The Constitution is the most fundamental statement of American values, the very charter of our democracy. The oath of office we took this afternoon was to support and defend the Constitution and to bear true faith and allegiance to it. The first responsibility of our job in Congress is to honor that charter and remain true to its basic principles.

The gentleman from New York, the new chairman of the Rules Committee, has written that the Constitution says the House may write its own rules. Yes. And the gentleman has quoted an 1892 Supreme Court decision, *United States versus Ballin*, which says this rule-making power "is absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal" so long as it does "not ignore constitutional constraints or violate fundamental rights."

But there's the rub. The rulemaking power of the House does not give us a license to steal other substantive provisions of the Constitution, especially not one so central as the principle of majority rule.

The gentleman from New York conveniently failed to point out that a unanimous Supreme Court in that very same case determined that one constitutional constraint that limits the rulemaking power is the requirement that a simple majority is sufficient to pass regular legislation in Congress. To quote the Court:

The general rule of all parliamentary bodies is that, when a quorum is present, the act of a majority of the quorum is the act of the body. This has been the rule for all time, except so far as in any given case the terms of the organic act under which the body is assembled have prescribed specific limitations. \* \* \* No such limitation is found in the Federal Constitution, and therefore the general law of such bodies obtains.

The Court expressed the same understanding as recently as 1983, when, in *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha*, it stated:

\* \* \* Art. II, sect. 2, requires that two-thirds of the Senators present concur in the Senate's consent to a treaty, rather than the simple majority required for passage of legislation.

This principle, while not written into the text of the Constitution, was explicitly adopted by the Constitutional Convention. It was explicitly defended in *The Federalist*, the major contemporary explanation of the Framers' intent. It was followed by the first Congress on its first day, and by every Congress for every day since then. And, as I've already indicated, this principle has been explicitly found by the Supreme Court to be part of our constitutional framework.

The Framers were very much aware of the difference between a supermajority and a simple majority. They met in Philadelphia against the historical backdrop of the Articles of Confederation, which required a supermajority in Congress for many actions, including the raising and spending of money. It was the paralysis of national government caused by the supermajority requirement, more than any other single cause, that led to the convening of the Constitutional Convention.

In that Philadelphia Convention, the delegates repeatedly considered, and rejected, proposals to require a supermajority for action by Congress, either on all subjects or on certain subjects. In only five instances did they specify something more than a majority vote. These are for overriding a veto, ratifying a treaty, removing officials from office, expelling a Representative or Senator, and proposing amendments to the Constitution. Amendments to the Constitution later added two others: restoring certain rights of former rebels, and determining the existence of a Presidential disability.

The records of the debates in Philadelphia make it clear that in all other instances the writers of the Constitution assumed that a simple majority would suffice for passage of legislation. The text of the Constitution itself also indicates as much. Why, otherwise, would it provide that the Vice President votes in the Senate only when "they be equally divided"? Because, as Hamilton explained in *Federalist* No. 68, it was necessary "to secure at all times the possibility of a definitive resolution of the body." Certainly the Framers didn't intend the Senate to operate by the principles of majority rule, but not the House.

Indeed, majority rule is such a fundamental part of a democratic legislature that the Founders saw no need to state it explicitly—just as they didn't bother to spell out that it is the top vote-getter, not the second-place finisher, who wins a race for Congress. But each is an inherent element of our constitutional framework.

The reason behind the principle of simple majority rule was stated clearly in *The Federalist*—one of the five

books which the new Speaker has urged every Member to read. In *Federalist* No. 58, James Madison wrote:

It has been said that more than a majority ought to have been required for a quorum, and in particular cases, if not in all, more than a majority of a quorum for a decision. That some advantages might have resulted from such a precaution, cannot be denied. It might have been an additional shield to some particular interests, and another obstacle generally to hasty and partial measures. But these considerations are outweighed by the inconveniences in the opposite scale. In all cases where justice or the general good might require new laws to be passed, or active measures to be pursued, the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed. *It would be no longer the majority that would rule; the power would be transferred to the minority.* Were the defensive privilege limited to particular cases, an interested minority might take advantage of it to screen themselves from equitable sacrifices to the general weal, or in particular emergencies to extort unreasonable indulgences. (Emphasis added.)

And again, remember that it was a lack of effective national government, produced by the minority-rule effects of the supermajority provisions of the Articles of Confederation, that led to the convention that wrote the Constitution.

Some argue that a three-fifths requirement to raise taxes would be like a two-thirds vote requirement to suspend the rules and pass a bill, or the 60-vote requirement to end debate in the Senate. Wrong. Those rules address procedural steps. A bill not approved under suspension of the rules in the House can be reconsidered and passed by a simple majority. After debate is over in the Senate, only a simple majority is required to pass any bill.

So this proposed rule is not like any rule adopted in the 206 years in which we have operated under our Constitution. As 13 distinguished professors of constitutional law recently said in urging the House to reject this rule:

This proposal violates the explicit intentions of the Framers. It is inconsistent with the Constitution's language and structure. It departs sharply from traditional congressional practice. It may generate constitutional litigation that will encourage Supreme Court intervention in an area best left to responsible congressional decision.

I ask unanimous consent to include after my remarks in the RECORD the law professors' full memorandum.

So, if this rule is so clearly unconstitutional, why propose it?

The answer is simple. This rule is a gimmick. It is an act of high posturing. And as much as the Republicans may wish to seem opposed to tax increases, it is unseemly to do so at the expense of the Constitution.

This rule itself would violate the Constitution, and voting for it would

violate our oath to uphold the Constitution. Those are, obviously, serious matters.

Beyond that, if we start down this road of making it harder for Congress to carry out some of its responsibilities, who knows where it will end. Two weeks ago, Rep. Solomon sent out a "dear colleague" letter enclosing and endorsing a newspaper column saying that this supermajority requirement should be broadened to apply to all taxes and fees; to any spending increase; and to any bill imposing any costs on any type of private business—for example, the Clean Air Act.

So let's be clear that if we vote today for a supermajority for one type of legislation, in the future we'll be voting on extending that bad idea to other types of legislation, too. And with it, we slide measurably toward the empowerment of a minority against which Madison warned.

Of course, the supermajority idea might not stop at a three-fifths vote. If the idea here is to make it hard to raise taxes, do we really want it to be easier to go to war than to raise taxes? So perhaps we should have a rule requiring unanimous consent to declare war.

Is any of that nonsense really less preposterous—less an assault on the basic American values of democracy and majority rule—than the rule that is before us today?

The idea of a three-fifths majority to raise tax rates was first proposed in the Republican Contract with America as a part of a balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution, not as a rules change. For those of you who are serious about this idea, that is the appropriate and lawful way to do it—through an amendment to the Constitution.

This proposal raises profound constitutional issues. Yet, there have been no hearings. And debate here tonight on the floor is limited to all of twenty minutes. That is a shamelessly cavalier approach to a matter of such importance. It belies its advocates' claims to a thoughtful and open deliberative process in this House.

What is at stake here is the Constitution. Have respect for this foundation document of our democracy. Don't return us to the failed approach of the Articles of Confederation. Don't subvert the Constitution's basic principles. And don't ask us to break the oath of office we just took.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

To: The Honorable Newt Gingrich.  
 From: (Institutional affiliations are for purposes of identification only) Bruce Ackerman, Professor of Law and Political Science, Yale University; Akhil Amar, Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Philip Bobbitt, Professor of Law, University of Texas Law School; Richard Fallon, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School; Paul Kahn, Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Philip Kurland, Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School; Douglas Laycock, Professor of Law, University of Texas Law School; Sanford Levinson, Professor of Law, University of Texas Law School; Frank Michelman, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School; Michael Perry, Professor of Law, Northwestern University School of Law; David Strauss, Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School; Cass Sunstein, Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School; Harry Wellington, Dean, New York Law School.

We urge you to reconsider your proposal to amend the House Rules to require a three-fifths vote to enact laws that increase income taxes.<sup>1</sup> This proposal violates the explicit intentions of the Framers. It is inconsistent with the Constitution's language and structure. It departs sharply from traditional congressional practice. It may generate constitutional litigation that will encourage Supreme Court intervention in an area best left to responsible congressional decision.

Unless the proposal is withdrawn now, it will serve as an unfortunate precedent for the proliferation of supermajority rules on a host of different subjects in the future. Over time, we will see the continuing erosion of our central constitutional commitments to majority rule and deliberative democracy.

#### 1. ORIGINAL INTENTIONS

The present proposal is unprecedented, but it was anticipated by Madison in a remarkably prescient discussion in the *Federalist Papers*—a document that you rightly urge your colleagues to reread with care. *Federalist No. 58* is explicitly directed to complaints about the constitutional design of the House. It concludes by confronting an objection "against the number made competent for legislative business." Madison's description perfectly fits the present proposal:

It has been said that more than a majority ought to have been required for a quorum, and in particular cases, if not in all, more than a majority of a quorum for a decision.<sup>2</sup>

Madison rejects this suggestion, but only after recognizing that it serves certain values—notably it might serve as a "shield to some particular interests, and another obstacle to hasty and partial measures."<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, he finds these considerations "outweighed" by more fundamental ones:

In all cases where justice or the general good might require new laws to be passed, or active measures to be pursued, the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed. It would be no longer the majority that would rule; the power would be transferred to the minority. Were the defensive privilege limited to particular cases, an interested minority might take advantage of it to screen themselves from equitable sacrifices to the general weal, or in particular emergencies to extort unreasonable indulgences.<sup>4</sup>

Madison's audience understood the backdrop of these remarks. The Articles of Confederation required Congressional super-

majorities for specially important subjects, including the raising and spending of money.<sup>5</sup> But the Philadelphia Convention decisively rejected such a system, repeatedly voting down key proposals that imposed supermajorities in legislative fields of special sensitivity.<sup>6</sup> In *Federalist No. 22*, Alexander Hamilton explicitly defended this decision to break with the supermajority system of the Articles, insisting that ordinary legislation should not "give a minority a negative upon the majority."<sup>7</sup>

The Founders' rejection of selective supermajority rule for specially sensitive legislation was neither casual nor peripheral to their larger design. Instead, it was based on practical experience and careful consideration of the arguments on both sides. Nothing in the past two centuries of our history authorizes a simple majority of the House to take unilateral action and restrike the constitutional balance.

#### 2. CONSTITUTIONAL TEXT AND STRUCTURE

Of course, there are times when the Constitution weighs the balance differently. On seven different occasions, it stipulates a supermajority requirement.<sup>8</sup> But it never makes three-fifths, rather than two-thirds, a numerical hurdle of special significance. More fundamentally, it never places any special obstacles on the enactment of ordinary legislation signed by the President.<sup>9</sup> As the *Chadha* case teaches, this carefully considered lawmaking system can only be changed by constitutional amendment.<sup>10</sup>

If the present proposal were legitimate, it would set a precedent for endless proliferation of supermajority requirements: If income tax increases can be subject to a special rule, why not national defense or civil rights? Since a 60 percent rule has no special place in the constitutional text, why not 55 or 73 percent? Indeed, the present proposal already suggests how easily this logic may be extended. It not only contains a three-fifths rule for income tax increases, but imposes a kind of unanimity rule for the special category of "retroactive" taxes—already propelling us down the path to proliferation.

It is true that the constitution gives each house the right "to determine the rules of its proceedings." This sensible housekeeping provision, however, does not authorize the House to violate fundamental principles of constitutional democracy. It simply authorizes it to organize itself for informed and efficient debate and decision.

Indeed, we have no objection to supermajority rules so long as they fit comfortably within this rationale. Consider, for example, the House rule that requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules for the expeditious consideration of legislation. This supermajority requirement transparently serves the interest of the efficient organization of decisionmaking. If it were too easy to suspend House rules there would be undue disruption of the normal system of deliberation and decision; but if it were impossible, the House would be incapable of responding to emergencies. Hence, a two-thirds rule is a perfectly appropriate way to exercise the House's power "to determine the rules of its proceedings."

But the present proposal cannot be justified as a general procedure aiming to induce deliberative decisionmaking. It is simply based upon a substantive and selective judgment that income tax increases—and only these increases—are unwise and should not be encouraged. Such opinions are entirely defensible, but they do not fall within the limited constitutional authority granted each house over its "proceedings."

There is much more than language at stake. House rules are enacted on the first day of the session. Hence substantive judgments made in the rules cannot be the result of serious deliberation by the Members. House rules are made unilaterally without consultation with the Senate. Hence substantive judgments cannot be reached after the complex bicameral process contemplated by Article I. House rules are made by a bare majority. Hence the enactment of supermajority rules provides a mechanism to transform a narrow majority into a supermajority at a time when the process of substantive deliberation has not yet seriously begun. The introduction of substantive policies into procedural rules, then, undermines the system of deliberative democracy established at the Founding.

Defenders of the supermajority rule have minimized its threat to constitutional values by suggesting "that the same House majority that votes to impose a three-fifths rule could as easily vote to rescind that rule if it truly wanted to raise taxes."<sup>11</sup> But this claim is simply false. Once the sixty-percent provision is on the books, its operation would apply to tax legislation unless the House agreed to suspend its rules. But we have seen that this can only occur after a two-thirds vote. House traditions even given the Speaker unilateral authority to refuse to recognize a motion to suspend the rules even if two-thirds wished to allow the majority to have its say.<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, even if the House wished to reconsider its opening day decision to impose a three-fifths rule, it would have great difficulty doing so. Such an effort normally requires the prior approval of the House Rules Committee, whose composition does not mirror the House as a whole. The only remaining method for reconsideration will be the notoriously difficult procedure by which 218 members may finally force the Rules Committee to "discharge" a measure that it has bottled up.<sup>13</sup> While 218 is an absolute majority of the whole House, requiring such a large number is inconsistent with Madison's insistence that "a majority of a quorum" should suffice for ordinary legislation. By the time this mechanism could be employed, moreover, the chance to vote on pending tax measures may have long since passed.

There is no escape, then, from the conclusion that the proposed rule strikes at the heart of the system of deliberative democracy established by the Constitution.

#### 3. CONGRESSIONAL PRACTICE

The sixty-percent proposal seems to be based on an analogy with the Senate's practice on cloture. Whatever the constitutional merits of the filibuster rule, it does not provide a sound precedent. By making it hard to stop filibusters, the cloture rule provides for a more fully informed discussion, and falls within the rationale of the Constitution's grant of rule-making power to both Houses. In contrast to this general and procedural norm, the House proposal is selective and substantive and is simply beyond the scope of its rule-making authority.

It is quite true that, since 1985, Congress has passed new rules requiring a three-fifths majority in the Senate as part of the budget reconciliation process.<sup>14</sup> While these provisions are vulnerable to our constitutional objection, they are such recent innovations that they can hardly count as a "tradition" which demands constitutional respect.

#### 4. SUPREME COURT REVIEW

We believe that the constitutional violation is sufficiently plain and fundamental to

Footnotes at end of article.

warrant action by the Supreme Court. As the Court cautioned in *United States v. Ballin*, House rules may not "ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights."<sup>15</sup> The Court went on to elaborate principles of constitutional interpretation of decisive significance in the present case:

[T]he general rule of all parliamentary bodies is that, when a quorum is present, the act of a majority of the quorum is the act of the body. This has been the rule for all time, except so far as in any given case the terms of the organic act under which the body is assembled have prescribed specific limitations.<sup>16</sup>

We emphasize, however, that it would be far better to rethink the issue at this stage than invite litigation. Not only would litigation lead to a protracted period of uncertainty, but it would destroy a valuable House tradition of constitutional self-restraint in the exercise of its rulemaking powers which has served the country well for two centuries. It would be far better to redeem this tradition now without the need of an unnecessary confrontation with the Court.

Indeed, both the Senate and President would also find themselves drawn into the controversy. Both of these branches would be required to define their own constitutional responsibilities if a tax measure gained the support of a House majority that fell short of three-fifths. The resulting confusion would undermine fundamental commitments to the rule of law, and would predictably draw the Supreme Court into the affair.

Under applicable precedent, Representatives have standing to challenge basic law-making practices which dilute the voting power that the Constitution grants to them and their constituents.<sup>17</sup> Other cases establish that the Supreme Court will intervene on the merits to protect the integrity of the deliberative and democratic process established by the Constitution.<sup>18</sup>

But the better part of wisdom is to avoid confrontation and return to the foundations of deliberative democracy laid down by Madison in the *Federalist Papers*.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Sec. 106. Limitation on Tax Increases: (a) No bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report carrying an income tax rate increase could be considered as passed or agreed to unless so determined by a vote of at least three-fifths of the House. No measure or amendment could be considered that contains a retroactive income tax rate increase.

See p. 3 for our analysis of the second sentence of this proposal.

<sup>2</sup> *Federalist* No. 58, p. 396 (Ed. Jacob E. Cooke, Wesleyan University Press: 1961) (emphasis supplied).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 397.

<sup>5</sup> *Articles of Confederation*, art. 9, para. 6 (1781).

<sup>6</sup> These proposals sought to impose a two-thirds rule on legislation dealing with commerce and navigation—fields which were understood to be sensitive precisely because they characteristically involved taxation. 5 Johnathan Elliot, *Debates on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* 489-92, 552 (Philadelphia: 1941).

<sup>7</sup> *Federalist* No. 22, supra n. 2, at 140. Like Madison, Hamilton counseled that "much ill may be produced by the power of hindering that which is necessary from being done, and of keeping affairs in the same unfavorable posture in which they appended to stand at a particular period." *Id.* at 141.

<sup>8</sup> The original Constitution identifies five contexts for supermajority rule—when overriding Presidential vetoes, ratifying treaties, proposing constitutional amendments, convicting on impeachments, and expelling members from the House or Senate. Two more are added by the Fourteenth Amendment (two-thirds of both Houses required to remove disability of rebellious officeholders) and the Twenty-fifth Amendment (two-thirds of both Houses required to establish Presidential disability to dis-

charge office). In addition, the Twelfth Amendment requires an absolute majority of the relevant chamber in cases where no candidate for President or Vice-President has won a majority in the Electoral College.

<sup>9</sup> The textual commitment to majority rule is also expressed by the grant of a vote to the Vice-President in those cases in which the Senators are "equally divided." U.S. Constitution, art. 1, sec. 3.

<sup>10</sup> *I.N.S. v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983).

<sup>11</sup> Letter of Roger Pilon to the Editor of the *New York Times*, December 16, 1994, p. 38, col. 8.

<sup>12</sup> See Charles Tiefer, *Congressional Practice and Procedure: A Reference, Research and Legislative Guide* 299 (Greenwood Press, 1989).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 314-26.

<sup>14</sup> See Kate Stith, *Rewriting the Fiscal Constitution: The Case of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings*, 76 *Calif. L. Rev.* 593, 666 (1988). These rules were expanded in scope in P.L. 101-508, sec. 13208, 104 Stat 1388-619 (1990). As in previous cases, Congress made it clear that such statutory creation of supermajority rules involved "an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate." See sec 13305, 104 Stat 1388-627 (1990). See also, P.L. 103-66, sec. 14004, 107 Stat. 685 (1993).

<sup>15</sup> *United States v. Ballin*, 144 U.S. 1, 5 (1891).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>17</sup> See *Michel v. Anderson*, 14 F3d 623 (D.C. Cir. 1994), affirming 817 F. Supp. 126 (D.D.C. 1993). See also, *Kennedy v. Sampson*, 511 F2d 430 (D.C. Cir. 1974); *Barnes v. Kline*, 759 F2d 21, 25-30 (D.C. Cir. 1985), vacated as moot sub nom *Burke v. Barnes*, 107 S. Ct. 734 (1987) (reaffirming *Kennedy* analysis of standing); Laurence Tribe, *American Constitutional Law* 152-54 (2d ed. 1988); Bator et al., *Hart & Wechsler's Federal Courts and the Federal System* 157 n. 7 (3d ed. 1988).

<sup>18</sup> See *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983); *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486 (1969).

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE].

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, mugging a senior citizen and stealing their money will land you in jail. Why then is it so easy for Congress to raise taxes and spend more money out of the pockets of hard-working American people?

Raising taxes, sending your money to Washington, DC, should not be simple.

The newly elected Congress was given a message by the American people that the days of tax and of spend are over.

I am in favor of the proposal of requiring a 60-percent majority in order to raise taxes so that the taxing ways of Congress are gone forever.

This will restore the fiscal discipline by which every American family must live, spend less, save more, and balance your budget.

The simple solutions of the past have cost Americans millions and cost the taxpayers thousands of jobs. People work hard for their money, and it should be hard for Congress to take that from them.

I urge my colleagues to require a 60-percent vote to approve all tax increases.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this unconstitutional measure.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise in opposition to the requirement for a super-majority of three-fifths of the House of Representatives to increase income taxes.

This measure may sound good to our constituents. Many Americans are upset at all of their taxes: Federal income taxes, State income taxes, sales taxes, and property taxes. I share their sentiments it is imperative that we provide middle-class Americans with meaningful tax relief.

So why am I voting against this supposed reform? Quite simply because it threatens the very foundations of our democratic society and violates the American tradition of majority rule.

The Founding Fathers explicitly rejected the notion of supermajorities at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention. As Alexander Hamilton said, we should not "give the minority a negative on the majority."

James Madison was even more specific. With a supermajority, he said, "the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed. It would be no longer the majority that would rule; the power transferred to the minority."

Let us not try to solve one problem by creating worse ones. Let us all work together to provide middle-class taxpayers with real and meaningful tax cuts. But let us not attack the very foundation of our free society—the American Constitution. It has served us well for over 200 years—let's keep it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this unconstitutional amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this section. This rule would require a three-fifths majority to pass any legislation raising income tax rates. This rule flies in the face of the Constitution. It will only strengthen the ability of special interest lobbies to paralyze this Nation.

Let us be clear that this rule would only govern taxes on earned income. Income taxes are progressive taxes. Republicans do not propose a three-fifths requirement to change the tax rate for capital gains. Republicans do not propose a three-fifths majority to create tax shelters for tax avoiders. Republicans do not propose a three-fifths requirement to increase deficit spending or raise the national debt.

This is one more gimmick. It's a gimmick that will spawn more gimmicks. It's a gimmick that will undermine the constitutional provisions for majority rule in the House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to respect the pledge they made to uphold the Constitution. Don't give in to gimmicks.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to this measure.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

□ 2130

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today our new Speaker spoke of the majesty of this House. He spoke of 208 years of history. He spoke of the light of the world, this democracy, America.

It is our Constitution that gives this democracy its grace and its reverberation around the world.

Whether you agree or disagree, no one disagrees that this issue is of constitutional magnitude. My freshmen friends who want open meetings and the elimination of ghost voting do not come to this House and say to the American public that we will give 10 minutes per side of an issue of constitutional magnitude. If we retain the majority again and require a 3/5ths vote to repeal any action taken by the previous Congress, would any of you stand still for such an act? I think not.

Reject this provision.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, requiring a 3/5ths vote makes tax increases a last resort.

In Washington State just a year ago the people of the State passed an initiative to do just this. And do you know what happened? Right now, instead of considering tax increase, they are actually looking at places to control the budget and looking at the base of the budget where we have never looked before.

If we are going to get to control spending and control the deficit, we absolutely have to control the ability to raise taxes first.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this proposal.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

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

Mr. Speaker, after everything is said that can be said, this proposal would make it more, would make it easier to run up the bills than to pay them, thus beckoning one of the weakest aspects of human nature.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of the House, the reason we

are here tonight on this amendment is because we forced through this House a retroactive tax increase last year. We would not probably be having this amendment today if you had not trampled on the rights of the taxpayers of America. This is a good bill, this is a good amendment. We need this to protect American taxpayers.

Support this amendment.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to require a majority to increase taxes.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this tax limitation provision.

The very clear message of the last election was that the American people want a smaller and less expensive government. There is no better way to start this process than by passing this provision.

The average American today pays almost half of his or her income in taxes, counting taxes of all types—Federal, State, and local. This is not only enough, it is too much.

If we really want to help the children and families of this country, the best way we can do that is to greatly downsize the government and decrease its cost. Only in this way can we allow the individuals and families of this Nation to spend more of their own money on the things that they need the most.

I believe very strongly that the American people can do a much better job of spending their money than the bureaucrats in Washington who currently spend it for them.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time in order to close.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that many of the proponents of this proposal have not even read it, for if they had, they would discover to their chagrin that it only limits the Congress in enacting income tax rate increases, not tax increases. You know what that will do: Merely transfer the tax increases over to other kind of taxes where the people that are worried about the income tax rates will be protected.

But this is unconstitutional. There is no way that a simple majority of this House can adopt a rule here tonight and bind the rest of the House to require a 60 percent vote on any other thing.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rules change to have three-fifths to change the tax rate for an increase or a decrease in income taxes, and I do this because there is no precedent in Congress requiring a super-majority for final action on any measure except those specifically cited in the Constitution, such as overriding a veto or impeachment.

We have seen what a super-majority has done in the Senate by requiring 60 votes to end debate. It results in gridlock. Nothing happens. Nothing gets done.

I cite James Madison as he discussed the rationale for not raising this threshold, and he said, "The fundamental principles of free government would be reversed. It would no longer be the majority that would control, power would be transferred to the minority."

The new majority should not override the wisdom of our forefathers. That is not a good rules change.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield only 5 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn, and I ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. For purpose of debate only.

Mr. OWENS. I move we adjourn.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Regular order. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. WALKER. Is the motion in writing?

Mr. VOLKMER. He recognized him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman is not yet recognized. Is the gentleman's motion in writing?

Mr. OWENS. A motion to adjourn does not have to be in writing.

I move that we adjourn and ask for a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Since a Member has properly demanded that the notices be in writing, is the gentleman's motion in writing?

Mr. OWENS. In writing? It does not have to be in writing.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's 5 seconds are up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman from Georgia yield to a Member for the purpose of debate only?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I beseech you, think what you are doing today. It may be the most important vote of your congressional career.

208 years ago this same fundamental debate took place. You have the opportunity to side with James Madison, with Alexander Hamilton, and continue the principles of the Constitution, or you have the opportunity, by your vote

today, to side with those who wanted to retain the Articles of Confederation.

This amendment does violence to the principles established by our forefathers and by each and every one of our descendants in this House of Representatives. It is inherently unfair; it is inherently undemocratic; it is inherently unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] have only one remaining speaker?

Mr. FOX. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. We want to make sure we are last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. FOX. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, paraphrasing from a newspaper editorial:

Not content with their party's 15-vote majority in the House of Representatives, the Republicans want to improve their odds by changing the rules of the game.

The Republicans intend to offer a bill that would require a three-fifths majority in the House to approve any bill increasing some taxes.

So much for the careful deliberations of the Constitution's Framers. They required a supermajority only for the most momentous decisions—approving treaties, impeaching Presidents, and expelling Members of Congress. Republicans think they got it wrong. They would add their own policy preference to that select list.

If they succeed, the tactic will probably be used again. Republicans could force a three-fifths vote to cut defense spending. If Democrats regain control, they could require a three-fifths vote to cut poverty programs. So much for majority rule. So much for simple fairness.

The Republican's boldness has a darker side—their recklessness. With this proposal, they defy the intent of the Framers of the Constitution and upset a carefully-balanced system that has worked well for two centuries.

Mr. Speaker, the article in its entirety is as follows:

#### RUNNING ROUGHSHOD OVER THE CONSTITUTION

Not content with his party's 15-vote majority in the House of Representatives, Newt Gingrich wants to improve his odds by changing the rules of the game.

The Speaker-to-be intends to offer a bill that would require a three-fifths majority in the House to approve any bill increasing taxes.

So much for the careful deliberations of the Constitution's framers. They required a supermajority only for the most momentous decisions—approving treaties, impeaching presidents, and expelling members of Congress, for example, Mr. Gingrich apparently thinks they got it wrong. He would add his own policy preference to that select list.

If he succeeds, the tactic will probably be used again. Republicans could force a three-fifths vote to cut defense spending, for exam-

ple. If Democrats regain control, they could require a three-fifths vote to cut poverty programs. So much for majority rule. So much for simple fairness.

Mr. Gingrich's boldness has a darker side—recklessness. With this proposal, he defies the intent of the framers of the Constitution, and upsets a carefully-balanced system that has worked well for two centuries.

If Mr. Gingrich believes tax hikes deserve such exalted status, he should proceed in accord with the Constitution and offer a constitutional amendment. That would require approval by two-thirds of each house in Congress, and three-fourths of the states—unless two-thirds of the states convene a constitutional convention. Apparently, Mr. Gingrich does not want to risk the scrutiny that the Founding Fathers prescribed for such momentous change.

Other changes offered by Mr. Gingrich make sense. At his behest, the incoming Republican majority has voted to reduce the number of committees in the House, and cut staff. He would make each committee's jurisdiction more clear. The change is designed to prevent several committees from latching onto a single issue, as happened with health legislation earlier this year.

Mr. Gingrich was right to end funding for the special caucuses, including the Black Congressional Caucus and the Caucus for Women's Issues. He has been accused of cutting these funds to undercut his political opposition, and that may be the case. Nevertheless, there is merit to his case.

The caucuses are special-interest groups, and taxpayers shouldn't have to support them. The 28 caucuses that get taxpayer money have spent \$35 million in the last decade, and critics say \$7 million of that hasn't been accounted for. One caucus, the New York State congressional delegation, bought a Steuben glass eagle and 11 crystal apples as gifts for a retiring congressman and his staff.

After losing this fight, the chairman of the black caucus, Kweisi Mfume, D-Md. pledged that his caucus will raise private money to continue its work. That's the idea.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, our forefathers had such a deep respect for major rule that they determined that majority rule was insufficient to send our troops to war. They knew how difficult it would be to resist politically popular pressures, but they were insistent that there not be minority rule determining those issues that took the most political courage.

Mr. Speaker, this pressure does not belong among these internal rules changes. It is constitutionally illegal, and it is fiscally irresponsible, and, if we are ever going to address a \$4 trillion debt, we have to make it within the reach of this body and the American people to do so.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I rise to say that I am not here to raise taxes. I am here to lower taxes. But what is the reason for a majority, a supermajority, when simply a

majority can say to the American people, we don't want taxes. I think that we are going in an unconstitutional way if we start talking about making a superminority. It is important to be able to say we do not want to raise taxes and we vote in a simple majority to do so.

Mr. Speaker, there have been only three actions in the Constitution that need a two-thirds vote. Why are we not trying to change, and to argue that we want to create this superminority?

I say to my colleagues, vote for lower taxes. You don't need a supermajority. Support the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to vote for an increase in taxes, and if such an item were presented at this time, I would vote "no." There are only five situations where current rules require more than a simple majority of Members voting for the House to act. A two-thirds supermajority is required in two instances—passage of a bill under suspension of the rules, and consideration of a rule recommended by the Rules Committee on the same day it was reported. Additionally, the Constitution of the United States requires a two-thirds vote for House action in three situations—overriding the President's veto, submitting a constitutional amendment to the States for consideration, and expelling a Member from the House. All other action by the House is accomplished by a majority vote of Members present and voting.

This measure will simply tie the hands of the House and actually prevent its Members from doing the business of the American people. The Constitution does not demand a supermajority when dealing with tax issues. This legislation would serve only to help certain, singled out groups, while other groups would be subject to the tax burdens that could be randomly set by this House.

We can already vote "no" on tax increases with a simple majority vote. Why should we implement a restriction which the Constitution does not require, and, at the same time, strangle this institution so that its Members cannot properly serve the interests of the people who elected them?

A simple majority will get you what you want. I will vote "no" on this item.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] for our final speech.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this country was founded on the principle of no taxation without representation. Today many Americans believe that principle has been violated and that their elected Representatives in Washington have taxed them so that they can spend money on the special big-spending interests in Washington, DC. To correct this sad situation the new Republican majority has now introduced section 106 of the rule change package. Section 106 would require a three-fifths vote to increase income taxes. It also contains an absolute prohibition against retroactive tax increases.

The opponents of this provision have been whining and wailing all evening

about the constitutionality of this provision. The constitutional argument simply will not stand. In 1971, Mr. Speaker, in the Supreme Court case of Gordon versus Lance the Supreme Court blessed the constitutionality of supermajority restraints on the tax and spending propensities of government. I might also point out that numerous States have a supermajority requirement for tax increases in their State constitutions, including the State of Arkansas, the home State of our President, which requires a three-fourths vote. I might also point out that we plan, on January 19, to introduce a constitutional balanced-budget amendment that contains a 60 percent supermajority to increase taxes.

The real question that we should be asking this evening is whether supermajority votes to raise income taxes really work. To answer that question let us look to the States that require supermajorities for such tax increases. An analysis of State spending between 1980 and 1987 shows that in States with supermajority requirements for tax increases their tax burden has gone down an average of 2 percent while States that do not have a supermajority tax rate requirement, their tax burden has gone up an average of 2 percent. That is a difference of 4 percent. When we look at State spending, in States with the supermajority requirement State spending has gone up 2 percent, but in States that do not have the supermajority requirement for income increases, their spending has increased 8.5 percent, or a net difference of 6½ percent. I say to my colleagues, "If you take these differentials and apply them to the current Federal budget, you would see that, if we had a supermajority requirement for an income tax increase in effect today, our income taxes would be approximately \$56 billion less, and our Federal spending would be approximately \$105 billion less."

Put simply, supermajority requirements for income tax increases do work.

I have also asked my staff to go back and look at the major votes we have had in the last three decades on tax increases in the House of Representatives. There were 16 such votes. Seven of those were passed with a supermajority, seven were passed with less than a supermajority, and two were passed by voice vote. Interestingly enough, since the advent of C-SPAN television coverage in the early 1980's, only one tax increase has passed by more than the 60 percent supermajority. Amazingly, if we had had a three-fifths vote requirement for a tax increase in effect in the 1980's, we would have saved \$666 billion in new taxes.

I submit for the RECORD the charts and data to support this conclusion, and I ask for a yes vote. Let us start listening as much to the taxpayers of

America as we do to the special interests of America and pass this amendment.

HISTORY OF TAX INCREASES—MAJOR TAX INCREASES SINCE 1960

Since 1981:  
 1 Bill passed with 60 percent supermajority in each House. 4 Bills passed without 60 percent supermajority in each House.  
 Those 4 bills added \$666 billion in taxes.  
 Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960—No.  
 House 223-174, No. (56%).  
 Senate 61-32, Yes. (66%).  
 Tax Rate Extension Act of 1961—Yes.  
 House 295-88, Yes. (77%).  
 Senate voice.  
 House Voice.  
 Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962—Yes.  
 House Voice.  
 Senate voice.  
 Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963—Yes.  
 House 283-91, Yes. (76%).  
 Senate voice.  
 Excise Tax Rate Extension Act of 1964—Yes.  
 House voice.  
 Senate voice.  
 Interest Equalization Tax Act of 1964—Yes.  
 House 238-142, Yes. (63%).  
 Senate 45-28, No. (62%).  
 Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965—Yes.  
 House 274-97, Yes. (74%).  
 Senate voice.  
 Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—Yes.  
 House 288-102, Yes. (74%).  
 Senate 72-5, Yes. (94%).  
 Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1967—Yes.  
 House 224-83, Yes. (73%).  
 Senate voice.  
 Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968—Yes.  
 House 268-150, Yes. (64%).  
 Senate 64-16, Yes. (80%).  
 Crude Oil Windfall Profits Tax Act of 1980—Yes.  
 House 302-107, Yes. (74%).  
 Senate 66-31, Yes. (68%).  
 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982—No: \$214 billion.  
 House 226-207, No. (52%).  
 Senate 52-47, No. (52%).  
 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987—No: \$40 billion.  
 House 237-181, No. (57%).  
 Senate 61-28, Yes. (62%).  
 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989—Yes: \$25 billion.  
 House 272-128, Yes. (68%).  
 Senate 87-7, Yes. (93%).  
 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990—No: \$137 billion.  
 House 228-200, No. (53%).  
 Senate 54-45, No. (55%).  
 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993—No: \$275 billion.  
 House 218-216, No. (50.2%).  
 Senate 51-49, No. (51%).

THE MOMENTUM FOR SUPERMAJORITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TAX INCREASES

9 states require supermajority votes for tax increases (Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Dakota).  
 1971—Florida requires ¾ vote to changes in corporate income tax.  
 1978—California requires ¾ vote for tax increases.  
 1978—South Dakota requires ¾ vote for increasing tax rate or base.  
 1980—Delaware requires ¾ vote for tax increases.

1992—Oklahoma requires ¾ vote or majority of voters to increase state revenue.

1992—Arizona requires ¾ vote to increase state revenues.

WHY TAX-LIMITATION AND A SUPERMAJORITY FOR TAX INCREASES?

Taxes are already too high, slowing economic growth and robbing taxpayers. Spending is also too high. Every federal program has waste and overspending.

Making it politically difficult to raise taxes will deny free-spending legislators the "easy" approach to balancing budgets—raising taxes.

The three-fifths supermajority requirement will force Congress to look hard at spending and will force tax-raisers to find 261 Members willing to raise taxes rather than cut spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). All time for debate on section 106 has expired.

The question is on section 106 of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 279, nays 152, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]  
 YEAS—279

Allard	Condit	Goodling
Andrews	Cooley	Gordon
Archer	Cox	Goss
Army	Cramer	Graham
Bachus	Crane	Green
Baker (CA)	Crapo	Greenwood
Baker (LA)	Cremeans	Gunderson
Baldacci	Cubin	Gutknecht
Ballenger	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Barcia	Danner	Hancock
Barr	Davis	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	de la Garza	Harman
Bartlett	DeLay	Hastert
Barton	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bereuter	Dickey	Hayworth
Bevill	Dooley	Hefley
Billbray	Doolittle	Hefner
Billrakis	Dorman	Heineman
Bishop	Doyle	Heger
Bliley	Dreier	Hilleary
Blute	Duncan	Hobson
Boehlert	Dunn	Hoekstra
Boehner	Edwards	Hoke
Bonilla	Ehlers	Holden
Bono	Ehrlich	Horn
Brewster	Emerson	Hostettler
Browder	English	Houghton
Brown (OH)	Ensign	Hunter
Brownback	Everett	Hutchinson
Bryant (TN)	Ewing	Hyde
Bunn	Fawell	Inglis
Bunning	Fields (TX)	Istook
Burr	Flanagan	Johnson (CT)
Burton	Foley	Johnson (SD)
Buyer	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Callahan	Ford	Jones
Calvert	Fowler	Kasich
Camp	Fox	Kelly
Canady	Franks (CT)	Kim
Castle	Franks (NJ)	King
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Chambliss	Frisa	Klug
Chapman	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Chenoweth	Galleghy	Kolbe
Christensen	Ganske	LaHood
Chrysler	Gekas	Lambert-Lincoln
Clinger	Geren	Largent
Coble	Gilchrest	Latham
Coburn	Gillmor	LaTourette
Collins (GA)	Gilman	Laughlin
Combest	Goodlatte	Lazio

Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCollum  
McCreery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mollnart  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker

Pastor  
Paxon  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Traffant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Wyden  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zelliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—2

Bateman Yates

□ 2204

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

So Section 106 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUNDERSON). Section 107 of the resolution is now debatable for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member, I am amazed that the House of Representatives has been taking money from the taxpayers to run Congress without keeping track of where that money goes. A comprehensive audit of this institution is long overdue.

The days of treating the American taxpayer's money with an arrogant disregard for accountability must end now. Congress must understand that the money spent here is not ours—it is the peoples money—and they are entitled to know where every penny goes.

Throughout my campaign, people told me they are fed up with scandals in Congress—the House bank scandal—the House Post Office scandal—the House restaurant.

This reform, Mr. Speaker, instructs the House inspector general to use independent auditing firms to conduct a full scale audit of all the House's functions. This reform will restore openness and accountability to the way Congress does business. We must eliminate any "waste, fraud, and abuse" from this body as is called for in the contract with America.

We want this audit to be as expansive as possible—to account for every asset—every dollar spent by this institution.

My new colleagues and I were sent to Congress to reform the way the Federal Government works. But to do this, we must first clean up the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity to help restore America's faith and trust in Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this act of genuine congressional reform.

□ 2210

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this proposal, and I do so not because I feel

there will be any great revelations that might satisfy those who would like to find problems here in the institution, but I think audits have been, should be, and will be in the future absolutely essential to restoring public trust in an institution that has come under I think consistent unfair criticism over a long period of time.

I am particularly concerned, though, that as we manage these audits, and I might say that the language in the document we are dealing with tonight is rather imprecise, we have to ask ourselves the question about how we will function in this new Republican majority.

For a number of years, Republicans have been adamant about bringing about bipartisanship in the manner in which we run this institution. The rules package Republicans offered in the last Congress called for a non-partisan administration committee, equally numbered with Members of both parties, quite apart from whatever party was in the majority here. They even asked for that complete bipartisanship with equal representation on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

We asked to have in place management of the House that was totally nonpartisan. Whether it was the Post Office, whether it was the Director of Non-Legislative Services, the entire thrust in a bipartisan sense was to bring about a change in the way we had functioned here, and Democrats and Republicans I think in mutual pride and satisfaction found a way to move in that direction.

But what we have encountered recently is a complete rejection of everything Republicans fought for to bring about change in the way this institution functioned, and, that is, to select individuals based on their partisan background to manage the institution only at the whim, the beck and call of one individual who has been elected Speaker.

My belief is when Republicans asked that we have a two-thirds vote of the House to select a financial officer of this institution, they were going on record for something that had legs, that would last through the years, that was a position that they took firmly and hoped to have govern the institution when and if they at some point in the future took control. I am disappointed to say the least that we focus now on audits and not on the management of how those audits would be functioning, exactly who would manage them, and whether or not they would truly be done in the bipartisan spirit which was the hallmark of the Republican arguments in recent years on occasions such as this when they brought their rules package to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to audits. What I am opposed to is partisan

## NAYS—152

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Baesler  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bellenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bontor  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Durbirn  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez

Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Hastings (FL)  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsul  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar

Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Rivers  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn

management of an institution that had come a long way into a different era, one that was to be bipartisan in every sense. I regret that reversion.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California deserves an answer and he will get one.

Under H. Res. 429 which was supported bipartisanship, we created the Oversight Subcommittee. We also created an Inspector General. The very first time the Oversight Subcommittee had to support the new chief executive officer, the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, the Democrats refused. There was a 2-2 tie. It did not work. The Inspector General needed assistance. The Democrats would not provide him with any. The Democrats only allowed 3 total employees to the Inspector General. We are now honoring the Inspector General's request of 18 employees to carry out the audits.

In a letter dated December 21, 1994, the Office of Inspector General in responding to a letter about going forward with these audits said this:

"Therefore, the Office of Inspector General is very willing to accept this responsibility (i.e. the audits) and will perform the associated tasks in a totally professional and nonpartisan manner."

What we are asking for, and getting, is professional management of the House. What the American people are getting is transparency of that management. The old system would not open up. The new system will.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 12, 1994.

Mr. JOHN LAINHART,  
Inspector General,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LAINHART: Republicans have called for the selection of a major, independent accounting firm to perform comprehensive audits of the Congress. We believe that such audits are needed both to ensure full accountability to the U.S. taxpayer and to provide the factual information necessary to build an efficient, cost-effective administrative structure.

We envision a series of audits, to begin as soon as possible, that will result in a final, consolidated picture of the financial and operational status of the Congress. We are contacting you at this time to request that your office assume this responsibility. The audits, and the process under which they are conducted, must be free from interference and partisan influence. The office of the Inspector General was created in 1992 for the specific purpose of nonpartisan review and evaluation of House operations, and is the logical office to carry out this charge.

By copy of this letter to Richard Gephardt, we are asking for his full cooperation in assisting you in this task, which we expect will

include the need for additional staffing for your office and funding for the audit contract. It is our intention that the comprehensive audits conducted under this process will complement the audit plan which you have recommended to bipartisan leadership, in fact expediting the overall review of House operations which you have already presented.

Research has already been performed regarding the steps necessary to let a contract for these audits, and a preliminary review of the entities which we envision will be involved. The first task is an audit plan for House entities, shortly followed, based on agreement with the Senate, by audit plans for joint Senate-House entities. We would be glad to provide you with the background information we have collected; however, we offer this only as a suggestion to help speed the process. No such comprehensive review of House operations has been undertaken before, and we recognize that the challenges inherent in completing such a review now are enormous.

We have confidence in your professional ability to carry out this task, and hope that your office is willing to accept this responsibility. Please contact Stacy Carlson, at the Committee on House Oversight (Committee on House Administration), if you need additional information. We look forward to your response to this request.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE,  
BILL THOMAS.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 21, 1994.

Hon. BILL THOMAS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMAS: Thank you for your letter of December 12, 1994, cosigned by Congressman Jim Nussle, requesting the Office of Inspector General (OIG) to assume responsibility for managing the comprehensive audits of the Congress as discussed in your letter. As suggested in the letter, Bob Frey, Deputy Inspector General, and I met with Stacy Carlson on December 16, 1994, to further discuss these audits. As a result, I have a good idea as to what needs to be done to successfully accomplish these audits. Therefore, the OIG is very willing to accept this responsibility, and will perform the associated tasks in a totally professional and nonpartisan manner.

As indicated in your letter, these audits can best be performed by contracting with an independent accounting firm or firms for a series of audits that will result in a final consolidated report of the financial and operational status of the Congress. In order to establish accountability at the beginning of the 104th Congress, and make recommendations for control and operational improvements for building a more efficient, cost-effective administrative structure, I propose that the consolidated report address issues as of December 31, 1994. This audit effort would, as you indicated, complement the OIG audit plan and greatly expedite the initial review of House operations, in a significant number of areas. Continuing OIG audit effort would, of course, still be required in other areas beyond the scope of these audits and in additional areas as the incoming House Officers make changes in their operations.

To establish accountability at the beginning of the 104th Congress, the independent accounting firm(s) would be responsible for

preparing audited financial statements reflecting the: (i) overall financial position, (ii) results of operations, (iii) cash flows or changes in financial position, and (iv) reconciliations to budget reports for all House activities. This effort would include audits of House Information Systems (HIS) financial activities, and all revolving funds, contingent funds, commercial functions, etc., as of December 31, 1994. It would also include a determination as to whether the internal control structure provides reasonable assurance of achieving generally accepted control objectives and all applicable laws and regulations have been complied with fully. The financial statements would be prepared in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountant's "Generally Accepted Accounting Principles" and audited in accordance with the General Accounting Office's "Government Auditing Standards." Furthermore, this effort would be in compliance with the applicable provisions of the Chief Financial Officers Act (P.L. 101-576), Government Performance and Results Act (P.L. 103-62) and Government Management Reform Act (P.L. 103-356). The OIG would review all work performed by the independent accounting firm(s) to ensure the completeness and quality of that work.

With respect to operational areas, I have identified two primary areas needing review—financial and HIS operations. The financial operations include audits in the OIG audit plan designed to evaluate economy, efficiency and effectiveness of program operations. These audits would address areas beyond pure funds accountability, in an effort to identify ways to eliminate waste, inefficiencies, fraud, abuse and mismanagement, and highlight areas for contracting out, privatizing, streamlining, downsizing and elimination. Additional details concerning the financial operations audit plan are included in Enclosure 1. The audit of HIS operations would include reviews of the general controls (including management, data center operations and data center protection) and system development, acquisition and modification controls (including user satisfaction, system development life cycle and project documentation), and confidentiality, integrity and availability testing. The audit program for performing this audit is included as Enclosure 2.

As indicated in your letter, audit coverage of joint Senate-House entities will need to be identified at a later date. Once agreement is reached with the Senate, I will develop a detailed proposal concerning audit coverage for these entities and submit my audit proposal to you for your review.

I will be contacting the Office of the General Counsel later today to request a legal opinion on the most expeditious method to contract for the independent accounting firm(s), while assuring competitive bidding to the maximum extent practical. Once I get this legal opinion, I will make a recommendation to you as to the best method for proceeding. In addition, as soon as I can estimate the contract costs, I will apprise you of the funding requirements so that reprogramming can be expeditiously accomplished.

With respect to the issue of additional staffing, I have included an organization chart (Enclosure 3) which depicts our current staffing (both Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight, Committee on House Administration approved permanent OIG staff and General Accounting Office detailees), and proposed additional staffing needed to make the OIG fully functional, considering the additional audit requirements to be assumed

by the OIG in the 104th Congress. The total additional funding required for Fiscal Year 1995 is \$494,000, consisting of \$372,000 in personnel costs, and \$122,000 in equipment, software, supplies and other similar costs. The justification for the additional staffing is also included as Enclosure 4. Since personnel hiring can take a considerable amount of time and additional staff members are critically needed to accomplish the tasks discussed above, I would hope that this issue can be addressed at the earliest possible time so that the appropriate staffing authorization and reprogramming can be expedited.

An identical letter has been sent to Congressman Nussle. If you should need additional information or want to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to call me on x61250.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. LAINHART IV.  
*Inspector General.*

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important change in House rules. Like many of my Democratic colleagues, I favor many of the reforms being instituted today.

As a freshman member in 1992, I was honored to chair a task force on changes in House rules. One of my top priorities was to see that this institution was held more accountable to the American people. I believe that the proposed comprehensive audit of all our financial records and physical assets is a big step in ensuring our accountability to our constituents.

This is an opportunity for improvement—one every Member should welcome who is actively seeking to use taxpayer dollars more efficiently.

I know that a comprehensive audit, if properly executed, will be an important management tool here in this House. If a truly independent firm performs the audit, then we can take advantage of new technologies and management practices and identify the areas where we must improve our efficiency, accountability, and effectiveness.

However, I have specific concerns that are not addressed and that is that the Speaker and the House Oversight Committee must carefully monitor the money appropriated to the Inspector General to conduct the audit and promptly implement the recommended changes so we can get the most for the taxpayers' money and provide the best services for our constituencies.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, Section 107 of the House rules package directs the House Inspector General to conduct a comprehensive House audit. This will be both a financial and performance audit of all House services and operations.

Mr. Speaker, 39 months ago in October 1991, I stood on this very spot and called for full disclosure of Members

with House bank overdrafts. A key to restoring the credibility of Congress, I said then, was to hold ourselves accountable. And I and 6 of my colleagues, the so-called Gang of 7, pressed for an open House. Our calls for candor were met with intransigence, but the outrage of the American people was overwhelming. We did learn the details of the House bank overdrafts, and let me stress to my colleagues who are listening now that that one specific limited GAO audit of a House function, a House service, led to several criminal convictions.

□ 2220

My colleagues, we introduced a bill one year later in October 1992, House Resolution 595, to require an independent House audit. Today's House action is the culmination of that effort.

Results of these audits, which will be performed by the Inspector General in consultation with the GAO and a major independent accounting firm will be made public, and therefore the people will have more information than ever before regarding House operations past and present, and that will go a long way toward restoring the integrity and credibility of this proud institution.

I urge approval of the rule. Let the sunshine in and open the books of the people's House to scrutiny by the people.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this proposal as well to conduct an audit of the financial and administrative operations of the House. But it really does not go far enough. I suspect that the audit itself is likely to show that we have been conducting our business in a responsible, professional manner. One of the reasons that has been the case is that we have had professional, nonpartisan, individuals conducting these affairs, and we reached that agreement in a nonpartisan way, as Members will recall.

But, we have two problems with this. I am going to vote for it, as is the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and probably the other speakers, but the two deficiencies are one because it is a closed rule and we cannot insist that we continue to conduct the administrative and financial nonlegislative operations of this House in a nonpartisan professional manner which we could if we had an open rule, and secondly, the person who has been put in this position is not nonpartisan.

I will not repeat the arguments for why there ought to be an open rule because my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], knows them by heart. He is certainly the most persuasive, articulate proponent of an open rule. But I guess where you sit is where you stand now.

We are faced with a closed rule where we cannot improve this amendment. I

do think we ought to raise that issue, though, because I am sure other Members of the House have read the articles about the individual that has been appointed to this position as I have. It raises very serious concern. I do not know Mr. Faulkner. I do know he was head of the Young Republicans, that he has been investigated and interviewed on any number of partisan political issues. At one point he was asked by investigators about leaking documents to the Reagan campaign and he said, yes, we have been obtaining leaked material from whistle blowers and passing them on.

This is not the nonpartisan professional individual we are looking for.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group appointed the current Inspector General.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, this comprehensive audit of House financial records and administrative operations will prevent in the future the kinds of problems we have seen with the House restaurant, the House Post Office and the House bank and will identify whether and to what extent other House units have been in compliance with law and House rules and have operated effectively and efficiently. It will provide necessary information to the public to determine the manner in which taxpayer funds have been used and will ensure accountability in the administration of this House.

This audit should examine, amongst other things, monies in the contingent fund, monies expended by legislative service organizations, House officers accounts, committee accounts and the Architect of the Capitol. It should also look into allegations concerning ghost employees and official payrolls. This audit will set an important precedent for openness and accountability and is a much desired reform.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1. But again, I must reiterate my disappointment about the procedure we are using today. I am deeply disappointed that this bill is coming before the House under a closed rule. Not very long ago, the new chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend from New York said that when he admonished members about the use of closed rules, that our Republican friends were "not simply engaging in some procedural or partisan tantrum. We are instead" he said, "trying to warn against what we perceive as the deliberate decline of democracy in this House." (April, 2, 1993). It is somewhat shocking, after all the speeches, that on the

first day of the new Republican run House we are proceeding under a closed rule.

However, it is important today that we are moving forward on a bill, that has been blocked for too long. The House passed this bill, essentially, twice in the last Congress only to see our efforts thwarted by Republican led efforts in the Senate. The Democratic and the Republican Members of the House want this bill and want it to move forward. On this point, there is great bipartisan agreement.

We have gone a long way toward making sure that the Congress lives under the same laws as any other American. Most pieces of legislation we have passed apply to Congress. The Americans With Disabilities Act which I proudly cosponsored specifically applies to Congress as did the Civil Rights Act, the Minimum Wage Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Family and Medical Leave Act. The House has also had in place, since 1988, prohibitions against employment discrimination.

H.R. 1 will ensure that all Members of the Congress—not just House Members—live under all of the laws we pass and do so permanently, not just as an internal House rule but as an ironclad law.

I cannot tell you how many times I have had businessmen and women complain that Congress passes laws and then simply exempts itself. They are frustrated. They want us to share the same challenges they have when they try to start a business, or try to create new jobs for their community. They need and deserve to know that we live up to the same standards that we expect from them, and afford our employees the same protections that any other American worker deserves.

Most of my constituents did not know that the Congressional Accountability Act passed the House last year by a vote of 427 to 4. They did not know because the Senate failed to act to make it law. In early September, I wrote to urge the Senate committee on Government affairs to have the Senate act promptly. I told them that the Congress could never engender trust among the American people until the Congress lives by the same rules as the rest of the Nation. When the Senate did not act, we made congressional accountability part of the House rules.

But the American people deserve something more than an internal House rule—they deserve an ironclad law passed by and applying to both Houses of Congress.

I want to go home and tell those constituents that we have answered their plea. I want to tell them that we meet the same requirements that they do—that we follow the same laws they follow from OSHA to fair labor standards. I want to tell them that our employees have the same protections theirs do,

from anti-age discrimination to family and medical leave. Perhaps the shared experience will help us write better, more careful laws. Just as importantly, this is about common sense, trust and accountability. That is why we are all here, late into the evening, finishing the work which began in the last Congress. I hope all my colleagues will join me in moving forward on H.R. 1.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you how fascinating it is for me to see you in your role tonight, and also see my good friend, the gentleman from California, FRANK RIGGS, back here after a 2-year absence because it was 4 years ago that FRANK and I and five other freshmen blew the whistle on the House bank and then 3 years ago we blew the whistle on the House post office. The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that after 4 years and 3 years respectively we still have not seen a number of internal documents from either of those investigations, taxpayer funded investigations of taxpayer operations.

My colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], says this is all behind us, but the honest answer is we do not know if it is behind us because for decades these books simply have not been audited, nor have we had the access to those very documents.

Former Congressman Dan Rostenkowski, now facing charges connected to the stationery store, has an intriguing defense. He says he was not the only Congressman who misused the stationery store and bought chairs and champagne buckets and other things, all with public money and all personal gifts. And you know his defense team might be right because we do not know, but after this audit is done, we will know, and when we know, you will know too.

□ 2230

Mr. BROWNBAC. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today—a new day in Congress—where Members will finally open the doors of the House to greater public input and disclosure.

The idea of the House audit was a brainchild of the Gang of Seven. I am delighted to join my fellow gang members here today and am pleased that the leadership included our idea in the rules package.

I am not even sure why we are debating this issue. If a company the size of the House of Representatives did not report the activities of its officers and directors to its shareholders, it would not survive—disclosure is a key component to gaining the public trust essential for survival in a market economy.

It is ridiculous not to support this proposal. The American people are the shareholders of our American Government and deserve to know the activities of their Representatives.

Members of the House have been embarrassed and distracted by scandals in its bank, post office, and other departments. An independent inspector general would conduct audits to expose fraud, waste, and abuse.

I wholeheartedly support a comprehensive House audit and urge my colleagues to do likewise. It is a proposal that will ensure that the House of Representatives remains The People's House.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, on October 1, 1991, I stood here on this House floor and I said, "What are we trying to hide from the American people? What do we have to fear?"

Today we have a historic opportunity to vote to open up the books of the U.S. Congress in a very open and complete way. We know that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and never in the history of this Congress have we ever had an open and complete audit of the books of this Congress for the American people to view.

And echoing the comments of my colleagues who were involved with me, my six other colleagues, I fully encourage the Inspector General to not only do the fiscal 1995 audit, but I would encourage the Inspector General to look back, to look back several years at some areas of the Congress that have been called into question, LSO's the House restaurant system, the Speaker's contingent fund, the disposal of office equipment that has raised everyone's eyebrows, but we never have seen the details.

I am pleased tonight to be here to support this very important part of our House rules.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts offered today and believe this audit will go a long way to cut waste and save taxpayer money, streamline the process. But let us go a step further. Let us require the audit to include unused office allowance funds.

I am concerned. We still do not know what exactly happens to that money. Many of us agree funds left over from our office budgets should not be reprogrammed, but instead returned to the Federal Treasury for deficit reduction. Let us use this opportunity to find the means to that end.

This audit will ensure that House operations are efficient and effective, and this investigation will ensure this audit is complete.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of section 107 of this rules package authorizing a comprehensive House audit of House financial records, physical assets, and facilities.

All the rules changes we are considering today—cutting committees and committee staff, ending baseline budgeting, making the laws of the land apply to Congress—are critical. We are reforming this institution and restoring the faith of the American people.

However, while these reforms may grab the headlines, I believe the section authorizing an audit of House functions is perhaps the most important reform of all. For the first time the American people will have the opportunity to see how their tax dollars are being used and often wasted on Congress itself.

I am a small businessman who knows that keeping track of where the money goes is the only sound way to run a business. Slush funds, sloppy management, or outright fraud will land you either in bankruptcy or jail.

As the owner of a small business I must make sure that my financial statements and inventory are accurate and up-to-date. A bank considering issuing me a loan—or potential investors—would accept nothing less than a close examination of my balance sheet before making any decisions.

Why, then, the House of Representatives has escaped a similar analysis for its investors—the American taxpayers—is beyond me. It is time for a change.

We should pass this section authorizing an audit of House activities, and then the entire rules package, to let the sun shine in.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we all understand this provision in the rule this evening was an opportunity for people to rehash the problems that beset this institution in the past that we are, thank God, well under way to resolving.

But what I think is not something that was intended to be brought up tonight—but which is central to the whole question of the audit, which will be broadly supported on a bipartisan basis—is who will do the audit, how will it be administered?

Now, the real issue here is who appoints the administrative authorities in this institution. There has been a change. When Republicans were in the minority, they wanted bipartisanship. They wanted equal access. They wanted professionalized. They wanted no taint of partisan activity.

But now the worm has turned. Now the Republicans find themselves in the majority.

What they have done is they have reversed the field. They have now called for a different structure, one that places in the hands of an administrator appointed by the Speaker the authority to manage this institution in a way that could become as partisan as we can imagine.

I think that is tragic. I think that is wrong. And I support the audit, but I am very concerned about the way it will be managed by a partisan leader.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the speaker from the other side that he had 40 years to ask for this audit and did not do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make two points.

First of all, a good reason for doing the audit is that we do not know what we will find. When we did this in Michigan 2 years ago after a large number of years of Democratic rule, we discovered a major scandal in the House fiscal agency. As a result of that discovery, we currently have three former staff members serving prison time, four more on probation, three still in the courts. That is an example of the type of thing you may find, and it is not a result of the Members' misbehavior but of staff misbehavior.

My second point, all of the discussion has been about fiscal aspects, but the operational aspects of the audit are equally, if not more, important, in particular the computer activities which I hope to audit.

Just a few weeks ago a Member came to me that spent \$22,000 for a file server last year. It is now useless.

I urge that we go ahead with both the fiscal and operational audit and do it well.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUNDERSON). All time has expired.

The question is on section 107 of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 430, nays 1, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—430

Abercrombie	Bevill	Callahan	Conyers	Hastings (WA)	Meyers
Ackerman	Billbray	Calvert	Cooley	Hayes	Mfume
Allard	Billrakis	Camp	Costello	Hayworth	Mica
Andrews	Bishop	Canady	Cox	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Archer	Bliley	Cardin	Coyne	Hefner	Miller (FL)
Armey	Blute	Castle	Cramer	Helmen	Mineta
Bachus	Boehert	Chabot	Crane	Hergert	Minge
Baesler	Boehner	Chambliss	Crapo	Hilleary	Mink
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Chapman	Creameans	Hilliard	Moakley
Baker (LA)	Bonior	Chenoweth	Cubin	Hinchev	Mollinari
Baldacci	Bono	Christensen	Cunningham	Hobson	Mollohan
Ballenger	Borski	Chrysler	Danner	Hoekstra	Montgomery
Barcla	Boucher	Clay	Davis	Hoke	Moorhead
Barr	Brewster	Clayton	de la Garza	Holden	Moran
Barrett (NE)	Browder	Clement	Deal	Horn	Morella
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Clinger	DeFazio	Hostettler	Morpha
Bartlett	Brown (OH)	Clyburn	DeLauro	Houghton	Myers
Barton	Brownback	Coble	DeLay	Hoyer	Myrick
Bass	Bryant (TN)	Coburn	Dellums	Hunter	Nadler
Bateman	Bryant (TX)	Coleman	Deutsch	Hutchinson	Neal
Becerra	Bunn	Collins (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Hyde	Nethercutt
Bellenson	Bunning	Collins (IL)	Dickey	Inglis	Neumann
Bentsen	Burr	Collins (MI)	Dicks	Istook	Ney
Bereuter	Burton	Combest	Dingell	Jackson-Lee	Norwood
Berman	Buyer	Condit	Dixon	Jacobs	Nussle
			Doggett	Jefferson	Oberstar
			Dooley	Johnson (CT)	Obey
			Doolittle	Johnson (SD)	Olver
			Dornan	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
			Doyle	Johnson, Sam	Orton
			Dreier	Johnston	Owens
			Duncan	Jones	Oxley
			Dunn	Kanjorski	Packard
			Durbin	Kaptur	Pallone
			Edwards	Kasich	Parker
			Ehlers	Kelly	Pastor
			Ehrlich	Kennedy (MA)	Paxon
			Emerson	Kennedy (RI)	Payne (NJ)
			Engel	Kennelly	Payne (VA)
			English	Kildee	Pelosi
			Ensign	Kim	Peterson (FL)
			Eshoo	King	Peterson (MN)
			Evans	Kingston	Petri
			Everett	Kieccka	Pickett
			Ewing	Klink	Pombo
			Farr	Klug	Pomeroy
			Fawell	Knollenberg	Porter
			Fazio	Kolbe	Portman
			Fields (LA)	LaFalce	Poshard
			Fields (TX)	LaHood	Pryce
			Fliner	Lambert-Lincoln	Quillen
			Flake	Lantos	Quinn
			Flanagan	Largent	Radanovich
			Foglietta	Latham	Rahall
			Foley	LaTourette	Ramstad
			Forbes	Laughlin	Rangel
			Ford	Lazio	Reed
			Fowler	Leach	Regula
			Fox	Levin	Reynolds
			Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)	Richardson
			Franks (CT)	Lewis (GA)	Riggs
			Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)	Rivers
			Frelinghuysen	Lightfoot	Roberts
			Frisa	Linder	Roemer
			Frost	Lipinski	Rogers
			Funderburk	Livingston	Rohrabacher
			Furse	LoBlondo	Ros-Lehtinen
			Gallely	Lofgren	Rose
			Ganske	Longley	Roth
			Gejdenson	Lowey	Roukema
			Gekas	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
			Gephardt	Luther	Royce
			Geren	Maloney	Rush
			Gibbons	Manton	Sabo
			Gilchrest	Manzullo	Salmon
			Gillmor	Markey	Sanders
			Gilman	Martinez	Sanford
			Gonzalez	Martini	Sawyer
			Goodlatte	Mascara	Saxton
			Goodling	Matsui	Scarborough
			Gordon	McCarthy	Schaefer
			Goss	McCollum	Schiff
			Graham	McCreery	Schroeder
			Green	McDade	Schumer
			Greenwood	McDermott	Scott
			Gunderson	McHale	Seastrand
			Gutierrez	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
			Gutknecht	McInnis	Serrano
			Hall (OH)	McIntosh	Shadegg
			Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shaw
			Hamilton	McKinney	Shays
			Hancock	McNulty	Shuster
			Hansen	Meehan	Sisisky
			Harman	Meek	Skaggs
			Hastert	Menendez	Skeen
			Hastings (FL)	Metcalfe	Skelton

Slaughter	Tejeda	Ward
Smith (MI)	Thomas	Waters
Smith (NJ)	Thompson	Watt (NC)
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Waxman
Smith (WA)	Thornton	Weldon (FL)
Solomon	Thurman	Weldon (PA)
Souder	Tiahrt	Weller
Spence	Torkildsen	White
Spratt	Torres	Whitfield
Stark	Torricelli	Wicker
Stearns	Towns	Williams
Stenholm	Traficant	Wilson
Stockman	Tucker	Wise
Stokes	Upton	Wolf
Studds	Velazquez	Woolsey
Stump	Vento	Wyden
Stupak	Vislosky	Wynn
Talent	Volker	Young (AK)
Tanner	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Tate	Waldholtz	Zeliff
Tauzin	Walker	Zimmer
Taylor (MS)	Walsh	
Taylor (NC)	Wamp	

NAYS—1

Fattah

NOT VOTING—2

Yates

Brown (FL)

□ 2251

So section 107 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER (Mr. TORKILDSEN). Section 108 is now debatable for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

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

Mr. Speaker, my grandma used to say that it is wrong to teach our kids to do as I say and not as I do. As parents of three teenagers, my wife and I believe that we need to set a good example for our children. It is my fervent belief that this philosophy should apply to the U.S. Congress as well. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the actions of our Government have been, in essence, to do as I say and not as I do.

On behalf of the freshmen who promised their constituents consideration on the first day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leadership for this opportunity. The failure of the previous Congress to pass the legislation is unfortunate. We have, in effect, been saying to the American people, "You must comply with the rules and regulations we pass, but we don't."

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Accountability Act will put an end to this hypocrisy and put our House in order. Today the new Congress is telling the American people that we have heard their demand for change and that on the first day we meant what we said in that we will begin to play by the same rules as those who we were elected to serve.

I understand that some Members are opposed to the closed rule, but the bottom line is that H.R. 1 is virtually identical to a bill, H.R. 4822, which passed this House on August 10, 1994, on a 427 to 4 vote. That bill has been thoroughly debated in committee, subcommittee and here on the House floor. To my 13 new Democratic freshman colleagues I say, I apologize to you for denying you the opportunity for review of this legislation in committee, but the time has come now to act responsibly. As you know, we have pledged to the American people to change the way we do business in this House.

The Republican freshman Members have demanded change from this leadership, and we have demanded that a vote occur today on congressional accountability. We feel this legislation is vitally important and should be passed today in order to reestablish this as the people's House. We must now take the initiative and pass this important measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as has been said so often today, this is truly a historical day. We are witnessing something on the floor today that we may never have observed before. For the first time the people on the other side are in charge, and we are seeing two completely closed rules, but probably for the first time ever they have proposed a closed rule within a bill brought up under a closed rule.

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

□ 2300

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Palm Beach, FL [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for accountability, the Congressional Accountability Act, to bring Congress in compliance with the 10 laws such as fair labor, civil rights, Americans with Disabilities Act and others.

As a freshman Member of the Congress, I was appalled to find out that this body had exempted itself from the very laws that they had passed on small business and the consumers of America. When I toured the offices of Congress in the Cannon and Longworth buildings, I found exits blocked, boxes packed. Staff members could not have exited in a fire. As a restaurateur, if that happened in my business, I would not only have been fined, but I would have been closed down that very day for failure to observe common safety practices in my business. I think this Congress can make a statement to America tonight, and to every small business, that we understand the burdens we have placed on them, and that

we are willing to accept those very burdens on ourself. That is the least we can do. The Congressional Accountability Act should and must pass.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor. It should pass. This is a bad rule and it should be voted down. As was indicated, this bill is virtually identical to the bill that passed last year. One major exception, the ban on frequent flier miles has been ripped out of this bill. Why has it been ripped out? It has been ripped out because the laws that have been passed that we want to have applied here don't affect you as individuals. They affect the U.S. Government, because that is where the liability is. But the frequent flier prohibition strikes right at the people in this room. The people in this room should not use frequent flier miles for personal use. It is hypocrisy of the highest order that is not being dealt with this bill when it was dealt with in the bill we passed last fall. There is only one explanation, and that is greed. The Members who want to use frequent flier miles for personal use are ripping off the taxpayers of this country, and it is wrong and it should be stopped today.

So if you believe in bipartisanship, vote this rule down and let us do this right.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the land of Lincoln, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER].

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for the Congressional Accountability Act. For years, Members of Congress have exempted themselves above many of the laws that we impose on the private sector. It is time we held ourselves accountable to the same standards that we expect of our constituents.

The House passed this bill last August by a vote of 427 to 4. At that time, the provisions of this bill were deliberated to the fullest extent possible. The rule today allows the House to expedite the process to bring Congress in line with the laws of the land under which every American citizen must live. When this measure is adopted, Congress will be subject to the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will apply to Congress.

We are here to make positive changes in the way Congress operates. Congress has delayed far too long on this initiative requiring us to live by the same rules as everyone else. Congressional accountability is a step in the right direction, and it is time to bring it to a vote.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion of history tonight, so let us quote Karl Marx. "History repeats itself; the first time in history and the second time as farce." Farce is what we are getting tonight. It is from the 18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon.

This is almost exactly what the House did before, but there are some differences. When the Democratic majority brought this bill to the floor last time, it allowed in the rule 14 amendments, 8 of which could be designated by Republicans.

You are bringing up a closed rule on a substantive bill for no good reason. You are going to debate it after midnight. You told us you would be family friendly. You forgot to tell us it would be the Addams Family that would be friendly, because we will be doing it at 3 o'clock in the morning. Why do something perfectly sensible, but block a chance to vote on frequent fliers, do it at 3 o'clock in the morning, don't allow amendments?

Let me tell you from experience. When you are in the majority, sometimes inevitably you got to defend some dumb things. But in 1 day you have been dumber than we were in 2 years. What are you doing it for? Why not wait until tomorrow. You said we could wait.

Do you want to hide the debate on frequent fliers? I do not know why the new Speaker is so attached to the frequent flier rule. But why not talk about it tomorrow? Why now allow some amendments?

History? We made this history last year. We made history once. You cannot make history twice, unless you flunked it the first time, and the way you guys are handling this, I think some of you must have, because you do not understand what is going on.

We are in favor of this. Most of us worked hard for it. We passed it last year. It was bipartisan. Why are you rushing this through on a totally closed rule?

Comparison: We had eight amendments in order from Republicans. We had the frequent flier thing in here. We let it be debated during the day. You are rushing it through, because the Republicans promised it would be done on the first day? It will be after midnight. Now you are even fooling with the clock. Be sensible. Do not get carried away. Do it tomorrow, and do not exempt yourself from the most important law of all, common sense.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mesa, AZ [Mr. SALMON].

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this has been an awesome day for me. I was able to sit here on the floor of this very hallowed place with my four children, and I can't tell you the experience this has been for me, to be able to sit among some of the most intelligent minds of

our country, and to be able to have just heard the very eloquent speech of Mr. FRANK. I am impressed. You are even better in person than you are on C-SPAN.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, it will be better tomorrow afternoon if you get a little sleep.

Mr. SALMON. Nice try. But I would like to say this: One thing I have learned over my political career is that I know I am an incredibly average person, and the incredibly average person that I talk to out there cannot understand why we cannot move this to a vote and why we cannot move it quickly.

I think some good points have been made, and we will get an opportunity I believe to visit some of these issues later. But I do not want to wait. I want to move, and I want to vote now. Let us vote this through. Let us make Congress live under the very same laws as any other American. It is the right thing.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman who like many of you ran on the issue of reform. I campaigned for, supported, and have voted for many of the things we have dealt with today. So great was the call for reform in our freshman class and across this country that I really expected to come into a House today that would be liberated by the free flow of ideas.

It has been just the opposite. On our very first day, the most symbolic day, I have come into a House where 100 percent of our rules are closed, where we will not have the opportunity to advance our ideas and see them win or lose in the court of public opinion. That is not allowed in the new Congress.

There is no opportunity for amendments, no opportunity for fine tuning, and no opportunity to divide the question in a way that will allow us to represent our constituencies within many-itemed bills.

This is not the new way, the good way. This is what you all campaigned against. And I think we should learn from JERRY SOLOMON who said the people are sick and tired of political gamesmanship. They want back their House, they want it open and democratic. I think so.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cincinnati, OH [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the principle that no person is above the law. It is more than shameful—it is worse than outrageous—that Congress routinely has exempted itself from the laws that others must obey. From the labor laws enacted in 1938, to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to OSHA—Congress has said:

"These laws apply to others, but not to us. Not to us."

At long last, these exemptions are going to stop. Finally, we're going to recognize that if a law is good enough to apply to the American people, then by golly, it's good enough to apply to Congress. And if any law isn't good enough to apply to Congress, then certainly it's not good enough to apply to everyone else.

When Congress has to live by the laws it passes, then Congress will take care to pass better laws. I urge support for the rule.

□ 2310

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grave reservations about the rule proposed for consideration of H.R. 1.

Although I strongly support the Congressional Accountability Act, and although I believe it was wise of the new leadership to bring up substantially the same bill that was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives last August, I strongly disapprove of the manner in which the majority has proposed considering this legislation.

I understand the desire of the new Republican leadership to bring the Congressional Accountability Act to the floor today, to fulfill the promise made in the "Contract With America." But voting on a major piece of legislation on the very day it is introduced, without having an opportunity to amend it is simply the wrong way to legislate—and Members on the other side of the aisle know that.

In fact, our Republican colleagues have chastised Democratic members, more times than we would like to remember, for speeding bills to the floor before there had been adequate opportunity to review them, and for not allowing amendments to be offered to them. "Gag rule" was the term our Republican friends used to describe rules like the one before us now.

To those of us who had to bear the brunt of the Republicans' criticism of such rules, it seems utterly outrageous—and rather ironic—that in this new era which has been heralded by promises of openness and fairness in the legislative process, the very first piece of legislation brought to floor will be considered in this manner. This rule makes us question whether criticism of closed rules issued by the majority party during the last Congress was based on true belief in opening up the amending process, or whether it was simply a means of generating public anger toward Democrats.

In fact, this procedure is worse than anything I can recall under Democratic control of the House. In the 18 years I have served in the House, I cannot remember a time when a bill advanced by the Democratic leadership was handled in so rushed and closed a manner as this one. Under this rule, this bill is to be considered on the very day it is introduced; there will have been no hearings or markup of this legislation—in fact, not even any informal review by the committees of jurisdiction; there will have been no review by the Rules Committee for the purpose of granting a rule; and,

of course, there will be no opportunity to amend the bill—other than through a motion to recommit—and no time to plan amendments even if there were such an opportunity.

For those of us who were part of the 103d Congress, the fact that this legislation is being considered in this way is less deplorable than it would otherwise be because the bill is substantially the same as last Congress' H.R. 4822. H.R. 4822 was a well-constructed, well-thought-out bill in large part because, unlike H.R. 1, it was developed through the regular legislative process. H.R. 4822 was considered by the committees of jurisdiction as well as the Rules Committee for purposes of granting a rule; there was sufficient time between the day the bill was introduced and the day it was sent to the floor for Members to familiarize themselves with it; and most of the amendments Members wanted to offer to it were allowed to be offered. In other words, we had ample opportunity to know what we would be voting on and to help shape and improve the bill.

But the 86 Members who are new to the 104th Congress will not have that opportunity. Their right to review and amend this legislation is being abrogated for the sake of political expediency. It is unfair—and wrong—to ask them to vote on a very important piece of legislation without giving them any chance to review the bill, let alone help shape it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that it is only because of the political imperative dictated by the "Contract With America" that we are proceeding in this manner on a major piece of legislation. And I hope that we will have the assurance of the new leadership that the procedure being used to consider H.R. 1 is an aberration, and not a signal of how legislation will be handled during this Congress.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Perhaps an uninterested observer listening to the debate today, Mr. Speaker, might be uninformed enough to have found a little hypocrisy on both sides, and maybe listening to the debate on this issue, an uninformed observer might not understand that as stronger reform bill than the piece now being offered came before this body written by Democrats just a few months ago, and was eventually blocked by Republicans. I would not say that the action today is hypocritical, but an uninformed observer might.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this section is a rule providing for consideration of the Congressional Accountability Act. This is the exact same bill that we Democrats passed in the House last year.

However, sadly, the Republicans derailed it in the Senate, so I do not want anybody out there thinking that we Democrats in the House opposed this. We proposed it, and it passed the House last year. I strongly supported this measure last year and I will support it again this year.

Let me add that I am delighted that the Republicans seem to be on board this time. Better late than never. However, Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to the rule we are operating under. This is a closed rule, plain and simple.

My left ear has gone deaf from all the catcalls and the charges of gag rule from the minority in the last couple of years, but now they come to the floor and put two closed rules together, so I am really disappointed in the actions of the minority today. Over the years, the cries from the Republicans, maybe Mr. Solomon learned something from me or maybe I learned something from him.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman would yield, believe me, I learned a lot from you, JOE.

Mr. MOAKLEY. OK, but I could spend all week reciting quotations from Members on the Republican side calling restrictive rules of any kind unconstitutional, undemocratic, unfair. Yet, the first day of the session, on the very first item on our legislative agenda, what do we get? A closed rule within a closed rule. I am very, very disappointed in the party who is crying for open rules and free debates, to come forward today with this rule.

I know some of my Republican colleagues will argue that we do not need an open rule on this particular measure because the House passed the same legislation in the last session, under Democratic leadership, let me add. Yet I cannot recall a single occasion on which my Republican colleagues supported a closed restricted rule on any previously-passed piece of legislation.

Let me add that when the Democratic leadership brought the Congressional Accountability Act to the floor last year, we made 14 amendments in order. The scream was "It is a gag rule, it is a closed rule." Here today we come and we cannot put one amendment in order; they come with seven amendments into the bill. Evidently there has been an awakening of the Committee on Rules, or there has been a change in the heart of my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

However, I recall during debate last year my good friend and the new chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] arguing for more open

rules on a previously passed bill due to the fact that there were so many new freshmen that had not read the bill and it was not fair. Evidently he has had some second thoughts. He thought they should be able to have greater say in the process. I can point to some freshmen this year, Mr. Speaker, who should be given the courtesy that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and his party thought we should have given them last year.

Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as a bit ironic that notwithstanding the rhetoric, we are here with what last year my Republican friends would have called the gag rule. We were accused of having gag rules if they were preprinted in the RECORD, or moving a comma.

This is a blatant closed rule, and as I say, they were talking about openness and allowing full debate. Maybe tomorrow or the next day may show something else, but today, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any openness coming from the other side.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Muncie, IN [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the voters of Muncie, Anderson, Richmond, and all of the Second District I rise in support of both the rule and the Congressional Accountability Act. Mr. Speaker, the time is now to make Congress accountable for the laws it imposes on the American people.

For too long, Congress has told the American People: "Do as I say, not as I do." Congress is currently exempt from laws such as the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act and OSHA. For example: House Annex I—the O'Neill Building, could not legally be occupied by any private enterprise. It would be shut down. Only Congress, with its exemption from many workplace safety regulations, can reside there. Mr. Speaker, the time is now to end this double standard.

The Congressional Accountability Act will cause Congress to make better laws. Bad laws will surely be changed as Congress feels their weight. And good laws protecting safety and civil rights will benefit congressional employees.

James Madison wrote: "This Constitution places elected officials under the law, thereby avoiding tyranny." Mr. Speaker, the Congress has not lived under all of the laws of the land for too long.

The time is now to end the tyranny and make those laws apply to Congress.

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

I would like to close by saying I do not support this closed rule. It blocks any effort to have an honest, open debate about real reform.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we have 2½ minutes remaining, do we not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Prior to yielding further time, the gentleman does have 2½ minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute of our time to the gentleman from Westbury, NY [Mr. FRISA].

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years this Congress has been in an ivory tower, out of touch with reality, and out of touch with the American people. That is why the Congress thought it knew better, could pass its burdensome laws, rules and regulations for everyone else but for itself. That is going to change, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in November the American people knocked an elitist Congress off its pedestal. Tonight the majority will plant its feet firmly on the ground, and we stand proudly accountable to the American people for the laws that we will pass, because they should apply to us as well.

I would urge support for this measure.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when Vaclav Havel came and spoke to the American people, he quoted Thomas Jefferson when he said that "Words are plentiful, but deeds are precious." The American people want action, not protracted debate.

□ 2320

Mr. Speaker, we must seize this historic day. Let us not let the American people down. The U.S. Congress must comply with the laws of the land. I strongly encourage my fellow colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on H.R. 1.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment that the Republican majority has not seen fit to allow amendments to the Congressional Accountability Act. Let me say at the outset that I support the intent of the Congressional Accountability Act. I have fought for the rights of American workers throughout my political career. I strongly believe that all employees, private and public, including Federal, State, and local and congressional employees, should be afforded the protection of our labor laws. I believe that the Congressional Accountability Act accomplishes that objective with regard to congressional employees in a manner that does not impinge upon the independence of the legislative branch nor the ability of Members to represent their constituents.

Nevertheless, I am amazed that the Republican leadership has seen fit to deny Members any opportunity to amend this bill. This legislation is substantially the same bill that overwhelmingly passed the House last Congress under Democratic leadership. At that time, at least some amendments were permitted. As a matter of principle, the contention that the Congress should be covered by the labor statutes is so widely held in this body as to be beyond issue. So why bring the bill up under a

gag rule? Surely no one contends that the Congressional Accountability Act was written on Mount Sinai.

The stated purpose of the statute is to ensure that the Congress is subject to the same rules that we impose on private employers. Most private employers in this country are subject to the National Labor Relations Act. It is interesting to me that no effort has been made to at least apply that statute to those congressional employees who are not directly involved in the legislative process, such as janitorial and groundskeeping staff. Even if such an amendment were not adopted, I believe the debate would have been beneficial to both the Members and the public. I am disappointed that the Republican leadership has instead seen fit to gag the people's representatives. When the Republican leadership denies Members the right to fully participate in the legislative process on a noncontroversial issue like this, one cannot help but doubt their promises that future bills will be considered in an open and amendable manner.

Finally, I would like to point out to my colleagues the relationship between this act and the so-called unfunded mandates bill. Today, we are voting to apply our labor laws to the U.S. Congress. Shortly, we will vote on legislation modifying Congress' power to enact laws that affect State and local governments. That bill, at present, contains no exemption for the application of our labor laws to State and local governments. I hope that the principle that we are voting for today—that congressional employees should be protected by your labor laws—will apply equally next week when considering whether State and local government employees shall receive equal protection under our labor laws.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). The question is on Section 108 of the resolution.

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. 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 249, nays 178, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—249

Allard	Bevill	Burr
Archer	Billbray	Burton
Armey	Billrakls	Buyer
Bachus	Bishop	Callahan
Baesler	Billiey	Calvert
Baker (CA)	Blute	Camp
Baker (LA)	Boehlert	Canady
Ballenger	Boehner	Castle
Barr	Bonilla	Chabot
Barrett (NE)	Bono	Chambliss
Bartlett	Brewster	Chenoweth
Barton	Brownback	Christensen
Bass	Bryant (TN)	Chrysler
Bateman	Bunn	Clinger
Bereuter	Bunning	Coble

Coburn	Hoke	Porter
Collins (GA)	Horn	Portman
Combest	Hostettler	Pryce
Condit	Houghton	Quillen
Cooley	Hunter	Quinn
Cramer	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Crane	Hyde	Ramstad
Crapo	Inglis	Regula
Creameans	Istook	Riggs
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Danner	Jones	Rohrabacher
Davis	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Kelly	Rose
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Roth
Dickey	King	Roukema
Doolittle	Kingston	Royce
Dreier	Klug	Salmon
Duncan	Knollenberg	Sanford
Dunn	Kolbe	Saxton
Ehlers	LaHood	Scarborough
Ehrlich	Lambert-Lincoln	Schaefer
Emerson	Largent	Schiff
English	Latham	Seastrand
Ensign	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Everett	Laughlin	Shadegg
Ewing	Lazio	Shaw
Fawell	Leach	Shays
Fields (LA)	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Fields (TX)	Lewis (KY)	Siskisky
Flanagan	Lightfoot	Skeen
Foley	Linder	Skelton
Forbes	Livingston	Smith (MI)
Ford	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Fowler	Longley	Smith (TX)
Fox	Lucas	Smith (WA)
Franks (CT)	Manzullo	Solomon
Franks (NJ)	Martini	Souder
Frelinghuysen	McCollum	Spence
Frisa	McCrery	Stearns
Funderburk	McDade	Stockman
Gallegly	McHugh	Stump
Ganske	McInnis	Talent
Gekas	McIntosh	Tanner
Gilchrest	McKeon	Tate
Gillmor	Metcaif	Taylor (MS)
Gilman	Meyers	Taylor (NC)
Goodlatte	Mica	Thomas
Goodling	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Goss	Mollnar	Tiaht
Graham	Montgomery	Torkildsen
Greenwood	Moorhead	Torricelli
Gunderson	Morella	Upton
Gutknecht	Myers	Waldholtz
Hall (TX)	Myrick	Walker
Hamilton	Nethercutt	Walsh
Hancock	Neumann	Wamp
Hansen	Ney	Weldon (FL)
Harman	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Hastert	Nussle	Weller
Hastings (WA)	Oxley	White
Hayworth	Packard	Whitfield
Hefley	Parker	Wicker
Heineman	Paxon	Wolf
Herger	Peterson (MN)	Young (AK)
Hilleary	Petri	Young (FL)
Hobson	Pickett	Zeliff
Hoekstra	Pombo	Zimmer

NAYS—178

Abercrombie	Collins (MD)	Flake
Ackerman	Conyers	Foglietta
Andrews	Costello	Frank (MA)
Baldacci	Coyne	Frost
Barca	de la Garza	Furse
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Gejdenson
Becerra	DeFazio	Gephardt
Bellenson	DeLauro	Geren
Bentsen	Dellums	Gibbons
Berman	Deutsch	Gonzalez
Bonior	Dicks	Gordon
Borski	Dingell	Green
Boucher	Dixon	Gutierrez
Browder	Doggett	Hall (OH)
Brown (CA)	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hayes
Bryant (TX)	Durbin	Hefner
Cardin	Edwards	Hilliard
Chapman	Engel	Hinchee
Clay	Eshoo	Holden
Clayton	Evans	Hoyer
Clement	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Clyburn	Fattah	Jacobs
Coleman	Fazio	Jefferson
Collins (IL)	Filner	Johnson (SD)

Johnson, E. B.	Mink	Scott
Johnston	Moakley	Serrano
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Skaggs
Kaptur	Moran	Slaughter
Kennedy (MA)	Murtha	Spratt
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Stark
Kennelly	Neal	Stenholm
Kildee	Oberstar	Stokes
Klaczka	Obey	Studds
Klink	Olver	Stupak
LaFalce	Ortiz	Tauzin
Lantos	Orton	Tejeda
Levin	Owens	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Thornton
Lipinski	Pastor	Thurman
Lofgren	Payne (NJ)	Torres
Lowey	Payne (VA)	Towns
Luther	Pelosi	Traffant
Maloney	Peterson (FL)	Tucker
Manton	Pomeroy	Velazquez
Martinez	Poshard	Vento
Mascara	Rahall	Visclosky
Matsul	Rangel	Volkmer
McCarthy	Reed	Ward
McDermott	Reynolds	Waters
McHale	Richardson	Watt (NC)
McKinney	Rivers	Waxman
McNulty	Roemer	Williams
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Wilson
Meek	Rush	Wise
Menendez	Sabo	Woolsey
Mfume	Sanders	Wyden
Miller (CA)	Sawyer	Wynn
Mintea	Schroeder	
Minge	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (FL)	Dornan	Vucanovich
Cox	Markey	Yates

□ 2333

Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GORDON and Mrs. SCHROEDER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So section 108 of the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS). Title II of the resolution is now debatable for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the eight reform items considered previously represent the most visible elements of the House Republican reform agenda. These reforms, combined with the 23 additional changes made to the House rules in title II of this resolution, send a clear message to the American people that Congress is serious about changing the way Washington does business.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the changes in title II is compelling. The rules governing committee jurisdictions and the general procedures governing the House are ineffective and out-of-date. They breed bureaucratic inertia and rigidity, and they are a hindrance to setting priorities and carrying out agendas.

The rules governing the administration of the House have bred a patron-

age system that has brought scandal and embarrassment to this institution and have weakened both the public's image and the effectiveness of Congress.

The reforms in title II are intended to make the House more accountable, professionalize the administrative management, and rebuild public confidence in representative government. Adoption of title II will bring about dramatic change to this institution while maintaining a structure of rules that achieve what Thomas Jefferson called "a uniformity of proceeding in business" and the "order, decency, and regularity" of a dignified public body.

These reforms are long overdue. They have the support of the American people, and they deserve our strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to clarify some of the committee jurisdiction changes contained in section 202 of House Resolution 5.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture is amended to include inspection of livestock, and poultry, and meat products, and seafood and seafood products. As a result, the food inspection programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration are consolidated under the Committee on Agriculture. The current jurisdictional arrangement with respect to food safety activities will remain in the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The committee's jurisdiction has also been amended to include water conservation related to activities of the Department of Agriculture. This grants the committee jurisdiction over any measure that changes section 6217 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 with respect to agricultural activities in coastal zone areas.

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services retains all of the existing authority of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs from the 103d Congress over financial services providers generally, including the activities and supervision of depository institutions and any affiliates. The committee's jurisdiction has been expanded, as well as clarified by this resolution.

The committee is given jurisdiction over bank capital markets activities. In response to technological and market innovations, banks have sought to continue to service their traditional customer base by providing certain types of investment banking or functionally similar capital market services. The committee has jurisdiction over these capital markets activities engaged in by banks which include, but are not limited to, acting as a government securities broker or dealer under the Government Securities Act, acting as a municipal securities broker or dealer under section 15B of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, acting as an

investment advisor under the Investment Advisors Act of 1940, providing loan guarantees and other similar off-balance sheet support, privately placing securities, securitizing loan assets of any type, syndicating and selling bank loans, engaging in transactions involving exchange-traded and over-the-counter derivatives, and engaging in transactions involving other types of qualified financial contracts as that term is described in section 11(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. A comprehensive summary of bank capital markets activities as industry practices have defined this term are contained in A Guide to the Capital Markets Activities of Banks and Bank Holding Companies (1990).

In addition, the committee's jurisdiction is amended to expressly include depository institution securities activities generally, including the activities of any affiliate, except for the functional regulation under applicable securities laws not involving safety and soundness. This clarifies the committee's primary jurisdiction over the Glass-Steagall Act. It should be noted that the term "depository institution" specifically includes "non-bank banks" grandfathered under the Competitive Equality Banking Act of 1987 and the committee has jurisdiction over any affiliate of a non-bank bank, other than a registered broker-dealer.

Depository institution securities activities under the committee's jurisdiction would include any activity involving bank-eligible securities as described in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) and any securities activity incidental to carrying on the business of banking. It would also include any activities by depository institutions, their holding companies, and any affiliates to:

First, underwrite, deal in, broker, or distribute securities of any type, and engage in other securities activities as permitted by the appropriate federal banking agencies;

Second, sponsor, organize, control, manage, and act as investment adviser to an investment company;

Third, engage in, or acquire the shares of any company engaged in any securities activity so closely related to banking as to be a proper incident thereto.

A list of current securities-related activities under the committee's jurisdiction that have been determined to be so closely related to banking as to be a proper incident thereto is described in Federal Reserve Board Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.25).

Any securities activity conducted by a depository institution, its holding company, or any affiliate in a registered broker-dealer should be functionally regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission under applicable securities laws and the appropriate Federal banking agency jointly.

The SEC would functionally regulate a registered broker-dealer affiliated with a depository institution for purposes of compliance with the legal and regulatory framework generally established for registered broker-dealers under the securities laws. SEC functional regulation under applicable securities laws will not be included in the committee's jurisdiction. Registered broker-dealers affiliated with insured institutions will also be supervised by the appropriate Federal banking agency, most likely the Federal Reserve Board, for compliance with applicable Federal banking laws and for purposes of protecting the safety and soundness of affiliated insured institutions. Supervision for safety and soundness purposes of a broker-dealer affiliated with a depository institution by the appropriate Federal banking agency is maintained within the committee's jurisdiction.

Several significant changes are made to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce formerly the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Those changes include the transfer of jurisdiction over the inspection programs of the Food and Drug Administration to the Committee on Agriculture. The current jurisdictional arrangement with respect to food safety activities would remain in the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities will retain the jurisdictional authority of the Committee on Education and Labor from the 103d Congress.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight combines the jurisdiction of the former 103d Congress committees on the District of Columbia, Government Operations, and Post Office and Civil Service. The resolution clarifies the committee's jurisdiction over the Federal Paperwork Reduction Act. It also clarifies the committee's jurisdiction over public information and records as they pertain to the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act. This should not be construed to affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Oversight with respect to the Government Printing Office, or the Library of Congress, or House Information Systems, or the dissemination of such government information to the public.

The Committee on House Oversight retains the jurisdictional authority of the Committee on House Administration from the 103d Congress, with the addition of jurisdiction over the Franking Commission. Jurisdiction over measures relating to the erection of monuments to the memory of individuals is transferred to the Committee on Resources.

The Committee on International Relations retains the jurisdictional authority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the 103d Congress.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary is amended to include ad-

ministrative practice and procedure. This is added to reinforce the fact that, since 1946, the committee has had jurisdiction over the Administrative Procedures Act and the rights and remedies under administrative law.

The Committee on National Security retains the jurisdictional authority of the Committee on Armed Services from the 103d Congress. Jurisdiction added to the committee includes tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense. This clarifies the existing relationship between the committee and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The Committee on Resources retains the authority of the Committee on Natural Resources from the 103d Congress, with the addition of some jurisdictions formerly vested in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on House Administration, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce from the 103d Congress.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business is amended to include measures relating to the Regulatory Flexibility Act and the Paperwork Reduction Act as they affect small business.

The Committee on Science retains the jurisdictional authority of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology from the 103d Congress. Jurisdiction added to the committee includes marine research, which was formerly vested in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from the 103d Congress. This jurisdiction includes, but is not limited to, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Regional Marine Research Programs, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion, Global Climate Change, Global Learning and Observation to Benefit the Environment, National Undersea Research Program, NOAA Corps, and NOAA fleet; and

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure retains the jurisdictional authority of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation from the 103d Congress. Jurisdiction added to the Committee includes Federal management of emergencies and natural disasters. This language is added to reflect an agreement reached in the 103d Congress between the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. It transfers nearly all of the responsibility for the authorization and oversight of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Additionally, it is my understanding that, based on an agreement with the Office of Management and Budget, programs related to this jurisdictional transfer will be moved out of budget function 050 to the budget function dealing with public works. Jurisdiction over measures relating to merchant marine, except for

national security aspects of merchant marine will be further clarified by a memorandum of understanding between the National Security Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

In addition, the committee is granted jurisdiction over marine affairs, including coastal zone management, as they related to oil and other pollution of navigable waters. This vests the committee with primary jurisdiction over all aspects of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the coastal nonpoint pollution program established in section 6217 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

□ 2340

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

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

I take this minute of time to indicate to my colleagues that at the end of this 20-minute block of time there will be a motion to recommit, and I want to appreciate my colleagues of what that will be. For the newer members of this institution, you will get yet a third chance tonight to vote on a ban on gifts from lobbyists, you will get a third chance tonight to vote on a limit on royalties for books to one-third of annual salary, you will get a chance again this evening to vote on an open rule for the Congressional Accountability Act, and in addition to that, you will get a chance to institute some of the reforms that your friends and your colleagues have championed on this floor over the years, guaranteeing, for instance, a third of committee staff for minority, limiting the terms of the Speaker to three terms instead of four terms, bipartisan House Administrator, something championed on this floor day in and day out over the last session which we have had and now we do not have anymore, and you can have a chance to vote on that. Committee ratios must match.

All of these reforms you will get a chance to vote on in the motion to recommit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to our new colleague, the gentleman from Friendswood, TX [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to speak in strong support of the reforms in title II. I was elected to Congress as a servant of the people; to limit the size and scope of the Federal Government and to clean up the mess here in Washington. This title has 23 provisions and I will focus on just a few.

In the Contract With America we committed to slash the number of committees and we have kept our word. This is revolutionary legislation. Today, we will eliminate three committees (Post Office, Merchant Marine, and District of Columbia). No full

standing House committees has been eliminated since 1947. In addition, 25 subcommittees will also be eliminated. The savings will be approximately \$35 million. House committees, like Federal programs, ought not live forever.

Our first order of business is to put the People's House in order. We signed a contract with the American people to look at every Federal action by the House will send a strong and clear message to the American people that we are serious about our purpose.

This bill will ensure that what is said on the floor and in committee will be recorded verbatim for the American people to read. Staff members will no longer work into the middle of the night to conceal what was actually said in the People's House.

This bill will end pork barrel projects on emergency spending bills. This change will make spending cuts easier.

This bill will ban commemorative legislation like National Asparagus Day. Banning this practice will save at least \$300,000 according to the Congressional Research Service and improve the operation of Congress by eliminating the 25 percent of floor time consumed by commemoratives.

Last, and perhaps most importantly, this bill will require the Pledge of Allegiance as the third order of business each day. In 1988, the Democrats defeated an attempt to require the Pledge on the House floor. The Pledge ought not to be optional in the People's House and now it is not. I am proud of our great Nation and believe our best days are yet to come. We will set an example by beginning our day pledging allegiance to this country which has been so richly blessed.

Mr. Speaker, thank you again for this historic opportunity to lead the debate on this bill. It is a good first step and sets an example that we are able to get our affairs in order. Let us move boldly ahead to return Congress and this Nation to the people. I urge adoption.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me express my disappointment with section 201 of the bill that is before us, where a partisan Chief Administrative Officer will replace a nonpartisan Chief Administrative Officer will replace a nonpartisan Director of Financial and Non-Legislative Services.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle have been working for less partisanship, particularly in the administration of the House of Representatives.

It was the Republicans who worked with us to develop the Director of Financial and Non-Legislative Services, being approved by both the majority and minority, reporting to a committee composed of equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans.

What happens under this particular bill? That office is abolished and re-

placed with a partisan Chief Administrative Officer. A few months ago the Republicans favored bipartisanship in administration to avoid the abuse of power by any one party. Now, just a few months later, we see a complete reversal.

What a missed opportunity to advance bipartisanship.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from West Chester, OH [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman, there are a lot of important reforms in title II of this part of the rules package tonight. One of those sections in there eliminates legislative service organizations or, as some have come to be known, taxpayer funded caucuses.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], sitting in the back of the Chamber, spent 14 years, and I have joined him the last 4 years, along with other Members, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], in trying to reform these LSO's, but, no, we could never get real reform of LSO's. We could never get a full accounting of the funds. We could never build a wall between these taxpayer-funded caucuses and outside 5013(c) organizations these foundations.

And so putting this in the rules package guarantees that no longer will the U.S. House of Representatives have to fund these organizations. That means less space, less overhead, less cost to America's taxpayers.

It is the right move, and the people who put this in here ought to be congratulated.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, included in the House rules package prepared by the Republican Conference being voted upon today are provisions to direct the House Oversight Committee to abolish all Legislative Service Organizations [LSO's], including the Democratic Study Group [DSG].

The Republican rules package is being brought to the floor under a procedure which bars amendments. So today there will be no opportunity for the House to effectively debate the merits of an organization such as the Democratic Study Group or to consider proposals to allow the Democratic Study Group to continue to provide top-quality research within the House of Representatives.

However, as the newly elected chairman of the Democratic Study Group for the 104th Congress, I cannot let this occasion pass without standing up to protest this misguided action on the part of the House Republican Conference.

Although under the new Republican rules the Democratic Study Group will be allowed to reconstitute itself as a "Congressional Member Organization,"

DSG's ability to have an office and staff and thus to produce the legislative research materials Members have relied upon for so long is being terminated.

The Democratic Study Group has served the House of Representatives extremely well for over 30 years. Over this period of time, DSG has provided independent, in-depth, and timely analyses of all legislation coming to the House floor.

Over this more-than-30-year period, DSG has developed a reputation for independence and credibility, by providing unbiased information that presents both sides of controversial issues fairly and objectively. Consequently, DSG research materials have come to be relied upon not only by House Democrats, but also by Republican subscribers, the press, lobbyists, and congressional scholars. Indeed, at times, DSG has had well over 50 Republican subscribers.

The quality of DSG research products has been noted by many independent observers. For example, scholar Norman Ornstein has written that DSG "has evolved over the years into a group that provides solid, objective, and timely information" on upcoming legislation.

House Republicans have attempted to characterize their abolition of the Democratic Study Group as part of their efforts to cut costs and increase efficiency in the House—and yet terminating DSG does neither.

The Democratic Study Group has been a cost-effective mechanism allowing rank-and-file Members of the House to pool their resources to have an independent staff that produced indepth legislative analyses that Members needed to carry out their legislative responsibilities.

Instead of having 435 congressional offices have individual staffers attempt to read every bill and accompanying committee report coming to the House floor for a vote, the premise of the DSG has been to have a small, independent staff analyze these bills and provide interested offices with the indepth analyses that they need.

As a result, the existence of DSG over the last three decades has actually increased the efficiency of the House of Representatives and reduced the cost to each Member of acquiring this in-depth information.

DSG has not only increased efficiency within the House, it has also done so in a very cost-effective manner. With a staff of only 18—including printers and support staff—the Democratic Study Group produces a prodigious amount of high-quality research materials for Members, the press, and other interested parties. For example, in the 103d Congress alone, DSG produced 517 reports on legislation and major issues, totaling 7,793 pages. Any Republican claims that

DSG has not been cost-effective simply ignore these facts.

Furthermore, despite Republican claims to the contrary, the elimination of DSG does not save even \$1 of taxpayer money and does not cut House staff by even one position. The new Republican rules don't cut office expense allowances or staff slots—they just restrict how Members are allowed to use their allowances and staff slots. Thus, under the new Republican rules, Members will simply now be free to use money currently used to pay DSG dues to meet other office expenses and be free to use staff slots currently used for a shared DSG employee to hire another personal staff member.

If abolishing DSG doesn't cut costs or increase efficiency, what is the true motivation behind the move to terminate this 35-year-old organization which has served the House so well?

The real motivation for House Republicans in terminating DSG is not hard to divine. In materials distributed in the Republican Conference on December 6, when the vote to eliminate DSG was taken, it is stated: "The demise of the DSG severely damages the power structure of the House Democrats."

Closing down DSG seems to be part of an effort to centralize information and to stifle debate on legislation that the new Republican majority produces.

Indeed, House Republicans have moved to abolish DSG at the same time that they have promised to bring 10 complicated pieces of legislation to the House floor—the Republican "Contract With America"—within the first 100 days of the 104th Congress. Thus, at the same time that the House is embarking on a furious legislative schedule, the staff most equipped to provide the minority party with legislative analyses has been abolished.

Although a nonprofit organization is being formed that will attempt to provide high-quality DSG-like research services to interested Members and to others, it is a disservice to the House of Representatives that such a step is now necessary.

Scholar Norman Ornstein has said that losing DSG as an integral part of the House of Representatives represents "a real loss for Congress." More than that, it is a blow to free, open, and honest debate, and a rather blatant attempt to censor information and quash dissent in this body.

□ 2350

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Long Beach, CA [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, we heard a few hours ago the word hypocrisy used; we have heard about the gift ban that needs to come before us. The facts of life are that this is not the place to discuss the gift ban, but if we are going to discuss it let us also discuss political

action committees. Five or ten dollar gifts such as the nasty lips ointment which arrived in our offices today from a Vermont firm, that is not the problem. The problem is there is too much money floating around in American politics at \$10,000 an election cycle per political action committee [PAC].

That is what we have to deal with. The fact that you can hold parties at the Republican Club and at the Democratic Club and get \$500 at a clip every quarter from Washington lobbyists is the real lobbyist problem. It is not the \$5 or \$10 gift that pops up, the raisins from Fresno, or whatever.

I would suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that what the Republican party offered this Chamber last year and they voted down was a ban on PAC's and a ban on soft money. Next time we ought to pass that legislation if we are really serious about curbing lobbyist influence.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend—and he is my friend—who just spoke that if he was serious and the party he represents was serious, they also would talk about the PAC issue and open up the books to GOPAC. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot have a PAC where people in this country give unlimited amounts of money where we do not know who gives it, what relationship they have to the legislation that is pending in this institution.

Let me speak to another issue, Mr. Speaker, that was raised here this evening, and that is the issue of closing down voices. We have had a disturbing trend occur in the last 2 months in this institution. LSO's, Women's Caucus, their voices closed down; African-American voices closed down; Hispanic voices closed down; Democratic Research, the voice of our party, closed down.

Then what do we have today? Three closed rules closing down our voice to offer amendments, and then the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle advocate closing down Public Broadcasting, the National Endowment for the Arts, and there is a narrow closing of voices in this country, and we will not be a part of it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Idaho Falls, ID [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. Speaker, let us understand what this debate is about. We have before us title II of a proposal that has over 25 major and important reforms and a motion to commit that will be coming that will say, Let's not consider these reforms tonight, reforms that will eliminate committees, reforms that will eliminate rolling quorums, make accountable votes in committees, and require automatic rollover votes for

spending money and raising taxes, and one which is especially important to our class—the freshman class of last year—and that is the discharge petition.

What is the reason for saying, Let's not enact these reforms tonight? Because we have the gift ban proposal put forward that our Speaker today said we will address in this Congress. You cannot use the issue of saying we want to do it tonight, to dodge these important reforms. We will get to the gift ban, but tonight let us focus on the reforms that this House needs, that the people of this country want, and let us get on with the business of reforming this House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, since 1800, the residents of Washington, DC, have been the only taxpaying U.S. citizens denied equal representation in Congress, denying the residents of the District of Columbia to send Representatives to Congress who can vote on taxes or decide questions of war and peace.

At the same time we expect them to shoulder the burdens of citizenship—including the obligation to pay taxes and to fight and die for their country in time of war, this is wrong.

The District of Columbia has more residents than three States, Alaska, Wyoming, and Vermont. Combined those three States have nine Representatives in Congress. The District of Columbia has only one nonvoting Member, that is unfair, unequal and not to mention unconscionable.

I urge Members to reconsider their stand on this issue. How can we deny persons the right to fair representation, how can we provide for taxation without representation in the United States—and at the same time, in good faith, fight for democracy abroad?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, all day the new majority has proposed a package of rules meant to symbolize a return of Government to the people. But there is one element of the rules package which flies in the face of democracy, which strengthens Federal control over the lives of citizens, which disempowers local Government and which makes this House less accessible to U.S. citizens, and that is the denial of the delegates their opportunity to vote in the Committee of the Whole.

Those who argue that against the delegate vote forget the past struggles of breaking down barriers to participation on the basis of gender, race, poll taxes and land ownership.

Now, as we confront the issue of fellow citizens who die like you for that flag, who serve like you for that flag and who remain spectators in this country's affairs, our history is conveniently forgotten. Those who would deny the participation of people from Guam, a place symbolized in the national consciousness in World War II as the only inhabited U.S. territory invaded and occupied since the war of 1812, which was the land from which much of American power has been extended into Asia and the Pacific during the cold war.

Guam was one of the major bases used to fight the Vietnam war. But when the wars are over and we attempt to put into practice what we allegedly fought for, Guam and her people recede into the back reaches of our memory, only to be jarred when again we need their piece of property to fight another war, but never to share in the peace.

We may lose this time in the fight over this important symbol, but we will be here constantly, reminding you of who we are until we jar your consciousness and bring the principles of this country into fruition wherever that flag flies.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, I rise in strong opposition to the provision in the rules package which will eliminate all legislative service organizations.

Let's be honest—this attack on the caucuses and their right to exist is not motivated by any desire for reform. It will not save the public money.

This change has one purpose, and one purpose only—to silence the voices of those who dare to question the status quo in this supposedly new and "open" House of Representatives.

The elimination of the caucuses is an attempt to cut off the flow of information and ideas that the party now in power finds threatening.

Despite their public lip service to bipartisanship, the Republicans showed true colors behind closed doors. Let me quote from the document they distributed in the Republican conference. They said it was important to cut out the caucuses because, and I quote, "Eliminating the Legislative Service Organizations severely damages the power structure of the House Democrats." Is this bipartisanship?

The Congressional Black Caucus and the other legislative service organiza-

tions have been run in an efficient, responsible manner. Members with similar concerns have been able to pool our resources to accomplish important goals in behalf of our constituencies. As all Members well know, the expenditures of legislative service organizations are carefully monitored by the House Finance Office.

To ensure strict accountability, the General Accounting Office conducts audits of the legislative service organizations.

So, again, this is not about reform. It is a blatant move to put a gag on minorities and others who may differ in opinion from the new majority party.

But let me say this—you will not succeed in silencing us. We have been through many struggles throughout the course of history, but we have never been silenced. Regardless of the outcome of this vote, the Congressional Black Caucus will continue to meet, to fight injustices, and to speak out passionately in behalf of those who have no power, who have no voice. We will continue to be the conscience of the Congress.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I regret this move by the new majority to obstruct the work of the Congressional Black Caucus and other organizations under the guise of "reform." I hope that all fair-minded people will see through this sham.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining and has indicated he has one speaker remaining. The gentleman is entitled to close.

□ 2400

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to many of the elements of this package.

While there are some admirable portions—for which I would vote if they stood alone—the package as a whole must be defeated!

When we carefully examine what these rules will do, we discover they are not reforms at all, as has been promised, but steps that actually reduce our ability to serve the public and increase opportunities for purely partisan activity.

Eliminating the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would be a disservice to the many retirees who have dedicated their lives in service to their country! I have received many letters and calls from seniors who are extremely concerned about this action.

Eliminating the legislative service organizations will make it more difficult to get a fair hearing for any program or analysis that goes in a different direction from that of the new majority.

In 1992, Congress went through a concerted effort in the aftermath of the House Post Office scandal to make the House administration a non-partisan activity, reporting in a bipartisan manner to Congress. This was true

reform. But the proposed rule would eliminate the nonpartisan Doorkeeper's Office—and open a backdoor to partisan manipulation.

The new Speaker's Office is another attempt to consolidate power in a partisan manner—eliminating the progress that has been made in protecting the rights of both the minority and the majority and in fostering full debate of issues before this legislative body.

In addition, this rule prevents some of our duly-elected Representatives from voting in the Committee of the Whole House, including the representative from Washington, DC—leaving the Capital's citizens with taxation without representation. Talk about moving backwards!

We must preserve the rights of the majority and the minority. We must preserve the votes of all Representatives. We must be cautious about reform that ends up costing more money and decreasing our ability to truly debate ideas. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this package.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Atlanta, GA [Mr. LINDER], a new member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address directly the question of stilling of voices, whether the Republican Party wants to still the voices, and the minority whip says we are stilling the black voices, the Hispanic voices, the women's voices and the Arts Caucus' voices, and I would like to suggest that it is precisely at the crux of a November 8 election. One tends to see America as groups of groups with groups' claims and society's assets, and we argue that America is 258 million individual Americans, each with their own voice, each being heard at every opportunity.

The last time we had a party in this country that saw America as a collection of groups with group claims and assets was in 1832, and 1856 and 1860. They were organized around opposition to another idea. They did not have a single organizing principle of their own. It was the Whig Party, and they died.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to just respond briefly to that.

Mr. Speaker, we are 209 Members strong, representing every part of this great country and representing every constituency in this great country of ours in our Democratic Party. We have been silenced tonight, all of us and the people that we represent, from offering any amendment on the bills that are pending before us tonight.

We are not a narrow group of people. We do not represent a narrow interest of people. We represent a broad spectrum of the American public, and they have shut us out this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I think, yes, in some ways today is historic. My colleagues, the most historic thing about today is the fact that on the very first day of the Republican majority eight significant changes were debated on the floor, and not a single amendment was allowed. We were totally shut out of the process, and it is not that these were the most earth shattering of debates of rules.

I have to say that when I go into O'Halleran's Pub and speak, to the fellows, Mr. Speaker, they do not say, "Hey, Charlie, make sure you go to baseline budgeting," or, "Get rid of proxy voting." These are internal issues that affect only ourselves, and they are not going to make the lives of our constituents better. They are a debate as to how to run the House.

Where could it be more appropriate than to allow that debate to be open and free and to allow alternative proposals as they so suggest that they want to do than on this kind of debate? The fact that we have not been allowed to debate these issues and amend these issues openly does not speak well for the future openness of how this House will be run.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS). All time has expired on the minority side.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the speaker tell me if it is his ruling that it is still Wednesday? I just want to know what day it is. I was told we have to this on the first day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Massachusetts that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair recognized him for a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, when we began this day debating the rule I said, as I yielded time to my colleagues, that we were considering these measures under the most open procedure that has ever been used for a first day of any session of Congress in our Nation's history.

Now I have been listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk over the last several hours about this process being closed, preventing them from the chance to offer amendments. I cannot help but think about the task that I was given in January 1993 along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and several

others, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], former Senator David Boren, Senator PETE DOMENICI, to put together the first bipartisan bicameral effort in nearly half a century to reform this institution, and I was very optimistic 2 years ago today believing that the leadership in this House would in fact bring the measures that we have been passing by overwhelming margins with bipartisan support over the past several hours to the floor. Time and time again they made those commitments to me. They said we would do it, and what happened? Absolutely nothing.

I look at my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], there with whom I served, and he knows very well that, as he went to members of his leadership, unfortunately his effort to bring about a bipartisan package of reform was denied by them, and I believe there are many other Democrat Members who wanted to have it done, but unfortunately the leadership did not allow it.

And what has happened here tonight? We have listened to people talk about how this process is closed, preventing Members from having the opportunity to amend it. Well, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] just reminded me, throughout the hours and hours that we had and the efforts of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, we took input from Democrat and Republican Members. We have got a chance to implement 23 of those, Mr. Speaker. We should do it right now.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] rise?

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR  
Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

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

Mr. BONIOR. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:  
Mr. BONIOR moves to commit the resolution H. Res. 6 to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with only the following amendment:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

#### TERM LIMITS FOR SPEAKER

SEC. 224. Clause 7(b) of rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "four" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

#### EQUITABLE PARTY RATIOS ON COMMITTEES

SEC. 225. (a) In rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, clause 6(a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(3) The membership of each committee (and each subcommittee, task force, or other subunit thereof) shall reflect the ratio of majority to minority party Members of the House at the beginning of the Congress (unless otherwise provided by House Rules). For the purposes of this clause, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and the Delegates to the House shall not be counted in determining the party ratio of the House."

(b) In rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, clause 6(f) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "The membership of each such select committee (and of any subcommittee, task force or subunit thereof), and of each such conference committee, shall reflect the ratio of the majority to minority party Members of the House at the time of its appointment."

#### MAJORITY-MINORITY COMMITTEE STAFF RATIOS

SEC. 226. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, not less than one-third of the staff funding made available to each standing, select, special, ad hoc, or other committee of the House of Representatives shall be allocated to the minority party.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

#### BUDGET WAIVER LIMITATION

SEC. 227. Clause 4(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(1) by striking out "(e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(e)(1)", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) It shall be in order after the previous question has been ordered on any such resolution, to offer motions proposing to strike one or more such waivers from the resolution, and each such motion shall be decided without debate and shall require for adoption the requisite number of affirmative votes as required by the Budget Act or the rules of the House. After disposition of any and all such motions, the House shall proceed to an immediate vote on adoption of the resolution."

#### BAN ON GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS

SEC. 228. Clause 4 of rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a)(1) No Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall accept a gift, knowing that such gift is provided directly or indirectly by a paid lobbyist, a lobbying firm (a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity), or an agent of a foreign principal (as defined in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938).

"(2) The prohibition in subparagraph (1) includes the following:

"(A) Anything provided by a lobbyist or a foreign agent which the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe is paid for, charged to, or reimbursed by a client or firm of such lobbyist or foreign agent.

"(B) Anything provided by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent to an entity that is maintained or controlled by a Member, officer, or employee.

"(C) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent on the basis of a designation, recommendation, or other specification of a Member, officer, or employee (not including a mass mailing or other solicitation directed to a broad category of persons or entities).

"(D) A contribution or other payment by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent

to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee.

“(E) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent in lieu of an honorarium to a Member, officer, or employee.

“(F) A financial contribution or expenditure made by a lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or a foreign agent relating to a conference, retreat, or similar event, sponsored by or affiliated with an official congressional organization, for or on behalf of Members, officers, or employees.

“(3) The following are not gifts subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (1):

“(A) Anything for which the recipient pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

“(B) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) Food or refreshments of nominal value offered other than as part of a meal.

“(D) Benefits resulting from the business, employment, or other outside activities of the spouse of a Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances.

“(E) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

“(F) Informational materials that are sent to the office of a Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audio tapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

“(4)(A) A gift given by an individual under circumstances which make it clear the gift is given for a nonbusiness purpose and is motivated by a family relationship or close personal friendship and not the position of the Member, officer, or employee shall not be subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (1).

“(B) A gift shall not be considered to be given for a nonbusiness purpose if the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the individual giving the gift will seek—

“(1) to deduct the value of such gift as a business expense on the individual's Federal income tax return, or

“(i) direct or indirect reimbursement or any other compensation for the value of the gift from a client or employer of such lobbyist or foreign agent.

“(C) In determining if the giving of a gift is motivated by a family relationship or close personal friendship, at least the following factors shall be considered:

“(i) The history of the relationship between the individual giving the gift and the recipient of the gift, including whether or not gifts have previously been exchanged by such individuals.

“(ii) Whether the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was purchased by the individual who gave the item.

“(iii) Whether the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the individual who gave the gift also at the same time gave the same or similar gifts to other Members, officers, or employees.

“(b) In addition to the restriction on receiving gifts from paid lobbyists, lobbying firms, and agents of foreign principals provided by paragraph (a) and except as pro-

vided in this Rule, no Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall knowingly accept a gift from any other person.

“(c)(1) For the purpose of this clause, the term ‘gift’ means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, or other item having monetary value. The term includes gifts of services, training, transportation, lodging, and meals, whether provided in kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has been incurred.

“(2) A gift to the spouse or dependent of a Member, officer, or employee (or a gift to any other individual based on that individual's relationship with the Member, officer, or employee) shall be considered a gift to the Member, officer, or employee if it is given with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Member, officer, or employee and the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee.

“(d) The restrictions in paragraph (b) shall not apply to the following:

“(1) Anything for which the Member, officer, or employee pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

“(2) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(3) Anything provided by an individual on the basis of a personal or family relationship unless the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe that, under the circumstances, the gift was provided because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and not because of the personal or family relationship. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall provide guidance on the applicability of this clause and examples of circumstances under which a gift may be accepted under this exception.

“(4) A contribution or other payment to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee, that is otherwise lawfully made, if the person making the contribution or payment is identified for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

“(5) Any food or refreshments which the recipient reasonably believes to have a value of less than \$20.

“(6) Any gift from another Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

“(7) Food, refreshments, lodging, and other benefits—

“(A) resulting from the outside business or employment activities (or other outside activities that are not connected to the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder) of the Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse of the Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits have not been offered or enhanced because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances;

“(B) customarily provided by a prospective employer in connection with bona fide employment discussions; or

“(C) provided by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in connection with a fund-raising or campaign event sponsored by such an organization.

“(8) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

“(9) Informational materials that are sent to the office of the Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audio tapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

“(10) Awards or prizes which are given to competitors in contests or events open to the public, including random drawings.

“(11) Honorary degrees (and associated travel, food, refreshments, and entertainment) and other bona fide, nonmonetary awards presented in recognition of public service (and associated food, refreshments, and entertainment provided in the presentation of such degrees and awards).

“(12) Donations of products from the State that the Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any individual recipient.

“(13) Food, refreshments, and entertainment provided to a Member or an employee of a Member in the Member's home State, subject to reasonable limitations, to be established by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

“(14) An item of little intrinsic value such as a greeting card, baseball cap, or a T shirt.

“(15) Training (including food and refreshments furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the training) provided to a Member, officer, or employee, if such training is in the interest of the House of Representatives.

“(16) Bequests, inheritances, and other transfers at death.

“(17) Any item, the receipt of which is authorized by the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or any other statute.

“(18) Anything which is paid for by the Federal Government, by a State or local government, or secured by the Government under a Government contract.

“(19) A gift of personal hospitality of an individual, as defined in section 109(14) of the Ethics in Government Act.

“(20) Free attendance at a widely attended event permitted pursuant to paragraph (e).

“(21) Opportunities and benefits which are—

“(A) available to the public or to a class consisting of all Federal employees, whether or not restricted on the basis of geographic consideration;

“(B) offered to members of a group or class in which membership is unrelated to congressional employment;

“(C) offered to members of an organization, such as an employees' association or congressional credit union, in which membership is related to congressional employment and similar opportunities are available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size;

“(D) offered to any group or class that is not defined in a manner that specifically discriminates among Government employees on the basis of branch of Government or type of responsibility, or on a basis that favors those of higher rank or rate of pay;

“(E) in the form of loans from banks and other financial institutions on terms generally available to the public; or

“(F) in the form of reduced membership or other fees for participation in organization activities offered to all Government employees by professional organizations if the only restrictions on membership relate to professional qualifications.

"(22) A plaque, trophy, or other memento of modest value.

"(23) Anything for which, in exceptional circumstances, a waiver is granted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(e)(1) Except as prohibited by paragraph (a), a Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance at a widely attended convention, conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by the sponsor of the event, if—

"(A) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member's, officer's, or employee's official position; or

"(B) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in subparagraph (1) may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for an accompanying individual if others in attendance will generally be similarly accompanied or if such attendance is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(3) Except as prohibited by paragraph (a), a Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse or dependent thereof, may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at a charity event, except that reimbursement for transportation and lodging may not be accepted in connection with the event.

"(4) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'free attendance' may include waiver of all or part of a conference or other fee, the provision of local transportation, or the provision of food, refreshments, entertainment, and instructional materials furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the event. The term does not include entertainment collateral to the event, or food or refreshments taken other than in a group setting with all or substantially all other attendees.

"(f) No Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift the value of which exceeds \$250 on the basis of the personal relationship exception in paragraph (d)(3) or the close personal friendship exception in section 106(d) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 unless the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issues a written determination that one of such exceptions applies.

"(g)(1) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to adjust the dollar amount referred to in paragraph (d)(5) on a periodic basis, to the extent necessary to adjust for inflation.

"(2) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall provide guidance setting forth reasonable steps that may be taken by Members, officers, and employees, with a minimum of paperwork and time, to prevent the acceptance of prohibited gifts from lobbyists.

"(3) When it is not practicable to return a tangible item because it is perishable, the item may, at the discretion of the recipient, be given to an appropriate charity or destroyed.

"(h)(1)(A) Except as prohibited by paragraph (a), a reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, officer, or employee for necessary transportation, lodging and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip or similar event in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an of-

ficer shall be deemed to be a reimbursement to the House of Representatives and not a gift prohibited by this paragraph, if the Member, officer, or employee—

"(i) in the case of an employee, receives advance authorization, from the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works, to accept reimbursement, and

"(ii) discloses the expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed and the authorization to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within 30 days after the travel is completed.

"(B) For purposes of clause (A), events, the activities of which are substantially recreational in nature, shall not be considered to be in connection with the duties of a Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder.

"(2) Each advance authorization to accept reimbursement shall be signed by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works and shall include—

"(A) the name of the employee;

"(B) the name of the person who will make the reimbursement;

"(C) the time, place, and purpose of the travel; and

"(D) a determination that the travel is in connection with the duties of the employee as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the employee is using public office for private gain.

"(3) Each disclosure made under subparagraph (1)(A) of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed shall be signed by the Member or officer (in the case of travel by the Member or officer) or by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works (in the case of travel by an employee) and shall include—

"(A) a good faith estimate of total transportation expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(B) a good faith estimate of total lodging expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(C) a good faith estimate of total meal expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(D) a good faith estimate of the total of other expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(E) a determination that all such expenses are necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses as defined in this paragraph; and

"(F) in the case of a reimbursement to a Member or officer, a determination that the travel was in connection with the duties of the Member or officer as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the Member or officer is using public office for private gain.

"(4) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term 'necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses'—

"(A) includes reasonable expenses that are necessary for travel—

"(i) for a period not exceeding 4 days including travel time within the United States or 7 days in addition to travel time outside the United States; and

"(ii) within 24 hours before or after participation in an event in the United States or within 48 hours before or after participation in an event outside the United States,

unless approved in advance by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

"(B) is limited to reasonable expenditures for transportation, lodging, conference fees and materials, and food and refreshments, including reimbursement for necessary transportation, whether or not such transportation occurs within the periods described in clause (A);

"(C) does not include expenditures for recreational activities or entertainment other than that provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event; and

"(D) may include travel expenses incurred on behalf of either the spouse or a child of the Member, officer, or employee, subject to a determination signed by the Member or officer (or in the case of an employee, the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the officer or employee works) that the attendance of the spouse or child is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(5) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make available to the public all advance authorizations and disclosures of reimbursement filed pursuant to subparagraph (1) as soon as possible after they are received."

#### LIMITATION ON ROYALTY INCOME

SEC. 229. (a) Clause 3 of rule XLVII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(g) In calendar year 1995 or thereafter, a Member, officer, or employee of the House may not—

"(1) receive any copyright royalties for any work—

"(A) unless the royalty is received from an established publisher pursuant to usual and customary contractual terms;

"(B) unless the total amount of such royalties for that work does not exceed one-third of that individual's annual pay as a Member, officer, or employee for the year in which the contract is entered into; and

"(C) without the prior notification and approval of the contract for that work by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; or

"(2) receive any advance payment for any such work."

(b) Clause 3(e)(5) of rule XLVII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"(5) copyright royalties."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only to copyright royalties received by any Member, officer, or employee of the House after the adoption of this resolution, pursuant to any contract entered into while that individual is such a Member, officer, or employee.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE RULES TO CREATE THE POSITION OF DIRECTOR OF NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

SEC. 230. The Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by adding at the end the following new rule:

##### "RULE LIII

##### "DIRECTOR OF NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

"1. The Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services shall be appointed for a Congress by the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, acting jointly. The Director may be removed by the House or by the Speaker. The Director shall be paid at the same rate of basic pay as the elected officers of the House.

"2. The Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services shall have extensive managerial and financial experience.

"3. Subject to the policy direction and oversight of the Committee on House Oversight, the Director shall have operational and financial responsibility for functions assigned by resolution of the House.

"4. Subject to the policy direction and oversight of the Committee on House Oversight, the Director shall develop employment standards that provide that all employment decisions for functions under the Director's supervision be made in accordance with the non-discrimination provisions of clause 9 of rule XLIII and of rule LI, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties involved. No adverse personnel action may be taken by the Director without cause."

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO THE DIRECTOR OF NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

SEC. 231. As soon as practicable, but not later than the ninetieth day beginning after the date of adoption of this resolution, the functions and entities specified in subsection (d) shall be transferred to the Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services.

(b) The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to prescribe regulations providing for—

(1) the orderly transfer of the functions and entities specified in subsection (d); and

(2) such additional transfers of functions and entities specified in subsection (d) with respect to the Clerk, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Director as may be necessary for the improvement of non-legislative and financial services in the House.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (d), functions and entities within the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Oversight under rule X may not be transferred to the Director.

(d) The functions and entities referred to in subsection (a) are: Office of Employee Assistance, Finance Office, pay and mileage of Members, House Information Systems, Office Furnishings, Office Supply Service, Office Systems Management, Placement Office, Special Services Office, Telecommunications, Telephone Exchange, Typewriter Repair, Barber Shop, Beauty Shop, House Restaurant System, Office of Photography, Inside Mail and Internal Mail Operations (including coordination with postal substations to be operated by the United States Postal Service), Guide Service, and Child Care Center, and the non-legislative functions of the Printing Services, Recording Studio, and Records and Registration.

OPEN RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

SEC. 232. (a) Section 108 of this resolution shall have no force or effect.

(b) 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. 1) to apply certain laws to the Congress. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority and Minority Leaders. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit with or without instructions.

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

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk continued the reading of the motion to commit.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the new majority in the House of Representatives have put forward a number of suggestions for reform here in the Congress.

Some of these proposals have merit, some do not.

But I believe that one of the most damaging, and fiscally questionable, is the proposal to eliminate Legislative Service Organizations here in the House.

Some Members on the other side of the aisle have suggested that elimination of LSO's will save money. Nothing could be further from the truth.

LSO's have given Members of this body, both Republicans and Democrats, the ability to combine their resources to more efficiently pursue policies they would have pursued anyway.

Eliminating LSO's will not mean that Members of these caucuses will stop working on these issues. Far from it.

As an associate member of both the Congressional Black and Hispanic Caucuses, I can assure my colleagues that the work of these caucuses will not stop.

As chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, which had hoped to organize as an LSO and will now be prevented from doing so, I can assure my colleagues that our work will continue as well.

If that work requires that each caucus member duplicate within his or her individual office the work that could be done more efficiently and at a lower cost by one person working for an LSO, then so be it.

The moral imperative that each of us feels to ensure that all Americans are represented in this House will not be changed. The ironclad commitment we have made to effectively providing that representation will not waiver.

And despite this effort to diminish the voices of African American, Hispanic American, Asian Pacific American and women Representatives in the Congress, our work will continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he 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 question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 227, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—201

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Obey
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Olver
Andrews	Gordon	Ortiz
Baessler	Green	Orton
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Owens
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hall (TX)	Parker
Becerra	Hamilton	Pastor
Beilenson	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Berman	Hayes	Pelosi
Bevill	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Bishop	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Bontor	Hinchee	Pickett
Borski	Holden	Pomeroy
Boucher	Hoyer	Poshard
Brewster	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Browder	Jacobs	Reed
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Cardin	Johnston	Roemer
Chapman	Kanjorski	Rose
Clay	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Clyburn	Kennelly	Sanders
Coleman	Kildee	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Klink	Schumer
Condit	LaFalce	Scott
Conyers	Lambert-Lincoln	Serrano
Costello	Lantos	Sislsky
Coyne	Laughlin	Skaggs
Cramer	Levin	Skelton
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
de la Garza	Lipinski	Spratt
Deal	Lofgren	Stenholm
DeFazio	Lowey	Stokes
DeLauro	Luther	Studds
Dellums	Maloney	Stupak
Deutsch	Manton	Tanner
Dicks	Markey	Tauzin
Dingell	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	Mascara	Tejeda
Doggett	Matsul	Thompson
Dooley	McCarthy	Thornton
Doyle	McDermott	Thurman
Durbin	McHale	Torres
Edwards	McKinney	Torricelli
Engel	McNulty	Towns
Eshoo	Meehan	Trafficant
Evans	Meek	Tucker
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Mfume	Vento
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Volkmer
Fillner	Minge	Ward
Flake	Mink	Waters
Foglietta	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mollohan	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Williams
Frost	Moran	Wilson
Furse	Murtha	Wise
Gejdenson	Nadler	Woolsey
Gephardt	Neal	Wyden
Geren	Oberstar	Wynn

NOES—227

Allard	Baker (LA)	Barton
Archer	Ballenger	Bass
Armey	Barr	Bateman
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Baker (CA)	Bartlett	Bilbray

Billirakis	Goss	Norwood
Bliley	Graham	Nussle
Blute	Greenwood	Oxley
Boehlert	Gunderson	Packard
Boehner	Gutknecht	Paxon
Bonilla	Hancock	Petri
Bono	Hansen	Pombo
Brownback	Hastert	Porter
Bryant (TN)	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Bunn	Hayworth	Pryce
Bunning	Hefley	Quillen
Burr	Heineman	Quinn
Burton	Herger	Radanovich
Buyer	Hilleary	Ramstad
Callahan	Hobson	Regula
Calvert	Hoekstra	Riggs
Camp	Hoke	Roberts
Canady	Horn	Rogers
Castle	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Chambliss	Hunter	Roth
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Roukema
Christensen	Hyde	Royce
Chrysler	Inglis	Salmon
Clinger	Istook	Sanford
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Collins (GA)	Jones	Schaefer
Combest	Kasich	Schiff
Cooley	Kelly	Seastrand
Cox	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Crane	King	Shadegg
Crapo	Kingston	Shaw
Cremeans	Klug	Shaun
Cubin	Knollenberg	Shuster
Davis	Kolbe	Skeen
DeLay	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Dickey	Latham	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	LaTourrette	Smith (WA)
Dornan	Lazio	Solomon
Dreier	Leach	Souder
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Ehlers	Lightfoot	Stockman
Ehrlich	Linder	Stump
Emerson	Livingston	Talent
English	LoBiondo	Tate
Ensign	Longley	Taylor (NC)
Everett	Lucas	Thomas
Ewing	Manzullo	Thornberry
Fawell	Martini	Tiahrt
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Torkildsen
Flanagan	McCreery	Upton
Foley	McDade	Vucanovich
Forbes	McHugh	Waldholtz
Fowler	McInnis	Walker
Fox	McIntosh	Walsh
Franks (CT)	McKeon	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Meyers	Weldon (PA)
Frisa	Mica	Weller
Funderburk	Miller (FL)	White
Gallely	Mollinari	Whitfield
Ganske	Moorhead	Wicker
Gekas	Morella	Wolf
Gilchrest	Myers	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Myrick	Young (FL)
Gilman	Nethercutt	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Neumann	Zimmer
Goodling	Ney	

## NOT VOTING—5

Brown (FL)	Rangel	Yates
Cunningham	Stark	

□ 0023

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

Messrs. BROWN of California, SAWYER, and TOWNS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS). The question is on Title II of the resolution.

Title II of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on the resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

## CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as the designee of the majority leader and pursuant to section 108 of House Resolution 6, I call up the bill (H.R. 1) to make certain laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1 is as follows:

## H. R. 1

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Congressional Accountability Act of 1995".

## SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEE.—The term "congressional employee" means—

(A) an individual on the payroll of an employing office of the House of Representatives;

(B) an individual on the payroll of an employing office of the Senate;

(C) an individual on the payroll of an employing office of the Architect of the Capitol; and

(D) an individual on the payroll of an employing office of an instrumentality.

(2) EMPLOYEE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—The term "individual on the payroll of an employing office in the House of Representatives" means—

(A) an individual who is covered under rule LI of the House of Representatives, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) any applicant for a position that is to be occupied by an individual described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) any individual who was formerly an employee described in subparagraph (A) and whose claim of a violation arises out of the individual's employment.

(3) EMPLOYEE IN THE SENATE.—The term "individual on the payroll of an employing office in the Senate" means—

(A) any employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

(B) any applicant for a position that is to be occupied by an individual described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) any individual who was formerly an employee described in subparagraph (A) and whose claim of a violation arises out of the individual's employment.

(4) EMPLOYEE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—The term "individual on the payroll of

an employing office of the Architect of the Capitol" means—

(A) an employee of the Architect of the Capitol or an individual within the administrative jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol if such employee or individual is paid from funds under a law providing appropriations for the legislative branch;

(B) any applicant for a position that is to be occupied by an employee or individual described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) any individual who was formerly an employee or individual described in subparagraph (A) and whose claim of a violation arises out of the individual's employment.

(5) EMPLOYEE OF AN INSTRUMENTALITY.—The term "individual on the payroll of an employing office of an instrumentality" means—

(A) any individual on the payroll of an instrumentality of the legislative branch of the Federal Government;

(B) any applicant for a position that is to be occupied by an individual described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) any individual who was formerly an employee described in subparagraph (A) and whose claim of a violation arises out of the individual's instrumentality employment.

(6) HEAD OF AN EMPLOYING OFFICE.—The term "head of an employing office" means the individual who has final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the Congressional employment of an employee.

## SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF LAWS.

(a) LAWS WHICH WILL APPLY.—The following laws shall apply, as prescribed by this subsection, to the legislative branch of the Federal Government:

(1) The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) (including remedies available to private employees), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) Titles I and V of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611 et seq.), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (other than section 19) (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) (subject to subsection (c)), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(7) Chapter 71 (relating to Federal labor management relations) of title 5, United States Code, effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(8) The Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 (29 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that this Act shall not apply to the United States Capitol Police.

(9) The Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(10) The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791), effective on the earlier of the effective date of applicable regulations of the Office of Compliance under section 5 or 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The laws referred to in this subsection which apply now to congressional employees shall continue to apply to such employees until the effective date such laws are made applicable in accordance with this subsection.

(b) LAWS WHICH MAY BE MADE APPLICABLE.—Any provision of Federal law shall, to the extent that it relates to the terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion or demotion, salary and wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, termination, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, health and safety of employees, and family and medical leave) of employees apply to the legislative branch of the Federal Government in accordance with this Act.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH OSHA.—The legislative branch of the Federal Government shall comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 as follows: If a citation of a violation of such Act is received, action to abate the violation shall take place as soon as possible, but no later than the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the citation is issued.

#### SEC. 4. OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the legislative branch an Office of Compliance (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Office").

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The Office shall have a Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall consist of 8 individuals appointed jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Appointments of the first 8 members of the Board of Directors shall be completed not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Board of Directors shall appoint, may establish the compensation of, and may terminate, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors, an Executive Director (referred to in this Act as the "executive director"). The compensation of the executive director may not exceed the compensation for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The executive director shall be an individual with training or expertise in the application of the laws referred to in section 3 to employment. The appointment of the first executive director shall be completed no later than 120 days after the initial appointment of the Board of Directors.

(B) OFFICE.—The executive director may not be an individual who holds or may have held the position of Member of the House of

Representatives or Senator. The executive director may not be an individual who holds the position of employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate but the executive director may be an individual who held such a position at least 4 years before appointment as executive director. The term of office of the executive director shall be a single term of 5 years.

(c) BOARD OF DIRECTORS QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) SPECIFIC QUALIFICATIONS.—

(A) LOBBYING.—No individual who engages in, or is otherwise employed in, lobbying of the Congress and who is required under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act to register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate shall be considered eligible for appointment to, or service on, the Board of Directors.

(B) OFFICE.—No member of the Board of Directors appointed under subsection (b)(1) may hold or may have held the position of Member of the House of Representatives or Senator, may hold the position of employee of the House of Representatives or Senate, or may have held such a position within 4 years of the date of appointment.

(2) HOLDING OFFICE.—If during a term of office a member of the Board of Directors engages in an activity described in paragraph (2)(A), such position shall be declared vacant and a successor shall be selected in accordance with subsection (b)(1).

(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Board of Directors shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) BOARD OF DIRECTORS TERM OF OFFICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), membership on the Board of Directors shall be for 5 years. A member shall only be eligible for appointment for a single term of office.

(2) FIRST APPOINTMENTS.—Of the members first appointed to the Board of Directors—

(A) 2 shall have a term of office of 2 years,

(B) 2 shall have a term of office of 3 years,

(C) 2 shall have a term of office of 4 years,

and

(D) 2 shall have a term of office of 5 years,

as designated at the time of appointment by the persons specified in subsection (b)(1).

(3) REMOVAL.—Any member of the Board of Directors may be removed from office by a majority decision of the appointing authorities described in subsection (b)(1) and only for—

(A) disability that substantially prevents the member from carrying out the duties of the member,

(B) incompetence,

(C) neglect of duty,

(D) malfeasance, or

(E) a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Board of Directors shall be appointed from the members of the Board of Directors by the members of the Board.

(f) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(1) PER DIEM.—Each member of the Board of Directors shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board of Directors shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the

member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(g) OFFICE STAFF.—The executive director may appoint and fix the compensation of such staff, including hearing officers, as are necessary to carry out this Act.

(h) DETAILEES.—The executive director may, with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned, use the services of any such department or agency, including the services of members or personnel of the General Accounting Office Personnel Appeals Board.

(i) CONSULTANTS.—In carrying out this Act, the executive director may procure the temporary (not to exceed 1 year) or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

#### SEC. 5. STUDY AND REGULATIONS.

(a) INITIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board of Directors shall conduct a study of the manner in which the laws made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under section 3(a) should apply. The Board of Directors shall complete such study and report the results to Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the first appointment of the first executive director.

(2) INSTRUMENTALITIES.—The Board of Directors shall include in its study under paragraph (1) an examination of the procedures used by the instrumentalities to enforce the application of laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government and a determination as to whether to direct the instrumentality to make improvements in its regulations and procedures so as to assure that procedures as effective as the procedures set forth in sections 7 through 12 will apply. If the instrumentality has no such regulations and procedures, the Board may direct the instrumentality to adopt the requisite regulations and procedures, or, if deemed necessary, in lieu thereof may itself adopt regulations pursuant to this section or authorize use of the procedures pursuant to sections 7 through 12.

(b) CONTINUING ACTION.—On an ongoing basis the Board of Directors—

(1) shall determine which of the laws referred to in section 3(b) should apply to the legislative branch of the Federal Government and if it should, the manner in which it should be made applicable;

(2) shall study the application to the legislative branch of the Federal Government of provisions of Federal law referred to in section 3 that are enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) may propose regulations with respect to such application in accordance with subsection (c); and

(4) may review the regulations in effect under subsection (e)(1) and make such amendments as may be appropriate in accordance with subsection (c).

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) LAWS MADE APPLICABLE.—

(A) GENERAL RULE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the completion of the study under subsection (a), the Board of Directors shall, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, propose regulations to implement the requirements of the laws made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under section 3(a). The Board of Directors shall provide a period of at least 30 days for comment on the proposed regulations.

(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—In addition to publishing a general notice of proposed rule-making under section 553(b) of title 5, United

States Code, the Board of Directors shall concurrently submit such notice for publication in the Congressional Record.

(C) AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS.—When proposing regulations under subparagraph (A) to implement the requirements of a law referred to in section 3(a), the Board of Directors shall recommend to the Congress changes in or repeals of existing law to accommodate the application of such law to the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

(D) FINAL REGULATIONS.—The Board of Directors shall, in accordance with such section 553, issue final regulations not later than 60 days after the end of the comment period on the proposed regulations.

(2) CONTINUING ACTION.—

(A) GENERAL RULE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the completion of the study or a determination under subsection (b), the Board of Directors shall, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, propose regulations that specify which of the provisions of Federal law considered in such study shall apply to the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The Board of Directors shall provide a period of at least 30 days for comment on the proposed regulations.

(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—In addition to publishing a general notice of proposed rulemaking under section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, the Board of Directors shall concurrently submit such notice for publication in the Congressional Record.

(C) AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS.—When proposing regulations under subparagraph (A) specifying which of the provisions of Federal law referred to in section 3(b) shall apply to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, the Board of Directors shall recommend to the Congress changes in or repeals of existing law to accommodate the application of such law to the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

(D) FINAL REGULATIONS.—The Board of Directors shall, in accordance with such section 553, issue final regulations not later than 60 days after the end of the comment period on the proposed regulations.

(3) REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.—Regulations under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be consistent with the regulations issued by an agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government under the provision of law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, including portions relating to remedies.

(4) ACTION IF DISAPPROVAL.—If a regulation is disapproved by a concurrent resolution considered under subsection (e), not later than 60 days after the date of the disapproval, the Board of Directors shall propose a new regulation to replace the regulation disapproved. The action of the Board of Directors under this paragraph shall be in accordance with the applicable requirements of this subsection.

(d) TRANSMITTAL.—A final regulation issued under subsection (c) shall be transmitted to the Congress for consideration under subsection (e).

(e) TAKING EFFECT OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to subsection (f), a final regulation which is issued under subsection (c) shall take effect upon the expiration of 60 days from the date the final regulation is issued unless disapproved by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

(2) CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.—A concurrent resolution referred to in paragraph (1) may be introduced in the House of Representatives or the Senate within 5 days of session

after the date on which the Board of Directors issues the final regulation to which the concurrent resolution applies. The matter after the resolving clause of the resolution shall be as follows: "That Congress disapproves the issuance of final regulations of the Office of Compliance as issued on \_\_\_\_\_ (the blank space being appropriately filled in)."

(3) PROCEDURE.—A concurrent resolution referred to in paragraph (1) shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the House involved. If no concurrent resolution is reported within 15 days of session after the Board of Directors issues final regulations under subsection (c)(1)(D) or (c)(2)(D), the committee to which the concurrent resolution was referred shall be discharged from further consideration of the first such concurrent resolution introduced and the concurrent resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved. Any meeting of a committee on a concurrent resolution shall be open to the public. Within 5 days of session after the concurrent resolution is reported or discharged, it shall be in order as a matter of highest privilege to move to proceed to its consideration and such motion shall not be debatable. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed 4 hours equally divided between proponents and opponents and it shall not be subject to amendment. If, prior to the adoption of a concurrent resolution by one House, that House receives a concurrent resolution of the other House with respect to the same regulations, then the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no concurrent resolution had been received from the other House, but vote on final adoption shall be on the concurrent resolution of the other House. If a concurrent resolution is received by a House in which no identical concurrent resolution has been introduced, it shall be referred to the appropriate committee and the same procedures and 20-day period for action shall apply to the consideration of the concurrent resolution by that House as would apply to an introduced concurrent resolution.

(f) RULEMAKING POWER.—The provisions of subsection (e) of this section are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(g) OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.—Any meeting of the Board of Directors held in connection with a study under subsection (a) or (b) shall be open to the public. Any meeting of the Board of Directors in connection with a regulation under subsection (c) shall be open to the public.

SEC. 6. OTHER FUNCTIONS.

(a) RULES OF THE OFFICE.—The executive director shall adopt rules governing the procedures of the Office, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors, including the procedures of hearing boards, which shall be submitted for publication in the Congressional Record. The rules may be amended in the same manner. The executive director may consult with the Chairman of the Ad-

ministrative Conference of the United States, the Legal Counsel of the Senate, and the General Counsel of the House of Representatives on the adoption of rules.

(b) INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.—The executive director shall have authority to conduct such investigations as the executive director requires to implement sections 8 through 10 and section 12.

(c) DUTIES.—The Office shall—

(1) carry out a program of education for Members of Congress and other employing authorities of the legislative branch of the Federal Government respecting the laws made applicable to them and a program to inform individuals of their rights under laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government and under sections 7 through 12.

(2) in carrying out the program under paragraph (1), distribute the telephone number and address of the Office, procedures for action under sections 7 through 12, and any other information the executive director deems appropriate for distribution, distribute such information to Members of Congress and other employing authorities of the legislative branch of the Federal Government in a manner suitable for posting, provide such information to new employees of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, distribute such information to the residences of congressional employees, and conduct seminars and other activities designed to educate employers and employees in such information.

(3) compile and publish statistics on the use of the Office by congressional employees, including the number and type of contacts made with the Office, on the reason for such contacts, on the number of employees who initiated proceedings with the Office under sections 7 through 12 and the result of such proceedings, and on the number of employees who filed a complaint under section 10, the basis for the complaint, and the action taken on the complaint, and

(4) within 180 days of the initial appointment of the executive director and in conjunction with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, develop a system for the collection of demographic data respecting the composition of the congressional employees, including race, sex, and wages, and a system for the collection of information on employment practices, including family leave and flexible work hours, in Congressional offices.

(d) REPORT.—Within one year of the date the system referred to in subsection (c)(4) is developed and annually thereafter, the Board of Directors shall submit to Congress a report on the information collected under such system. Each report after the first report shall contain a comparison and evaluation of data contained in the previous report.

SEC. 7. PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS.

The procedure for consideration of alleged violations of laws made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act consists of 4 steps as follows:

- (1) Step I, counseling, as set forth in section 8.
- (2) Step II, mediation, as set forth in section 9.
- (3) Step III, formal complaint and hearing by a hearing board, as set forth in section 10.
- (4) Step IV, judicial review if a congressional employee is aggrieved by a dismissal of a claim under section 10(c), a final decision under section 10(g), or an order under section 10(h) or if a head of an employing office is aggrieved by a final decision under

section 10(g) or would be subject to an order issued under section 10(h).

(5) Step V, as an alternative to steps III and IV, a civil action in a district court of the United States in accordance with section 12.

A congressional employee may elect the procedure described in paragraph (3) or (5) but not both procedures.

#### SEC. 8. STEP I: COUNSELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A congressional employee alleging a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act may request counseling through the Office. The Office shall provide the employee with all relevant information with respect to the rights of the employee. A request for counseling shall be made not later than 180 days after the alleged violation forming the basis of the request for counseling occurred.

(b) PERIOD OF COUNSELING.—The period for counseling shall be 30 days unless the employee and the Office agree to reduce the period. The period shall begin on the date the request for counseling is received.

#### SEC. 9. STEP II: MEDIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the end of the counseling period under section 8, the employee who alleged a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act may file a request for mediation with the Office. Mediation—

(1) may include the Office, the employee, the employing office, and individuals who are recommended by organizations composed primarily of individuals experienced in adjudicating or arbitrating personnel matters, and

(2) shall be a process involving meetings with the parties separately or jointly for the purpose of resolving the dispute between the employee and the employing office.

(b) MEDIATION PERIOD.—The mediation period shall be 30 days beginning on the date the request for mediation is received and may be extended for an additional 30 days at the discretion of the Office. The Office shall notify the employee and the head of the employing office when the mediation period has ended.

#### SEC. 10. STEP III: FORMAL COMPLAINT AND HEARING.

(a) FORMAL COMPLAINT AND REQUEST FOR HEARING.—Not later than 30 days after receipt by the congressional employee of notice from the Office of the end of the mediation period under section 9, the congressional employee may file a formal complaint with the Office against the head of the employing office involved. No complaint may be filed unless the employee has made a timely request for counseling and has completed the procedures set forth in sections 8 and 9.

(b) HEARING BOARD.—A board of 3 independent hearing officers (hereinafter in this Act referred to as a "hearing board"), who are not Members of the House of Representatives, Senators, or officers or employees of the House of Representatives or Senate, chosen by the executive director (one of whom shall be designated by the executive director as the presiding hearing officer) shall be assigned to consider each complaint filed under subsection (a). The executive director shall appoint hearing officers from candidates who are recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service or the Administrative Conference of the United States. A hearing board shall act by majority vote.

(c) DISMISSAL OF FRIVOLOUS CLAIMS.—Prior to a hearing under subsection (d), a hearing

board may dismiss any claim that it finds to be frivolous.

(d) HEARING.—A hearing shall be conducted—

(1) in closed session on the record by a hearing board; and

(2) no later than 30 days after filing of the complaint under subsection (a), except that the Office may, for good cause, extend up to an additional 60 days the time for conducting a hearing.

(e) DISCOVERY.—Reasonable prehearing discovery may be permitted at the discretion of the hearing board.

(f) SUBPOENA POWER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A hearing board may authorize subpoenas, which shall be issued by the presiding hearing officer on behalf of the hearing board for the attendance of witnesses at proceedings of the hearing board and for the production of correspondence, books, papers, documents, and other records. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States.

(2) FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1), the hearing board may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to appear before the hearing board to give testimony, produce evidence, or both, relating to the matter under investigation. The application may be made within the judicial district where the hearing is conducted or where that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(3) SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.—The subpoenas of the hearing board shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(4) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—All process of any court to which application is to be made under paragraph (2) may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(5) IMMUNITY.—The hearing board is an agency of the United States for the purpose of part V of title 18, United States Code (relating to immunity of witnesses).

(g) HEARING BOARD DECISION.—As expeditiously as possible, but in no case more than 45 days after the conclusion of the hearing, the hearing board shall make a decision in the matter for which the hearing was held. The decision of the hearing board shall be transmitted by the Office to the employee and the employing office. The decision shall state the issues raised by the complaint, describe the evidence in the record, and contain a determination as to whether a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act has occurred. Any decision of the hearing board shall contain a written statement of the reasons for the hearing board's decision. A final decision of the hearing board shall be made available to the public by the Office.

(h) REMEDY ORDER.—If the decision of the hearing board under subsection (g) is that a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act has occurred, it shall order the remedies under such law as made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act, except that no Member of the House of Representatives, Senator, any other head of an employing office, or any agent of such a Member, Senator, or employing office, shall be personally

liable for the payment of compensation. The hearing board shall have no authority to award punitive damages. The entry of an order under this subsection shall constitute a final decision for purposes of judicial review under section 11.

(i) FUNDS.—There shall be established in the House of Representatives and in the Senate a fund from which compensation (including attorney's fees) may be paid in accordance with an order under subsection (h) or as a result of judicial review under section 11 or a civil action under section 12. From the outset of any proceeding in which compensation may be paid from a fund of the House of Representatives, the General Counsel of the House of Representatives may provide the respondent with representation.

#### SEC. 11. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TYPES OF REVIEW.—Following any hearing under section 10 on a complaint relating to a provision of law described in section 3, any congressional employee aggrieved by a dismissal of a claim under section 10(c), a final decision under section 10(g), a final order under section 10(h), or any head of an employing office aggrieved by a final decision under section 10(g) or a final order under section 10(h), may petition for review by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO REVIEW.—The following provisions apply to a review under paragraph (1):

(A) LAW APPLICABLE.—Chapter 158 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply—

(i) with respect to section 2344 of title 28, United States Code, service of the petition shall be on the House or Senate Legal Counsel, or the appropriate entity of an instrumentality, as the case may be, rather than on the Attorney General;

(ii) the provisions of section 2348 of title 28, United States Code, on the authority of the Attorney General, shall not apply;

(iii) the petition for review shall be filed not later than 90 days after the entry in the Office of a final decision under section 10(g), an order under section 10(h); and

(iv) the Office shall be an "agency" as that term is used in chapter 158 of title 28, United States Code.

(B) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—To the extent necessary for decision and when presented, the court shall decide all relevant questions of law and interpret constitutional and statutory provisions. The court shall set aside a dismissal under section 10(c), a final decision under section 10(g), or an order under section 10(h) if it is determined that the dismissal, decision, or order was—

(i) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not consistent with law;

(ii) not made consistent with required procedures; or

(iii) unsupported by substantial evidence.

(C) RECORD.—In making determinations under subparagraph (B), the court shall review the whole record, or those parts of it cited by a party, and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error. The record on review shall include the record before the hearing board, the decision of the hearing board, and the order of the hearing board.

(b) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—If a congressional employee is the prevailing party in a proceeding under this section, attorney's fees for the judicial proceeding may be allowed by the court in accordance with the standards prescribed under section 706(k) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(k)).

**SEC. 12. CIVIL ACTION.****(a) IN GENERAL.—**

(1) **CIVIL ACTION.**—A congressional employee may, within 30 days after receipt of notice from the Office of the end of the mediation period under section 9 for a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, bring a civil action in a district court of the United States seeking relief from the alleged violation of law if such a civil action may be brought by an employee under such law. In any such civil action, any party may demand a jury trial.

(2) **EXHAUSTION REQUIREMENT.**—No civil action may be filed under paragraph (1) unless the employee has made a timely request for counseling and has completed the procedures set forth in sections 8 and 9.

(3) **COURT ORDER.**—If a court determines that a violation of law occurred, the court may only enter an order described in section 10(h).

(b) **ATTORNEY'S FEES.**—If a congressional employee is the prevailing party in a proceeding under this section, attorney's fees may be allowed by the court in accordance with any standards prescribed under Federal law for the award of such fees in the event of a violation of such provision.

**SEC. 13. RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINT.**

If, after a formal complaint is filed under section 10, the employee and the head of the employing office resolve the issues involved, the employee may withdraw the complaint or the parties may enter into a written agreement, subject to the approval of the executive director.

**SEC. 14. PROHIBITION OF INTIMIDATION.**

Any intimidation of, or reprisal against, any employee by any Member of the House of Representatives, Senator, or officer or employee of the House of Representatives or Senate, by the Architect of the Capitol or anyone employed by the Architect of the Capitol, or by an instrumentality of the legislative branch of the Federal Government because of the exercise of a right under this Act constitutes an unlawful employment practice, which may be remedied in the same manner under this Act as is a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act.

**SEC. 15. CONFIDENTIALITY.**

(a) **COUNSELING.**—All counseling shall be strictly confidential except that the Office and the employee may agree to notify the head of the employing office of the allegations.

(b) **MEDIATION.**—All mediation shall be strictly confidential.

(c) **HEARINGS.**—Except as provided in subsections (d) and (e), the hearings and deliberations of the hearing board shall be confidential.

(d) **RELEASE OF RECORDS FOR JUDICIAL ACTION.**—The records of hearing boards may be made public if required for the purpose of judicial action under section 9.

(e) **ACCESS BY COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—At the discretion of the executive director, the executive director may provide to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate access to the records of the hearings, including all written and oral testimony in the possession of the hearing boards, concerning a decision under section 10(g). The executive director shall not provide such access until the executive director has consulted with the individual filing the complaint at issue in the hearing, and until the hearing board has issued the decision.

(f) **COORDINATION.**—The executive director shall coordinate the proceedings with the Committee on Standards and Official Conduct of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate to ensure effectiveness, to avoid duplication, and to prevent penalizing cooperation by respondents in the respective proceedings.

**SEC. 16. POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND PLACE OF RESIDENCE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be a violation of a law made applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government under this Act to consider the—

- (1) party affiliation,
  - (2) domicile, or
  - (3) political compatibility with the employing office,
- of a congressional employee with respect to employment decisions.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "employee" means—

- (1) an employee on the staff of the House of Representatives or Senate leadership,
- (2) an employee on the staff of a committee or subcommittee,
- (3) an employee on the staff of a Member of the House of Representatives or Senate,
- (4) an officer or employee of the House of Representatives or Senate elected by the House of Representatives or Senate or appointed by a Member of the House of Representatives or Senate, other than those described in paragraphs (1) through (3), or
- (5) an applicant for a position that is to be occupied by an individual described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

**SEC. 17. ENFORCEMENT; OTHER REVIEW PROHIBITED.**

(a) **ENFORCEMENT.**—This Act shall not be construed to authorize enforcement by the executive branch of any of the laws made applicable to congressional employees under this Act.

(b) **REVIEW.**—No congressional employee may commence a judicial proceeding to redress practices prohibited under section 5, except as provided in this Act.

**SEC. 18. STUDY.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Office shall conduct a study—

- (1) of the ways that access by the public to information held by the Congress may be improved, streamlined, and made consistent between the House of Representatives and the Senate and of the application of section 552 of title 5, United States Code to the legislative branch of the Federal Government; and
- (2) of the application of the requirement of section 552a of title 5, United States Code, to the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

(b) **STUDY CONTENT.**—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall examine—

- (1) information that is currently made available under such section 552 by Federal agencies and not by the legislative branch of the Federal Government;
- (2) information held by the non-legislative offices of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, including—
  - (A) the instrumentalities,
  - (B) the Architect of the Capitol,
  - (C) the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives,
  - (D) the Clerk of the House of Representatives,
  - (E) the Secretary of the Senate,
  - (F) the Inspector General of the House of Representatives,
  - (G) the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate,
  - (H) the United States Capitol Police, and

(I) the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards;

(3) financial expenditure information of the legislative branch of the Federal Government; and

(4) provisions for judicial review of denial of access to information held by the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

(c) **TIME.**—The Office shall conduct the study prescribed by subsection (a) and report the results of the study to the Congress not later than one year after the date of the initial appointment of the Board of Directors.

□ 0030

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS). Pursuant to the provisions of section 108 and title I of House Resolution 6, it is now in order to consider H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and say to the Members of this Chamber that the Congressional Accountability Act is not one person's bill; it was authored 2 years ago by a colleague of mine, Dick Swett. There were four original cosponsors: ROSCOE BARTLETT, JAY DICKEY, David Mann, and PAUL MCHALE. The cochairman of the Freshman Bipartisan Task Force on Congressional Reform TILLIE FOWLER, PETER TORKILDSEN, Karen Shepherd, Eric Fingerhut, and 100 freshmen cosponsored this bill. The presidents of the freshman class last year, EVA CLAYTON and BUCK MCKEON, cosponsored this bill. The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress headed by LEE HAMILTON and DAVID DRIER, Republicans and Democrats throughout, championed this bill through their committee. The chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on House Administration and Committee on Rules that marked up H.R. 4822 on which this bill is based, Republicans and Democrats, were essential to its work: CHARLIE ROSE, BILL THOMAS, JOE MOAKLEY, JERRY SOLOMON. Other leaders who have been working on this issue for years and years and years, BILL GOODLING and HARRIS FAWELL and others, in particular BARNEY FRANK, who encouraged the Speaker of the House in this past time to move forward with this bill, was essential to its passage last time with JOHN BOEHNER.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has had bipartisan support. It moved forward in this Chamber last year with bipartisan support. Republicans and Democrats have made their mark on this bill.

I also want to thank the former Speaker Tom Foley for guaranteeing a vote and moving it to the Senate and for NEWT GINGRICH, our present Speaker, for championing this bill wherever he went, and to thank STENY HOYER for

his work. The bottom line to this is that this is our bill; it belongs to all of us, and it is a strong bill. It includes all the laws that we are presently exempted from. It covers all the instrumentalities, the Library of Congress, the GAO, it gives them the protection, and it allows employees for the first time to go to court, civil action if they choose to, de novo, or to have a court appeal.

In the whole process of deliberation on this bill, Mr. Speaker, we had 3 guiding principles that Dick Swett and I worked on with so many other Members. If a law is right for the private sector, it is right for Congress. Congress will write better laws when it has to live by the same laws it imposes on the private sector and the executive branch and we must as well respect the separation of powers embodied in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I do not quite know how long this bill will take in debate, it may be a full hour, but it is truly our bill. It passed this Chamber with overwhelming support, and it is my hope that the Senate will act shortly on this legislation, maybe tomorrow, and that we will have a conference and finalize this bill possibly by next week.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1.

I want to at the outset congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut [CHRIS SHAYS] and Dick Swett from New Hampshire. Dick is no longer with us. CHRIS is obviously here. They worked very hard on this issue in the last Congress. They raised the visibility of this issue, but more importantly than that, they worked with all the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle to try to reach agreement on the very difficult question as to how we include the House and the Senate and the instrumentalities of Congress under the provisions of 10 specific bills which we have passed over the last six decades and apply those so that our employees will enjoy the same protection as the employees of other entities in this country.

It is important that we are moving forward on this bill. It has been blocked frankly for too long. The House passed this bill essentially twice in the last Congress, only to see our efforts thwarted by Republican-led efforts in the Senate, unfortunately. The Democratic and Republican Members of this House want this bill and as has been said earlier in the day voted to approve it 427-4 back in August of last year.

We have gone a long way toward making sure that the Congress lives

under the same laws as any other Americans. Most pieces of legislation we have passed apply to Congress. The Americans with Disabilities Act which I proudly cosponsored specifically applies to Congress, as did the Civil Rights Act, the Minimum Wage Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Family and Medical Leave Act, all apply now. The House has also had in place since 1988 prohibitions against employment discrimination.

H.R. 1 will ensure that all Members of the Congress, not just House Members, live under all the laws we pass and do so permanently, not just as internal House rules which are now on the books adopted by this House in October of last year, but as a statute, a part of statutory law.

I cannot tell you how many times I have had business men and women, men and women in every walk of life complain that Congress passes laws and then simply exempts itself. Every one of us on this House floor has heard that criticism, which was legitimate, by our publics. Most of my constituents did not know frankly that the Congressional Accountability Act passed the House last year by that vote of 427-4. In fact the discussions that I have heard in debates sometimes on this floor and during the course of this election, you would not know that the House had acted. You would not know that it was in our rules. That perhaps served the purposes of some, but the fact is we did act. But the other body did not. And the instrumentalities are not covered. Furthermore, the mechanisms for appeal and hearing process are not provided for adequately in the rules because they could not be provided for adequately in the rules.

The American people deserve something more than the internal House rule that we have. But as importantly our employees deserve better than that. That really is the crux of this issue, so that we can protect them as we have protected others throughout this country.

I want to go home and tell those constituents that have talked to me and to all of you that we have answered their plea. I want to tell them that we meet the same requirements that they do, that we follow the same laws that we ask them to, from OSHA to Fair Labor Standards. I want to tell them that our employees have the same protections theirs do, from anti-age discrimination to family and medical leave. Perhaps the shared experience will help us, as some of you believe, write better, more careful laws.

□ 0040

This is about common sense, trust and accountability. That is why we are all here late into the evening finishing the work which began the last Congress. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in moving forward on H.R. 1.

Again I want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS and Mr. Swett for their leadership and their tenacious support of this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, there are speakers on both sides. There will not be a vote right this second. I yield myself 30 seconds to correct one point that was made during the debate on the rule and now here on the issue of Republicans killing it in the Senate. To correct the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, this bill passed with bipartisan support in this Chamber. It died in the Senate with bipartisan support.

The Senate Government Affairs Committee held a hearing on June 29. They then reported out and marked up the bill on September 20, after the break. They reported the bill out on the third and filed their report. The report was not printed until October 6, the day it was to be voted on. So any Member could object to it being brought up.

I say to the House it passed here with bipartisan support; it died there with bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Economic and Educational Opportunity Committee, who is truly the father of this legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on the last day Congress met on October 7, I recorded my serious concerns with the rule on congressional coverage then before the House. While I realized the rule was made necessary by the Senate's failure to act, I felt compelled to note the absence of an employee right to go to court, for full trial, where the underlying law provided that right to private sector employees, rendered the proposal fundamentally defective and I am gratified that the bill now before us extends that right by statute to Hill employees.

It also extends 10 major employment laws to Congress, and it is my understanding that we will also add court enforcement under the Veterans Reemployment Act through negotiations with the Senate to the bill that ultimately goes to the President.

Let us send a bill to the President soon. I am pleased that after the last several years where many of us have felt alone in trying to bring attention to this issue that it now appears certain we are on the verge of enactment of true congressional coverage. Yes, let us welcome the moment, but let us also admit that this is a step that should have been taken long ago.

We will never be as careful as we should be in passing, changing, and drafting laws until we ourselves are forced to comply with those laws and the fundamental unfairness of a double standard is obvious in any case. So let us not pat ourselves on the back too eagerly tonight. It is long overdue.

I also want to acknowledge the bipartisanship here in these late hours and

am pleased effective congressional coverage will become law on the Republican watch.

Politics, of course, is not a perfect process. This bill is not a perfect process either. Punitive damages have not been included, and personal liability is excluded.

Prior bills I have introduced provided for such liability, but I will leave that battle to another day, recognizing its controversial nature, and not wishing to jeopardize the passage of the legislation.

This is a new beginning that will go a long way in restoring the confidence of the American people in this great institution.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the leadership of my colleagues, the gentleman from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYS, and the gentleman from Illinois, HARRIS FAWELL, on this issue and that of key staffers such as Randy Johnson, Gary Visscher, Peter Carson, and Rob Green.

Mr. Speaker, let us work out whatever difference we have with the Senate and get this legislation to the President this month.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who cochaired the bipartisan reform commission.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act. Let me acknowledge that there have been many Members in both Chambers who deserve credit for the passage of this bill tonight, and I commend especially the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Maryland for their outstanding leadership.

I think there are three reasons why it is important for Members of Congress to follow the same laws that cover the private sector. First, the widespread perception that Members have exempted themselves from many laws significantly undermines the confidence of the American people in this institution. We lose credibility and legitimacy when people believe that Members are somehow above the law.

Second, more fully applying laws to Congress will improve the quality of legislation that we pass. A number of Members have made that point this evening. It can be difficult for Members to understand completely the practical implications of the legislation that we pass when we are not forced to confront these implications in our own place of work.

Third, and this point I think has not been mentioned, it is simply unfair to congressional employees not to extend to them the same rights and protections available to those who work elsewhere.

May I also add just a word of caution. House passage of this Congressional

Accountability Act is not the final process or hurdle in the process of bringing this legislation to enactment. The Senate, I know, has promised very quick consideration of a bill to apply laws to Congress. My information is, however, that the bill that the Senate will pass is going to be very different from the bill that we pass, and then we will have to agree on a single consensus package. We still have got a lot of work to do on this package. I hope Members will continue to follow it very carefully until we bring it to the point of enactment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HARRIS FAWELL, who has really been a champion of this legislation for years.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time. He has been the leader and has brought this bipartisan group together, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and so many others, have been also in the ranks. As has been stated, many Members have had a part to play.

We have all heard the old phrase that Congress would exempt itself from the law of gravity if it thought it could get away with it. And, indeed, Congress has tried to get away with it for a long time.

But that is changing now. And I compliment the new leadership in the House for having a Congressional Accountability Act as the first bill to be presented to the 104th Congress.

We know this bill is not perfect. And the full specifics as to the exact manner in which the 10 "place of employment" labor laws shall be applied to congressional employers will be fully determined by the passage of regulations by the Office of Compliance.

But the bill does establish the standard that congressional employees will have the right, in instances of violations of these labor laws by Members of Congress, to the same basic employee protections as possessed by employees in the private sector. This will include the right of congressional employees to seek a full de novo jury trial in Federal court against their congressional employers, complete with general damages, court costs and recovery of attorney's fees.

The bill does now allow for such employees to obtain punitive damages against their congressional employers. In addition, Members of Congress are indemnified for any damages, costs, or legal fees to which a prevailing employee may be found entitled. Private sector employers can generally be held personally liable for those types of damages under civil rights law, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act.

What is most important, however, is that our Leadership in Congress is now

committed to place this long overdue type of legislation on the front burner, indeed, as the very first bill to be considered in this 104th Congress. The Senate is doing likewise and doubtless both the House and Senate in conference will soon agree on a final law—not a set of rules which can be waived at the will of this House—for early presentation to the President to sign. That's what happens when leadership is really dedicated to moving legislation.

Once Congress has established the standard that the place of employment labor laws its passes shall also apply to Congress, these laws will then tend to be more equitable and flexible in the treatment of employees and employers generally within both the private and public sectors. And that is a better employment policy for America in the 21st century.

□ 0050

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], the vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that once again this body has taken up the Congressional Accountability Act as it did twice last year, and I am particularly proud of my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who joined with a former Member, Mr. Swett from New Hampshire, and did yeoman service to bring about this reform.

As some of us might remember as we read back in history, exempting Congress from various laws began because we thought we would not have the enforcement power that we should have if executive branches had administrative powers over us, so we would not be a coequal branch of government.

As you know, we went too far, and the laws did not apply to Congress. This is unacceptable to the public. I think this is excellent legislation. I think it demonstrates the best sense of what we can do together, Members of both parties working together.

Once again, may I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS]. He has done an excellent job.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], an original co-sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act.

In the 103d Congress, I was an original sponsor of this legislation along with my colleague Mr. SHAYS and am proud to be speaking on the House floor after 2 years of diligent work. This bill is, quite frankly, long overdue.

H.R. 1 is simple and straightforward—it makes us comply with the same laws we impose on the private

sector including the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and OSHA.

It is my view that Member of Congress should be treated the same as our laws treat the American people. If the laws we pass are good enough for our constituents, then they should be good enough for their Representative in Congress. If these laws are so onerous, Congress should simply stop passing them.

I believe we must go further than this bill in reforming Congress. However, H.R. 1 is a giant step in the right direction and I commend all those responsible for bringing this bill to fruition.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, over the years, this Congress has developed a package of policies and a set of laws designed to provide employee protection and to combat discrimination. Those laws have helped to make America better and more fair.

This bill, H.R. 1, will apply those same laws to Congress that now apply to all other employers. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill in the last session of Congress, and I will vote for this bill.

If discrimination occurs in Congress, there should be protection from it, regardless of race, creed, color, sex, age, family status, physical condition, or any other protected class. Labor practices should be fair, the workplace should be safe, and fair notice and retraining should be the expectation of those who work here.

We have outlived the days when Congress can expect special and different treatment from the average employer. If the Constitution means anything for anyone, equal protection of the laws must apply to everyone.

Of all that we have done today, this is the one measure that affects the ordinary citizen. It is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for passage.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], one of the six original cosponsors, a member of the freshman class that was so important to passage of this bill.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1978 a restaurant owner in Pine Bluff, AR, my hometown, built a restaurant with two required parking spaces, a ramp, and a streetlight for the disabled. In 1992 the regulators came in and said, "The laws have changed, and you have got to move that ramp and the two parking places to the front door."

Rather than fight the Government or pay a fine or both, the ramp was moved, the two spaces were moved, but the streetlight was left. So the cost to the owner was \$4,000 plus an extra space for the streetlight.

The owner is watching carefully tonight to see that we pass this bill, the Congressional Accountability Act. Why? Because if Congress has to abide by the regulators who come in and sustain their positions with their fines, then Congress someday will say, as we have said for a long time, "We cannot keep this place going with these expenses."

Then the people who fuel the engine of our economy, the small business person, will find relief in our leadership.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, in a day that could have passed being fairly irrelevant to real Americans, this is something that I think we all can be proud of.

I would like to congratulate and thank my fellow Pennsylvanian, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and all of the original cosponsors of this effort in the last session and their hard work on it, and on this day, this is something that goes beyond symbolism.

This is, indeed, something that both the majority and minority Members of the Congress can be proud of.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], who was the cochairman of the Freshman Bipartisan Task Force on Congressional Reform, so important to the passage of this bill.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and of everyone else involved in this measure to bring it forward for passage tonight.

I rise tonight in strong support of H.R. 1. In a direct contradiction of what the Framers of the Constitution intended, Congress has been exempting itself from the very laws that every American must follow.

In the 57th Federalist Paper, James Madison wrote that Members of the House of Representatives "can make no law which will not have its full operation on themselves and their friends as well as on the great mass of the society. This has always been one of the strongest bonds by which human policy can connect the rulers and the people together."

Madison was right. For too long what he called one of the strongest bonds connecting lawmakers and the people has been absent from the Congress.

Last fall the House overwhelmingly passed similar legislation. Failure of the Senate to act requires the House to act again this year.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure to make Congress abide by the laws every American citizen must comply with every single day.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. MCHALE], one of the original cosponsors of this legislation that passed last year.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act, a piece of legislation which I suspect will soon become one of the most important internal reforms enacted by the Congress during the past 50 years.

In Roman times it was said that the people become more subservient to justice when they see the author of the law obeying it himself. That, in fact, was the very principle cited by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] a few moments ago in Federalist 57 as drafted by James Madison, the father of our Bill of Rights.

Although I suspect a vote on this matter will be bipartisan and overwhelming, that should not cloud the recognition that but for the tremendous courage and tenacity of our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], and the leadership of our former colleague, Dick Swett, this matter would not be brought before the House this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that in our system of justice we cannot have two tiers. All members of our society, be they private citizens or Members of the Congress, are governed by the rule of law, the same rule of law.

I urge an affirmative vote on H.R. 1. Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], who was also just an essential part of the passage of this bill last year as cochairman of the freshman bipartisan task force on congressional reform.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Accountability Act. I want to commend my friend from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for his hard work.

From the beginning, this was a truly bipartisan effort. Both the Republican and Democrat freshman classes made this bill a top priority early on. By the time this bill passed in the 103d Congress, 97 Members of our class, Democrats and Republicans, had signed on as cosponsors.

Bringing Congress under the laws it passes for everyone else is something I campaigned on when I first ran for this office 2 years ago. It is something I fought for during my first term. It is something we simply must complete on this first day of the 104th Congress if we are to begin earning back the trust and respect the American people once had for this great institution.

The significant long-term impact of this bill will be that we pass better laws. Knowing that what we pass will affect us directly will surely make us more vigilant, more pragmatic, and maybe more reluctant when making the laws.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 0100

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. ROSA DELAURO], one of our chief deputy whips.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act and to commend my friend and colleague from Connecticut [CHRIS SHAYS] for his determination to see this important legislation come to pass. I also want to pay tribute to former Democratic Congressman Dick Swett of New Hampshire who worked tirelessly in the last Congress on behalf of this common sense legislation. I might add that it was a Democratic Congress which acted to advance this legislation, only to see it blocked by Republicans in the other body.

The Congressional Accountability Act simply requires that Congress abide by all the laws it passes. It's a proposal that is long overdue and one that will move Government closer to the people.

Politicians have set an unequal standard that put them above the people. That was wrong. And, it helps to account for the growing disaffection in the country. By passing this legislation, the people are one step closer to reclaiming this body, which has historically been the people's House. Let's pass the Congressional Accountability Act.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKEON] who was president of the Republican freshman class last year and a technical cosponsor.

Mr. McKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and for all his outstanding work in bringing this bill to this stage.

Mr. Speaker, at every meeting that I attend back home, the one question that always comes up is how can Congress pass laws and then exempt itself. We are supposed to be representative of the people, but we have consistently treated ourselves differently.

I will be the first to admit that I wish we were all exempt from some of the laws and regulations Congress has passed in the last few years. As a businessman, I have felt the burden of government regulation, but as a Congressman I am exempt from it. That must change.

The Shays amendment is based on a simple principle of fairness. This legislation will require the Congress to comply with the same rules it passes. Just as we back home cannot be above the law, Congress cannot be above the laws it passes by claiming special legislative privilege. The clock has run out on business as usual. Congress must regain the trust of the American people by living under the same laws it imposes on the private sector. I urge you to support the Shays amendment and return accountability to Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act. This bill, which is substantially the same legislation that the House of Representatives passed last August, represents a long-overdue step toward ensuring both that legislative branch employees are treated fairly, and that Members of Congress, as employers, are held to the same standards that our laws demand of private-sector employers.

Mr. Speaker, the charge that Congress exempts itself from laws it passes for everyone else is one of the most frequently heard criticisms of Congress, and understandably so. It is simply wrong to deny to congressional employees the same kinds of employment protections we grant to other employees, and it is wrong to insulate ourselves from the effects of these laws.

Last year, the House of Representatives demonstrated that it was in overwhelming agreement that workplace laws should apply by passing H.R. 4822, the Congressional Accountability Act, by a vote of 427 to 4. Those of us who are strong supporters of this legislation were hopeful—right up until the last moment of the 103d Congress—that the momentum generated by our strong showing on the vote would galvanize the other body to follow suit, and that we would complete action on this legislation before adjourning.

Unfortunately, that did not happen, and so we are back here today, on this first day of the new Congress, considering again a bill which rightly deserves the high priority it has been given by the new House leadership.

Mr. Speaker, to briefly review the background on this legislation: as Members are aware, in recent years, both the House of Representatives and the Senate have attempted to apply employment-related laws to Congress. It has been a difficult endeavor because we have had to construct a way to do so without breaching the separation of powers doctrine under the U.S. Constitution, which could occur if the executive branch enforced these laws.

For the last 7 years, the House has applied the Fair Labor Standards Act and other antidiscrimination measures to House employees through the Rules of the House. As Congress has passed new laws, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act, we have applied those new measures to the House as well.

However, neither the range of laws we have applied to the House, nor the manner in which they are applied, is comparable to the application of laws to the private sector. Not all the laws that apply elsewhere apply to Congress, and our internal enforcement

process does not provide adequate recourse for aggrieved employees. In addition, there are wide variations in the coverage of laws among different groups of legislative branch employees.

Establishing a new system for applying and enforcing these laws, and expanding and making uniform the range of laws covering the legislative branch, was one of the key recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which reported those recommendations in November 1993. The Joint Committee, drawing from the original bill authored by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], and our former colleague from New Hampshire, Mr. Swett, recommended applying 5 laws to Congress, with the possibility of applying more, and establishing a new, more politically insulated entity, the Office of Compliance, which would be responsible for applying laws to the House, the Senate, and other legislative branch entities. It also recommended new procedures, rights, and remedies for aggrieved employees.

Following hearings on this legislation by the subcommittee on the Rules of the House last spring, and with further efforts by Representatives SHAYS, Swett, and others, the Joint Committee's recommended legislation was revised in several respects. The result was that H.R. 4288 as considered (and further amended) by the House was a much stronger, much improved version of the compliance legislation included the Joint Committee's bill. It applied twice as many laws; ensured full coverage of all employees of the legislative branch; made the Office of Compliance a more independent entity and gave it more authority in the promulgation of regulations; and ensured that employees would continue to be covered under the various laws we already apply here in the House until the new regulations developed by the Office of Compliance took effect.

As a result, the bill before us, which reflects those improvements, provides for the following:

First, there are 10 employment-related laws that will be applied to the House of Representatives. They are:

- The Fair Labor Standards Act;
- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;
- The Americans With Disabilities Act;
- The Age Discrimination in Employment Act;
- The Family and Medical Leave Act;
- The Occupational Safety and Health Act;
- The Federal Labor Management Relations Act;
- The Employee Polygraph Protection Act;
- The Worker Adjustment and Retraining Act; and
- The Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

These laws will be administered by a new Office of Compliance, which would

replace the Office of Fair Employment Practices. The Office of Compliance would be governed by a 8-member Board of Directors, all of whom would be appointed jointly by the Speaker and the minority leader of the House, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. The Office would consist of an Executive Director who is appointed by the Board, and other staff. To help ensure the independence of this new office, the bill prohibits appointing to the Board of Directors current and former Members, current and former House employees (unless their employment in the House was more than 4 years previous to their appointment), and lobbyists; the same restrictions, except for lobbyists, will also apply to the Executive Director.

The Board will conduct a study of the way in which the laws should be applied to the Legislative branch, and then follow that study with proposed regulations prescribing the application of the laws to the House of Representatives. Unless the House rejects the regulations by resolution of disapproval, those regulations will take effect. If they are rejected, the Board would re-issue new regulations. Eight laws will be applied at the beginning of 1996, and the remaining two (OSHA and the Federal Labor Relations Act) will be applied at the beginning of 1997, regardless of whether regulations are promulgated by that time.

The bill also establishes a process for resolving alleged violations of the law: first, counseling; then, mediation; and, then, formal complaint and hearing. An independent hearing board will review employee complaints, and upon a finding of liability, prescribe remedies consistent with those that are available to private-sector employees under the relevant law. Parties dissatisfied with the outcome of the hearing would have the opportunity to have a decision reviewed by the Board of Directors.

Laws which currently apply to House employees shall continue to apply until the laws made applicable under this resolution are in effect.

This bill also requires the Office of Compliance to study and recommend additional laws to be applied on a continuing basis, and specifically to review the availability of information in the House and study the possible application of the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act. The Office would also be responsible for educating Members, officers, and employees about their rights and responsibilities under the applicable laws. And, the Office would be required to compile and publish statistics on the use of the Office by House employees, and to develop a system for collecting information on demographic data of employees, and on employment in House offices.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill will make Members of the House signifi-

cantly more accountable for our actions as employers. Perhaps just as importantly, it will give us a better understanding of the effects of laws every private-sector employer must live under and, hopefully, lead to more diligence and care and accountability for the laws we pass. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], an original cosponsor of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress starts to do what it asks everyone else to do: Live under its own laws. When I walk into a restaurant in my home town in Michigan, the owners of that restaurant must abide by a litany of Federal laws. The kitchen is regulated by OSHA, the doors and tables and chairs must abide by the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the employees and managers are protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act, Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to name just a few. Each year we pass more and more regulations on American businesses. It is time for us to start practicing what we preach, and walk the walk.

The House passed this bill before during the 103d Congress. Elements of this measure were approved by a whopping margin of 348 to 3. However, it was the last vote of the very last day of the 103d Congress. We have an opportunity to act again on the issue on the very first day of the 104th Congress. Let us take advantage of this special time as all of America watches and send a message back home that we are willing to live under the laws that we make. On the day we perhaps cut Congress' budget by \$50 to \$100 million, let us do the same thing, impose the same rules on us as on everyone else, the same laws that we ought to live under.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Yogi Berra, it's déjà vu all over again. This bill ought to look familiar because this House overwhelmingly passed it last year. I am happy to vote for congressional compliance 25 times if need be.

Mr. Speaker I find it ironic that on the day we cut committee staff by a third and put thousands of people out of work we celebrate. Mr. Speaker, I also find it ironic that as we cut the committee staff by a third, the office budgets of the new Speaker and the new majority leader have increased by nearly 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we enact this legislation that protects employees.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the

gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. PETER BLUTE.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and neighbor from Connecticut for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, tonight this is a very important issue that we deal with. It is true that the Shays act is about accountability and the arguments about the particulars of the bill have been made ably by Members of the both parties. It is a true bipartisan effort that we deal with tonight.

But there is one more important aspect of the Shays act that I think we should focus on as we cast our votes. Tonight we have an opportunity to do something about the perception out there in the land that Members of Congress are somehow a privileged elite. We have an opportunity to do something about the view of our constituents that somehow we are above the law. We have an opportunity to show our constituents that we are not in a distant capital and not understanding of their real-world problems.

Worst of all is the perception that the Congress is an arrogant institution. We have an opportunity tonight to deal with that issue. Let us take the first step by passing the Shays act and begin to rehabilitate the reputation of our great institution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my objection to the procedure by which we are dealing with this. Tom Foley, our former Speaker, has been, it seems to me, unfairly maligned to some extent.

Let us contrast the way we passed this bill, and we passed this bill, as the gentleman from Connecticut has been very decent in pointing out, under Tom Foley's leadership; but we passed it not in the middle of the night. I understand we are here at 10 after 1 in the morning because we are in the midst of this revolution, we are going to work hard except we are taking off now, I gather, for about 10 days. So we stay up late at night, rush this bill through, no amendments are allowed, no discussion will come through. Members are aware, for instance, and I am in favor of this, but it says in here no Member of Congress will be personally liable for the payment of compensation. I think that makes sense.

□ 0110

I do not think all the Members have had a chance to talk about this. This bill does not apply the Freedom of Information Act to Congress. It says we will study it. I think that is a sensible thing, but those are things that ought to be talked about.

This bill, unlike the bill we had before, allows Members to use federally

funded frequent flyer miles, and that is not easy to say for me. It allows those to be used for personal use. Now people in the private sector cannot do that. What we are doing with this is giving good intentions a bad name.

Yes, it is a good bill. It is a good bill when we worked it out last year. Typically the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] tries very hard to be bipartisan, but sometimes, I guess, there are constraints. This is an all partisan sponsorship. This bill was bipartisan until now. What we have got is this silly insistence of rushing this bill through with no amendments at 1 o'clock in the morning when we are about to take 10 days off and do absolutely nothing so the Republicans can take something that was passed under Democratic leadership last year and claim authorship of it.

Mr. Speaker, they are lucky that one particular bill does not apply to Congress, the copyright laws, because if it did, this example of intellectual theft and attempted partisan piracy would be ruled illegal.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute and a half to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, how interesting it is to note the tone of the debate for this last bill this evening. Most of it has been spoken in bipartisanship, and I say that it is music to the ears of most. I think even the old bulls, and the young freshmen, and the sophomores, and juniors—I look at for 4 years of floor action where the outcome, most of it was predetermined before it ever came to the floor. In only 16 years, only one Republican motion to recommit passed in 16 years. That is a crime, and that should not happen from our side to the now-minority either.

I would say to my colleagues, Yes, fight. I did not vote for a single closed rule in 4 years unless it had been cleared by the majority and the minority, and I would fight for continued open rules in most cases. The king-of-the-hill rule in which not a single Republican win was recorded because the outcome was afforded before it ever got to the floor, and that is not in the best interests of the minority or the majority.

Most of the problems that I have seen in the last 4 years have come out of the leadership, not just the Democratic leadership, and I think the challenge is to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] to make sure that as much as possible the political rhetoric is taken out of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. It has bipartisan support, and, no, it is not perfect. But I would ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and I welcome him back to this Chamber.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for yielding this time to me, and I realize the hour is getting late, colleagues. I can even hear some audible snoring, so I will take less than my minute and just point out tonight we are ending the double standard that has existed for more than 50 years in this institution and in the process that we are demonstrating to the people that we are willing to change in that Congress no longer considers itself above the law. The Congressional Accountability Act should be approved, and I am heartened to see the bipartisan support for this legislation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate him on his leadership. House action on the Congressional Accountability Act is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, in the 102d Congress, I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the congressional coverage coalition. We continually attempted to bring Congress under the same employment laws as the rest of the country, but we were stymied in our efforts.

We sought to cover Congress under the Family and Medical Leave Act, but were prevented by the Rules Committee from even offering the amendment. We wanted to bring staff under statutory civil rights protections, but were similarly rebuffed. Again, we weren't even given a chance to debate the merits and vote.

These amendments were offered at a time when Congress was being described by the media as "peak city;" as a place out of touch with the real world; and—most damning of all—was the "imperial Congress."

People reacted with boiling anger when stories such as the House bank and House dining room fiascoes became public knowledge.

Many Members of Congress just couldn't understand why the public was so aroused. Congress was desensitized.

Americans who run businesses—great and small—must comply with burdensome regulations. It is unconscionable that Congress exempted itself from every major employment and civil rights law it passed.

Businesses have long complained about bureaucratic overregulation. One likely reason that Congress has not been responsive is that it has not been subject to these same demands.

Those who want to continue the status quo will say that employees have protections in the House. They will point to the Office of Fair Employment Practices.

It is true that such an office was created in response to earlier scandals. But House employees are denied the right given to other workers to appeal adverse decisions in Federal court.

We may also be told that Congress has treated itself differently "to preserve separation of powers." Isn't this the same argument that has been made by Members who tried to insulate themselves from criminal charges? And haven't the courts routinely rejected that argument?

Today we are ending a double standard that has existed for more than 50 years.

We are demonstrating to the people that we are willing to change, and that Congress no longer considers itself above the law. The Congressional Accountability Act should be approved.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD]. I point out to Members here that he was a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that championed this legislation.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, change has been the key word the last couple months and today it truly began. The Congressional Accountability Act is the first big step! There are many reasons to support this legislation, but some still have their reservations about complying with the same laws as all other Americans, so I want to address some of the myths surrounding congressional accountability.

One argument concerns the constitutional separation of powers between the three branches of government. This is based on the concern over executive and judicial branch oversight of Congress. If this were a problem, then the executive branch would be exempt as well and the Supreme Court would have upheld this separation in precedent cases. However, the opposite is true, the executive must comply and the Supreme Court has never upheld this idea.

I have also heard the claim that elected officials, especially members of Congress, are uniquely vulnerable to charges against them and their jury would be an angry electorate. In my mind, political vulnerability is no different from economic vulnerability. This reaction is no different from the complaints of private sector employers facing complaints or suits from disgruntled employees, labor unions, or unscrupulous competitors. We should be required to defend our actions in the same manner as the people in the private sector. Plus, members of Congress are not willing to grant similar exemptions from the laws to elected state and local officials or to their political challengers.

So what will Congressional compliance allow? First, this Congress would again become a citizens legislature. Why, because we would become true citizens again. We would have to live under the rules which we have imposed on everyone else. Congressional compliance makes Members of Congress become members of their community and see how government rules and regulations affect people's lives. Just maybe, this bill will make Congress stop and ask the question "If this law is too burdensome for the U.S. House, then maybe it is too burdensome for everybody else."

That is why I want to encourage all my colleagues to support H.R. 1. This

bill will make us accountable to all the legislation we have passed.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

I stand in strong support of the Shays Act.

In the last 40 years, Congress has not been required to live under the laws it passes.

Passage of the congressional accountability law will change all that.

It is both fitting and proper that this fundamental reform be the first bill adopted by the 104th Congress which can and should receive unanimous bipartisan support.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS). What is the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House just adopted a rule sponsored by the Republican Party which says that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will from hereon be a substantially verbatim transcript, so when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend, I do not know what he could revise.

As I understand the rule, it says one can make punctuation and grammatical corrections, so are we adding semicolons? I mean what will appear in the RECORD as a result of that request because we have a new rule now? I would like to know what would appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the new standing rule of the House establishes a standard for the actual remarks to appear only as spoken in debate. Absent a unanimous consent permission to extend and revise remarks, a Member may not include any additional portion of the remarks not actually uttered on the floor either by way of revision or extension. By obtaining unanimous consent to revise and extend, a Member will be in effect able to relax the otherwise strict prohibition contained in clause 9 of rule XIV, but only in two respects: No. 1, to revise and/or to make technical, grammatical and typographical corrections; and, 2, to extend remarks, and this is the key point.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let me finish. Two, to extend remarks which have not been actually uttered in debate, which remarks would appear in distinctive type style and could not be confused with remarks actually uttered.

Thus the unanimous consent permission would not permit prepared or re-

vised remarks not actually uttered in debate to be substituted for remarks actually uttered, but would only permit the supplementation in a distinctive type style to follow all the remarks actually uttered. In no event would the actually uttered remarks be removable. The Chair will direct the Committee on House Oversight to promulgate rules for printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD consistent with this interpretation. The RECORD will carry a daily notice to all readers to this effect.

□ 0120

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, continuing my parliamentary inquiry, if a Member then says "I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend and I oppose the bill," he cannot change that wording, is that correct, except to add punctuation, like an exclamation point? Is it correct that that wording would then appear? Then as I would understand it, if this is correct further, anything beyond that would appear in a distinctive typeface.

Mr. Speaker, would it indicate it was not uttered on the floor, or would it just be a distinctive typeface?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The distinctive typeface would pertain to the comments turned in to the Clerk.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. The Chair explained anything uttered could not be changed, but something not uttered could be included in a separate typeface. So if one wanted to get a perfect set of remarks in, would one not be better advised not to utter anything because you could not change the utterance, but instead, put it in in writing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would generally be a wiser course of action.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry, and I think Members should be aware of this, because this is a new rule for Members who have been here for a while. As I understand it, rising and asking for unanimous consent to revise and extend your remarks and saying you are in opposition, gives you the right to be in the RECORD to say only that and nothing further, except in a typeface that indicates you were not speaking. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, first, what a privilege it is for me to join this great body, and I want my children to be proud also. That is why we should pass this bill. It is the right thing to do. Congress should operate under the same laws everybody else does—it is only

fair. But more importantly Congress will learn the practical consequences of these laws. Prior to November 8, I was a surgeon, essentially running a small business. When Congress has to deal with the same laws and regulations that small businesses do, I predict that we will modify many of the laws in a more commonsense way. I urge you to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting that my first floor statement as the new Representative of the Fourth District of the State of Iowa is about congressional reform.

Congressional reform was a major concern to the voters in last November's elections, throughout the country and specifically in the Fourth District of Iowa. Citizens concerned about the future of this country insisted that Congress needed to reform itself and make the Federal Government responsive to the people. The voters demanded control of their government.

Today, on this first day of the 104th Congress, I am proud to say to the people of the Fourth District of Iowa, that the new Republican majority is doing just that.

Today, I will be voting for nine major reforms of this institution—reforms that are long overdue. Reforms that will forever change the way business is done in Washington. These reforms include: Applying all laws to Congress; cutting the number of committees and subcommittees; cutting committee staff by a third; opening committee meetings to the public; limiting the terms committee chairmen can serve; banning proxy voting in committees; requiring a three-fifths majority to increase income tax rates; ending phony accounting by restoring honest numbers and zero baselines to the Federal budget process; and announcing a comprehensive independent audit of the House books.

The House of Representatives will no longer exempt itself from the laws they write. The Congressional Accountability Act ensures Members of Congress must observe employment laws, occupational health and safety laws, as well as other laws. If the American people have to live under these laws, it is high time that Congress do the same.

In the last 25 years, the Democrats have increased the budget of the Congress by 700 percent and tripled the size of committee staff. The last time the House dissolved a standing committee was 1947. That is going to change beginning today.

Three committees will be shut down—Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Civil Service, and the District of Columbia committee. Committee chairs will be required to eliminate an additional 25 subcommittees, and committee staff will drop from nearly 2,000 this year to about 1,300.

Legislative Service Organizations are groups for like-minded members supported by congressional staff, housed in congressional buildings, and often spending the taxpayers' money with little or no accountability. This type of abuse is one reason the public distrusts our government. Well, no more. These organizations will be eliminated.

These reforms are just the beginning. Any institution that is not constantly reforming itself in the face of changing times will soon collapse. I say to my colleagues, Democrat and

Republican, that these reforms are dramatic and historic, but they are just the beginning of a long journey to redeeming the reputation of the U.S. Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue to bring new changes to this institution, today and well into the future.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support for a longstanding Republican initiative that we have waited many years to see become law. It would put into permanent law section 108 of the rules changes which we just adopted. Simply put, it will subject Congress to the same laws that we apply to everyone else. I call it the golden rule. No American should be immune from the law or receive special treatment in its application, but that is what Congress has done by routinely exempting itself from the very laws it imposes upon others.

A double standard is a symbol of the arrogance of power which epitomizes Washington for so many citizens. It will also spur lawmakers to review more carefully the laws they pass.

In summary, if we pass it, we have to live by it. I urge an aye vote.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I am going to congratulate Members on both sides of the aisle for the work they have put into this bill over the last several sessions. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has been particularly active and has done a great job, along with the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Swett, in the last session. It is about time this bill has come to the floor so we can actually get it implemented.

But I hope there will be two things that come as a result of this legislation actually being enacted. First is that Members will begin to realize when we are drafting bills and we are building bills here on the floor, that the full weight of these bills will in fact fall upon us as Members of Congress. I think that with the passage of this bill, that Members will recognize that fact, that we are going to have to live under these. We might be a little more cautious.

Second, I would point out that we ought to, as we begin to live under these laws, we are going to realize that the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Civil Rights Act, and other laws we have exempted ourselves from, are rather weighty. They are weighty on the private sector, and they are going to be very difficult for all of the Members to comply with under our current structure. So we are going to have two choices, and we ought to have a debate about whether we should continue to live under the laws as they were drafted, or whether in fact we ought to go

back and listen to what the American people said on November 8 when they said Government is too big, it spends too much, and is too intrusive, and maybe we ought to look at some of those laws and revise a lot of them.

Let me also say as we begin to close this debate tonight, that as this opening day comes to a close, we have lived up to the first part of our Contract With America. We have had real reform of the People's House. And just as important as that was, today we did that in a very bipartisan manner. And I hope that as we continue over the next 99 days, we will continue to pass the rest of the Contract with America in this same spirit of bipartisanship.

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

Mr. Speaker, in November there were 435 contracts made in each of our districts, and we came here to represent as best we can the aspirations and the hopes of our constituents.

I would hope that as we proceed, that we together work to merit and properly explain this institution so that we can merit the respect of the American public.

I want to tell my new friends on both sides of the aisle who have come here that we spend a lot of time in this institution denigrating this institution. We have 435 campaigns that spend millions of dollars, and on both sides of the aisle we tell the American public how bad this institution is.

That is a disservice. It is a disservice to this institution, and it is a disservice to our democracy. It is no wonder that the American public has come to believe that this institution is not as good as I believe it to be, having served here for 14 years, and is peopled by individuals of integrity, patriotism, and commitment to the common good.

We have differences. But few of my colleagues on either side of the aisle I believe do not have their constituents' best interests at heart and want to serve the best interests of their country.

I say that in the context that many of these laws do in fact apply to the Congress. What they do not do, as has been observed, is give the redress that is given in the private sector.

That has been done for some very legitimate reasons in terms of the separate but equal status of this body with the executive department which is called upon in other instances to enforce these statutes. And determination has been made that it would be inappropriate to subject one coequal body to regulation by another coequal body. In fact, this very legislation, which is bipartisan in nature, addresses that concern and sets up an Office of Compliance within the Congress.

So as we in a bipartisan fashion pass this piece of legislation, which some believe will show how onerous are the protections we have extended to em-

ployees, and some of us believe how appropriate it is to extend to our own employees the protections for their safety, for their health, and for non-discrimination that we have extended to employees throughout this country.

□ 0130

So I join my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS]. I regret, frankly, that my friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Swett, is not here.

I congratulate all those, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and others who have been involved in bringing to fruition this very difficult piece of legislation.

I want to reiterate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. Speaker Foley, knowing full well that this was a difficult piece of legislation, nevertheless said, "We are going to bring it to the floor. I want to see this legislation passed." In August we did and it was passed. Unfortunately, it did not pass into law, but fortunately for us, in a bipartisan fashion we can act tonight to do what is right.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude and not use all of my time, but would thank the Members for their graciousness, and particularly thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for taking the place of the gentleman from New Hampshire, Dick Swett, in this important debate. I thank him from the bottom of my heart for treating it with such seriousness.

I say to my Members that behind the Speaker is the flag of the United States. The American people revere that flag, but that flag is a symbol. It is a piece of cloth that represents so much. Our Founding Fathers established in the Constitution this body, the people's body. My hope and prayer is that the American people will respect Congress as much as they respect the American flag.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, and I am proud to have been an original cosponsor last Congress and again this Congress.

As we pass H.R. 1, we keep another promise to America—to end the double-standard congressional exemption regarding civil rights and employee protection laws. As a small businessperson and cosponsor of this legislation, I fully support the three principles behind the Congressional Accountability Act:

If a law is right for the private sector, it is right for Congress;

Congress will write better laws when it has to live by the same burdens it imposes on the private sector and local governments.

And we do so by respecting the separation of powers embodied in the Constitution and provide appeals to the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I have experienced first hand from a business standpoint the financial burdens imposed by excessive unfunded Federal mandates such as the Family and Medical Leave Act, OSHA laws, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

As we close this historic first day of the 104th Congress, having significantly reformed the rules by which this institution operates, it is appropriate that we bring these laws to bear on us as we have imposed them on others. Hopefully, this will provide the discipline we need to better scrutinize future bills in terms of costs and excessive Federal intervention in our lives.

I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 1.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Representative CHRIS SHAYS for not giving up on H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act. The gentleman from Connecticut should feel doubly rewarded since this very bill passed the House once before—during the 103d Congress. Since the Senate chose to turn it down, we are doing the right thing in proceeding without hesitation to enact the Congressional Accountability Act again today.

As a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I took a special interest in applying our laws to Members. I felt obligated to do so as a past chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which has jurisdiction over many of the laws at issue today in this bill. Give the House credit, however, for having years ago applied these laws to itself. What has been missing was not the laws but an enforcement mechanism independent of the House. I am particularly proud that this mechanism is the central contribution of the Congressional Accountability Act.

This bill more than meets the standard set by those who sought passage of a law to apply congressional acts to the Congress itself. H.R. 1 sets a higher standard. For example, H.R. 1 allows employees to go immediately to court or to an administrative hearing to initiate a claim of discrimination. As a lawyer and former professional in the field, I have some reservations about eliminating the useful and ancient rule that claimants exhaust administrative remedies before proceeding to more costly and cumbersome court processes. The courts are already clogged. These days they should be reserved as much as possible for matters such as criminal trials. Cost-free administrative resolution of claims of the kind encompassed by H.R. 1 is always less expensive and often far more yielding of appropriate remedies in shorter periods of time.

Nevertheless, if this bill passes we must celebrate the choice to allow Members and employees to submit to an administrative process where hearing officers are selected from a rotating list of professionals recommended by the Administrative Conference of the United States and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The independence of the fact-finding process from control of the House is extraordinary for a legislative body and does great honor to the House.

I hope that this time Members in the majority will insist that Republicans in the Senate take the lead of their Republican colleagues in the House and make the Congressional Accountability Act the law of the land.

I am pleased to support H.R. 1.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act. This bill is the first step toward fulfilling the Republican pledge to the American people to demonstrate our sincerity about changing the way we conduct business in this body. For over 100 years, beginning with the first exemption from the Civil Service Act of 1883, Congress has absolved itself from laws which apply to private employers and other Government employees. The American people are not fooled—they recognize hypocrisy when they see it. It's no surprise that a majority of the American people consider us to be an elitist, privileged, out-of-touch group of individuals who can not recognize that it is wrong to require compliance from the entire Nation—except for ourselves. Thanks to the Republican leadership, we now have a chance to change our image—to show the American people that we too will accept the responsibility for complying with the laws that we pass for the rest of America.

The bill before us today applies 10 laws to this body—the Fair Labor Standards Act; title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Americans with Disabilities Act; Age Discrimination in Employment Act; Family and Medical Leave Act; Occupational Safety and Health Act; Federal Labor Management Relations Act; Employee Polygraph Protection Act; Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act; and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The newly created Office of Compliance will develop regulations to apply these laws to Congress which are consistent with application in the private sector. A four-step process is established to address employee complaints. If, after the mediation process, the complaint is not resolved, the aggrieved employee may seek redress in U.S. District Court for alleged violations.

I am confident that the legislation before us today will strengthen our credibility with the American people. It is time for this body to accept that we can no longer treat ourselves as a privileged body unaccountable for actions which violate the laws of this Nation.

I look forward to passage and implementation of this bill.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, the concept of applying the laws of the land to Congress has been one which I have been fighting for since I first came to Congress. This is why I am pleased to see a bill on the floor of the House which attempts to achieve this goal. The bill before us today, H.R. 1, the Congressional Accountability Act, is a good step in the direction of true congressional coverage, and it is very similar to the bill of the same name which was passed by the House last August. Both measures have been a long time in coming.

The hypocrisy of Congress in exempting itself from the very laws it imposes on others is so obvious, that one wonders how the practice so long managed to escape wide criticism. In the last few years, however, we have seen a change in the long-standing attitude that Congress is so unique and so different that it simply must be afforded special exemptions, even from employment laws, or it could not function; and those of us who once felt alone in the wilderness in urging Congressional coverage now have welcome company. The reality is that the public is fed up, and Congress has

been reacting. I am very pleased that the Republican leadership is bringing H.R. 1 to the floor today, as the first bill to be passed as part of the Contract With America.

In my years in the House, it has become increasingly clear that Congress, in its imperial wisdom, too cavalierly and too eagerly, continues to place layer upon layer of regulatory requirements on the private sector—without any deep understanding for what it is doing. Congressional coverage is vitally important because it will help Congress to adopt credible, effective, and workable laws which affect everyone else in the United States and will allow Congress to truly feel the pain of the impact of these laws. If the statutes don't apply to us, how in the world are we supposed to know how they will work in the real world outside of the beltway?

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 sets up a Congressional Office of Compliance which would be required to issue regulations to implement the application of 10 laws to Congress. Although there is no committee report language accompanying this bill, it is my understanding that the bill's sponsor, my colleague, Mr. SHAYS, is looking to the August, 1994, report language which accompanied last year's legislation, to provide guidance to the Office of Compliance. This report language directs that the Compliance Office should implement the specific provisions of the laws listed in the act to the greatest extent possible, and that it is not the act's intent that existing law be reinterpreted. I very much agree with Mr. SHAYS on this point.

I am also heartened by the fact that the Occupational Safety and Health Act is one of the statutes which will be applied to Congress. In 1993, I introduced the Congressional Safety and Health Act (H.R. 3458) to extend OSHA protections to employees of the House and its instrumentalities. Last year's Report language suggests an approach which is modeled after my bill, to ensure that OSHA enforcement mechanisms are applied to Congress that mirror, as closely as possible, those found in the private sector.

With regard to remedies available to aggrieved employees, H.R. 1 copies the private sector process in allowing private law suits in court, with jury trials, where the underlying law allows for such law suits. In my view, this is a very important provision in the bill, because congressional employees should be entitled to the same type of damages as private sector employees under the relevant laws.

I must emphasize that if Members of Congress and Senators are not subjected to the same employee remedies which exist under many of the laws of the land, especially in the area of "place-of-employment" labor law, then we will not have true congressional coverage of these laws. This is not very well known, because Members are currently exempt from the most important aspect of many private sector laws, the right of employees to sue the employer in trial court for damages. In this day and age, these employee rights are what put the "teeth" into many of our private sector labor laws—and in ever increasing frequency, Congress is expanding these rights.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to one of the laws included in H.R. 1, the Family and Medical Leave Act, I am pleased today to see that

Members will be supporting the correct position on its application to Congress—a position which was not accepted when I offered my motion to recommit the FMLA bill when it was considered by the House in 1993. My motion would have allowed congressional employees to use judicial remedies in the FMLA's enforcement and would have allowed Members to be sued in Federal court for violations of the act. H.R. 1 does, with the exception of allowing punitive damages and Member liability for wrongdoing, achieve the same result that I attempted to accomplish with my motion last year.

H.R. 1, however, although it provides major improvements in terms of employee rights, still is very deficient in the area of employer accountability. Under this bill, all Members of Congress, Senators, and heads of employing offices are totally shielded from any financial liability resulting from wrongdoing, even in proven cases of egregious violations of the law. This is a step back from the current procedures of the existing House Office of Fair Employment Practices, which provide for award payments from Members' office accounts. The bill also sets up a separate fund and provides for government-paid attorney representation, no matter how outrageous the behavior or allegations in question. In addition, H.R. 1 expressly excludes awards of punitive damages. Where is the sting here? If only private sector companies were lucky enough to have this arrangement.

In the final analysis, the lack of employer accountability in this legislation will likely result in additional litigation against congressional employers, because the "deep pocket" of the Government—the taxpayers—will pay for any damages or attorney fees which are awarded.

Mr. Speaker, despite these defects in the bill, it is still an improvement over the current situation. I would also hope that the shortcomings I mentioned can be addressed in conference with the Senate. There are many Members who should be thanked for their work on this issue, but I would like to specifically recognize several of my colleagues: Mr. SHAYS for his perseverance in promoting their legislation; Mr. DREIER and Mr. HAMILTON for their work in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, on which H.R. 1 is based; Mr. GOODLING, the new Chairman of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee who introduced legislation in 1993 which guided the authors of H.R. 1 and ensured that we have a better product before us today; and finally, the new Republican Leadership—Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader ARMEY for having the wisdom and the foresight to include congressional coverage as part of the Contract With America.

I only hope that the Senate will follow our lead and will pass similar legislation in the near future so that we may go to conference and send a bill to the President this year—one that provides a real and workable mechanism for making Congress subject to the same laws it mandates on the private sector.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Accountability Act and applaud those leaders on both sides of the aisle for bringing this legislation forward in the House. In the 103d Congress, Democrats and Republicans in the House

acted responsibly and passed this important and long overdue legislation. I am pleased that it is one of the first orders of business in the 104th Congress.

One of the reasons I strongly support this legislation is that it will—for the first time—extend Federal labor law to the U.S. Capitol Police.

For the past 2 years, I have waged a lonely struggle to get the House leadership to address the serious morale problem which exists on the U.S. Capitol Police. Over the past 10 years, dramatic progress has been made in transforming the Capitol Police from a patronage club to one of the best trained and most professional law enforcement agencies in the country. Unfortunately, the upgrades in training and professional standards have not been matched by parallel advances in labor or management policies. I have found instances of age, sex, and racial discrimination. I have found that in all too many instances management is petty, unsympathetic, and incompetent. The Capitol Police Board has made some important changes, but has done nothing to address the fundamental structural problems that exist. For example, the ombudsperson they established to hear complaints and grievances reports directly to management, and is perceived by the rank and file as a tool of management and not as an objective third party who can resolve problems.

The 3-day demonstration on the steps of the Capitol in February 1994 was proof positive that the morale problem is widespread, and not simply a matter of a few disgruntled officers making a lot of noise. There is a serious problem and Congress can't ignore it.

Many of the problems on the force could be effectively addressed simply by giving the rank and file what every other Federal law enforcement agency has: collective bargaining rights. As a Democrat, I am ashamed of the fact that the party of the working man and woman has turned its back on the brave officers who protect and serve them every day.

With passage of the Congressional Accountability Act, Congress has the opportunity to right this wrong. The act would afford the U.S. Capitol Police with the same labor rights as other Federal law enforcement officers.

The legislation would allow for a 2-year grace period before the Capitol Police would be permitted to collectively bargain. I intend to ask the Speaker and other congressional leaders to waive this provision and afford the rank and file the right to collectively bargain immediately. I would also strongly recommend that action be taken to fully professionalize the management of the force so that the officers are being led by experienced and competent managers.

By acting swiftly on this issue we will be sending a positive message to the rank and file that—at long last—those who run the House care about the men and women who protect the House.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Accountability Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS). Pursuant to section 108 of House Resolution 6, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 429, nays 0, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—429

Abercromble	Collins (MI)	Ganske
Ackerman	Combest	Gejdenson
Allard	Condit	Gekas
Andrews	Conyers	Gephardt
Archer	Cooley	Gerens
Armey	Costello	Gibbons
Bachus	Cox	Gilchrest
Baesler	Coyne	Gillmor
Baker (CA)	Cramer	Gilman
Baker (LA)	Crane	Gonzalez
Baldacci	Crapo	Goodlatte
Ballenger	Creameans	Goodling
Barcia	Cubin	Gordon
Barr	Cunningham	Goss
Barrett (NE)	Danner	Graham
Barrett (WI)	Davis	Green
Bartlett	de la Garza	Greenwood
Barton	Deal	Gunderson
Bass	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Bateman	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Becerra	DeLay	Hall (OH)
Bellenson	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Bentsen	Deutch	Hamilton
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hancock
Berman	Dickey	Hansen
Bevill	Dicks	Harman
Bilbray	Dingell	Hastert
Bilirakis	Dixon	Hastings (FL)
Bishop	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Billey	Dooley	Hayes
Blute	Doolittle	Hayworth
Boehlert	Dornan	Hefley
Boehner	Doyle	Hefner
Bonilla	Dreier	Helmman
Bonior	Duncan	Hergert
Bono	Dunn	Hilleary
Borski	Durbin	Hilliard
Boucher	Edwards	Hinchee
Brewster	Ehlers	Hobson
Browder	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Brown (CA)	Emerson	Hoke
Brown (OH)	Engel	Holden
Brownback	English	Horn
Bryant (TN)	Ensign	Hostettler
Bryant (TX)	Eshoo	Houghton
Bunn	Evans	Hoyer
Bunning	Everett	Hunter
Burr	Ewing	Hutchinson
Burton	Farr	Hyde
Buyer	Fattah	Inglis
Callahan	Fawell	Istook
Calvert	Fazio	Jackson-Lee
Camp	Fields (LA)	Jacobs
Canady	Fields (TX)	Jefferson
Cardin	Flner	Johnson (CT)
Castle	Flake	Johnson (SD)
Chabot	Flanagan	Johnson, E.B.
Chambliss	Foglietta	Johnson, Sam
Chapman	Foley	Johnston
Chenoweth	Forbes	Jones
Christensen	Ford	Kanjorski
Chrysler	Fowler	Kaptur
Clay	Fox	Kasich
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kelly
Clement	Franks (CT)	Kennedy (MA)
Clinger	Franks (NJ)	Kennedy (RI)
Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Kennelly
Coble	Frisa	Kildee
Coburn	Frost	Kim
Coleman	Funderburk	King
Collins (GA)	Furse	Kingston
Collins (IL)	Gallegly	Kleczka

Klink	Nethercutt	Shuster
Klug	Neumann	Sislsky
Knollenberg	Ney	Skaggs
Kolbe	Norwood	Skeen
LaFalce	Nussle	Skelton
LaHood	Oberstar	Slaughter
Lambert-Lincoln	Obey	Smith (MI)
Lantos	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Largent	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Latham	Orton	Smith (WA)
LaTourrette	Owens	Solomon
Laughlin	Oxley	Souder
Lazio	Packard	Spence
Leach	Pallone	Spratt
Levin	Parker	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Stenholm
Lewis (GA)	Paxon	Stockman
Lewis (KY)	Payne (NJ)	Stokes
Lightfoot	Payne (VA)	Studds
Linder	Pelosi	Stump
Lipinski	Peterson (FL)	Stupak
Livingston	Peterson (MN)	Talent
LoBlundo	Petri	Tanner
Lofgren	Pickett	Tate
Longley	Pombo	Tauzin
Lowey	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
Lucas	Porter	Taylor (NC)
Luther	Portman	Tejeda
Maloney	Poshard	Thomas
Manton	Pryce	Thompson
Manzullo	Quillen	Thornberry
Markey	Quinn	Thornton
Martini	Radanovich	Thurman
Mascara	Rahall	Tiahrt
Matsui	Ramstad	Torkildsen
McCarthy	Rangel	Torres
McCollum	Reed	Torricelli
McCreery	Regula	Towns
McDade	Reynolds	Trafficant
McDermott	Richardson	Tucker
McHale	Riggs	Upton
McHugh	Rivers	Velazquez
McInnis	Roberts	Vento
McIntosh	Roemer	Visclosky
McKeon	Rogers	Volkmer
McKinney	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen	Waldholtz
Meehan	Rose	Walker
Meek	Roth	Walsh
Menendez	Roukema	Wamp
Metcalfe	Roybal-Allard	Ward
Meyers	Royce	Waters
Mfume	Rush	Watt (NC)
Mica	Sabo	Waxman
Miller (CA)	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Miller (FL)	Sanders	Weldon (PA)
Mineta	Sanford	Weller
Minge	Sawyer	White
Mink	Saxton	Whitfield
Moakley	Scarborough	Wicker
Molinari	Schaefer	Williams
Mollohan	Schiff	Wilson
Montgomery	Schroeder	Wise
Moorhead	Schumer	Wolf
Moran	Scott	Woolsey
Morella	Seastrand	Wyden
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Myers	Serrano	Young (AK)
Myrick	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Nadler	Shaw	Zeliff
Neal	Shays	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (FL)	Stark
Martinez	Yates

□ 0146

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 1, the bill just passed.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I would think that that motion would be that Members would have 5 days to extend their remarks, but under the new rules I do not see how they could revise remarks unmade, so Members would be allowed to extend. But I think under the new rule giving Members the chance to review unmade remarks is out of order, and they could only extend in a different typeface.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, might I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAZIO of New York). The Chair would advise that Members' remarks can only be revised for technical reasons.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. But my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is how can a Member make a technical correction to things they never said yet? If we are taking this request, it is Members who have not said anything yet, and it would let them put something into the RECORD as if they said something, and under the new rules all they can do, it seems to me, is to extend. I would hope this is not allowing someone to say something they already said, and I just do not want Members to have the wrong impression.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advised the body earlier that the changes cannot be substantive, that they can only be technical in nature.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as was stated from the Chair earlier, the Committee on House Oversight will promulgate rules and language to deal with this. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. We are in a slight conundrum right now because we are utilizing words that have been used historically, the classic revise and extend. More properly I think it should be correct and extend. And although we are in this situation now where we are still using the what would be archaic language, we will provide the appropriate language and the structure for dealing with that early tomorrow morning for the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I gather revolutions would be confusing even to those who are trying to promulgate them so I appreciate that.

Mr. THOMAS. Order will come out of the structure, I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts. And I will not object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I seek recognition for the purpose of inquiring with the majority leader the schedule for next week. I yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding.

Let me announce the schedule for the rest of this week and the following week. We have had a long but productive day, and the vote we have just concluded is the last scheduled vote for today. Members should be advised that votes on further business are possible but I believe unlikely. Certainly we will not be calling any from our side, and I doubt that they will be called from the other side. Still, nevertheless, it is possible.

The remainder of this week and next week will be extremely busy workdays. Although we do not expect votes on the floor the remainder of this week or next, committees will be fully occupied with their organizational meetings, hearings, and markups on contract bills and other business.

I would like to remind all Members that under our new rules attendance at committee meetings are particularly important. First, any votes taken in committee will be open to public record. Second, there is a ban on proxy voting so Members will have to attend all meetings at which votes are taken in order for their constituents' voices to be heard.

In order to reiterate, the House will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow in pro forma session. Friday the House will not be in session.

Next week the House will meet in pro forma session Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. The House will convene at 2 o'clock, 11 a.m. on Wednesday and 10 a.m. on Friday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Could the gentleman perhaps relate to Members as to when he thinks in the following week there will be the first vote and at about what time and on what day? Would that be on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ARMEY. Monday of the following week of course is a holiday. We are not prepared at this point to announce any votes for that week. Should it develop that committees are able to produce work that could be possibly scheduled for the floor we will make an announcement to the Members in a timely fashion. I would advise Members that they may want to check their whips, rotary whips.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the floor for a second just to say that we are very interested in working with the other side in moving legislation, including fairly small things that might be mutually agreed to, as early as possible. But frankly, as Members know, if we protect your rights to have, for example, 3 days for the minority reviews on bills coming out of committee, and then we protect your rights going through the Rules Committee process, we probably have about 10 or 12 days where we have to say to our colleagues yes, you have to be here; no, we are not going to put Mickey Mouse on the legislative schedule just to give you some cover. And since we do not have proxy voting anymore, you are going to have to be here and be in committee, and this is substantive work. We may have to consult with you to find what is the best way in the interest of the House to manage this 2-week transition process. But I do not want us, and in fact we will not try to run over your rights to file minority views, your rights to have the process at the Rules Committee, your rights to have something come out the Rules Committee to come to the floor. As you know, we do not have a chart that shows it, but it could not be hard to generate one. If we really guarantee both sides their rights, it is about an 8- to 10-legislative-day process I am told by the Rules Committee members to get something done in a fair way, so we have about a 2-week startup process here that is very real, and I think the press will have more than enough to cover to amuse itself. But it will not be on the floor.

So we would rather go to pro forma sessions, but have Members here, and have them understand that with this no-proxy-voting situation it is a very real requirement to be here when your committees meet, because very real decisions will be made without proxies.

So I would hope that we could work it out. I just outlined that because I know some Members on both sides have been confused, and on your side several Members suggested, well, gee, all of a sudden we will have no business. Here we have the chairman of the Rules Committee who has an example of why it takes about 10 days, and we can talk this out.

I would just say to any of your Members who suggest to us this is a sign that we have not planned it out or that we are being dilatory that in fact the only way to preempt this is to go to suspensions or to in some way minimize the rights of Democrats to file minority views and to file amendments. So I would hope we could work together, get the fastest possible start-up time, but do so in a way that protects every Member.

I appreciate the majority leader and minority leader allowing me to intervene for a moment to express my deepest concern on this, and I thank them.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would simply suggest to Members on our side and probably on your side as well that they need to communicate with the Chair and ranking member of their committees to determine whether or not there are meetings and markups and other activities of the committees so they know when they are expected to be there.

□ 0200

But I understand what you are saying. We will communicate with our Members through the whip system, through the cloakrooms.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.  
Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. One of the difficulties on some committees, I would tell the minority leader, is we do not yet know the minority composition of the committee. I was wondering if the minority leader would indicate when I might know the makeup, for example, of the minority members of the Committee on Oversight.

Mr. GEPHARDT. As soon as we can do that.

Mr. THOMAS. That might be part of the problem. It is difficult to hold an organizing meeting of the committee when the members of the committee have not been named.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield further, let me just thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I believe we have clearly communicated to Members what to expect and how to check either with their committee chairman or ranking member or with their whip system. We will give as much notification as we can and see to it every Member's rights are protected. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1995 TO MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, January 5, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1995 TO WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns on Monday, January 9, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, January 11.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1995 TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, January 11, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, January 13.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS TO EXTEND REMARKS FOR LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 4, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the legislative day of January 4, 1995 all Members be permitted to extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extension of Remarks".

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that the committee consisted of myself and the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. We had a pleasant conversation with the President. I am sure he will be communicating to us later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield, if he should wish, to the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], for any remarks he would like to make.

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

This call was a tradition which we have usually fulfilled. We fulfilled it earlier today or yesterday with the gentleman from Texas. We did inform the President, as we are required to do, that the House is seated, we have elected officers, elected a Speaker, and that we were ready for legislative action, and I believe we are having a meeting later today with the President and the bipartisan leadership.

#### COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the designation of certain minority employees, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 7

*Resolved*, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, the six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following named persons, effective January 3, 1995, until otherwise ordered by the House, to-wit: Thomas O'Donnell, George Kundanis, Marti Thomas, Michael Wessel, Laura Nichols, and Steve Elmendorf, each to receive gross compensation pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 119, Ninety-fifth Congress, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of Public Law 95-94. In addition, the Minority Leader may appoint and set the annual rate of pay for up to three further minority employees.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOUR OF MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 8

*Resolved*, That unless otherwise ordered, the hour of meeting of the House shall be 2 o'clock post meridiem on Mondays; 11 o'clock ante meridiem on Tuesdays and Wednesdays; and 10 o'clock ante meridiem on all other days of the week up to and including May 13, 1995; and that from May 15, 1995, until the end of the first session, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be noon on Mondays and 10 o'clock ante meridiem on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOUR OF MEETING FOR MORNING HOUR DEBATE AND RESTRICTED SPECIAL ORDER SPEECHES UNTIL FEBRUARY 16, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, upon consultation with the minority leader, the Speaker has announced the format for recognition for morning hour debate and restricted special order speeches, which will continue until February 16, 1995. It is understood that the continuation of this format for recognition by the Speaker is without prejudice to the Speaker's ultimate power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XIV should circumstances so warrant.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that until February 16, 1995, the House may convene 90 minutes earlier than the time otherwise established by order of the House on Mondays and Tuesdays of each week solely for the purpose of conducting morning hour debates under the following conditions:

First, prayer by the Chaplain, approval of the Journal, and the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag to be postponed until the resumption of the House session following the completion of morning hour debate;

Second, debate to be limited to 30 minutes allocated to each party, with initial and subsequent recognitions alternating between parties;

Third, recognition to be conferred by the Speaker only pursuant to lists submitted by the respective leaderships;

Fourth, no Member to be permitted to address the House for longer than 5 minutes except for the majority leader, minority leader, and minority whip; and

Fifth, morning hour debate will be followed by a recess declared by the Speaker pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, until the appointed hour for the resumption of legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

#### FORMAT FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Upon consultation with the minority leader, the Chair announces that the format for recognition for morning hour debate and restricted special order speeches, which began on February 23, 1994, will continue until February 16, 1995, as outlined below:

On Tuesdays, following legislative business, the Chair may recognize Members for special order speeches up to midnight, and such speeches may not extend beyond midnight. On all other days of the week, the Chair may recognize Members for special order speeches up to four hours after the conclusion of 5-minute special orders speeches. Such speeches may not extend beyond the 4-hour limit without the permission of the Chair, which may

granted only with advance consultation between the leaderships and notification to the House. However, at no time shall the Chair recognize for any special order speeches beyond midnight.

The Chair will first recognize Members for 5-minute special order speeches, alternating initially and subsequently between the parties regardless of the date the order was granted by the House. The Chair will then recognize longer special orders speeches. The 4-hour limitation will be divided between the majority and minority parties. Each party is entitled to reserve its first hour for respective leaderships or their designees. Recognition will alternate initially and subsequently between the parties, regardless of the date the order was granted by the House.

The allocation of time within each party's 2-hour period, or shorter period if prorated to end by midnight, is to be determined by a list submitted to the Chair by the respective leaderships. Members may not sign up for any special order speeches earlier than 1 week prior to the special order, and additional guidelines may be established for such signups by the respective leaderships.

Pursuant to clause 9(b)(1) of rule I, the television cameras will not pan the Chamber, but a "crawl" indicating morning hour or that the House has completed its legislative business and is proceeding with special order speeches will appear on the screen. Other television camera adaptations during this period may be announced by the Chair.

The continuation of this format for recognition by the Speaker is without prejudice to the Speaker's ultimate power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XIV should circumstances so warrant.

#### PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE REPUBLICAN STEERING COMMITTEE AND THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9) providing amounts for the Republican Steering Committee and the Democratic Party Committee, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 9

*Resolved*, That, effective at the beginning of the 104th Congress, there shall be available, in equal amounts to the Republican Steering Committee and the Democratic Policy Committee, such sums as may be necessary, to be provided, as determined by the Committee on Appropriations, from amounts previously appropriated for other purposes under the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, fiscal year 1995.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR TRANSFER OF TWO EMPLOYEE POSITIONS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10) providing for the transfer of two employee positions, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 10

*Resolved*, That, effective at the beginning of the 104th Congress, two statutory employee positions under the chief majority whip are transferred to the majority leader.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SACRIFICE AND COURAGE OF ARMY WARRANT OFFICERS DAVID HILEMON AND BOBBY W. HALL II

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on National Security be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) recognizing the sacrifice and courage of Army Warrant Officers David Hilemon and Bobby W. Hall II, whose helicopter was shot down over North Korea on December 17, 1994, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to do that, I think it needs to be explained, and I would like for the gentleman from South Carolina to concur in this, that this resolution deals with the fact that a helicopter of the Army was downed in Korea on December 17, 1994, and that Army Chief Warrant Officer David Hilemon and Army Chief Warrant Officer Bobby W. Hall II were shot down over North Korea.

This resolution is intended to recognize the sacrifice of Army Chief Warrant Officer David Hilemon to his country and to express the gratitude for his selflessness and deepest regret for his loss of life to his family and to recognize the exceptional service of Army Chief Warrant Officer Bobby W. Hall II to his country and express commendation for his courage.

Am I correct, I ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE]?

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. That is exactly it, yes.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out in particular to the families of those involved this was a tremendous ordeal.

The individuals involved deserve the commendation that is given in this resolution. It was a very strenuous thing for our country to go through.

It is only appropriate that the very first order of business of this Congress in terms of a formal resolution, beyond the proceedings we have done earlier today, be this concurrent resolution.

With that in mind, and further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], in whose district resides the family and Bobby Hall, Warrant Officer Bobby Hall, who did survive, and I yield for whatever comment she may make under my reservation.

□ 0210

Mrs. THURMAN. I thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from South Carolina.

I know that you have worked tirelessly today to help me get this up tonight. So I really do appreciate their concern and their help.

Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution recognizing the sacrifice and courage of Army Warrant Officers Bobby Hall and David Hilemon, whose helicopter was shot down over North Korea on December 17, 1994.

David Hilemon gave his life in the service of our country, and Bobby Hall performed with bravery and honor during his 13 days in captivity in North Korea. These soldiers displayed the highest ideals of our armed services, and their efforts on behalf of our country should be justly noted.

In addition, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] who played an invaluable role in bringing this incident to a close, and he also deserves our gratitude. His leadership helped secure the remains of David Hilemon, and he kept the pressure on the North Koreans to release Bobby Hall.

Bobby Hall lives in Brooksville, FL, in the district I represent. On Saturday, Brooksville will be having a celebration in honor of his homecoming.

I have to tell you I never saw anything like it, with yellow ribbons and declared vigils, people coming out into the street, giving food and doing things for the Halls and for their family and loved ones. They just went out of their way to make sure that these folks were taken care of in a time that was not easy.

I do not believe that I ever have seen a community so committed or so united in purpose. Saturday's celebration will be a fitting tribute to Bobby Hall

and his family and to the thousands of people who prayed for his safe return.

Finally, I want to express my condolences to the family of David Hilemon for their loss.

I again thank the gentlemen for their assistance.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to do so, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her efforts in this matter, and I would like to comment on the record that first of all Brooksville, FL, was my birthplace and hometown and Bobby Hall II whom we are noting here in this commendation, his father was in my high school class when I graduated from high school, Hernando High School there.

I did spend time speaking with his father on several occasions during the time that he was in captivity. It is truly a very important day in that community to celebrate this occasion of the good news return and this particular commemorative is a very important piece of that.

So I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for offering it tonight.

I do not intend to object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAZIO of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 1

Whereas on December 17, 1994, the helicopter of Army Chief Warrant Officer David Hilemon and Army Chief Warrant Officer Bobby W. Hall II was shot down over North Korea;

Whereas as a result of this incident, Chief Warrant Officer Hilemon sacrificed his life for his country and Chief Warrant Officer Hall was taken captive by the Korean People's Army;

Whereas on December 22, 1994, Chief Warrant Officer Hilemon's remains were returned to the United States at the Demilitarized Zone at Panmunjom and on December 28, 1994, he was laid to rest with full military honors and in full view of Mt. Ranier in the State of Washington, in accordance with the wishes of Chief Warrant Officer Hilemon; and

Whereas Chief Warrant Officer Hall, held in captivity for 13 days under stressful circumstances, served his country above and beyond the call of duty; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the sacrifice of Army Chief Warrant Officer David Hilemon to his country and expresses gratitude for his selflessness and deepest regret for his loss to his family; and

(2) recognizes the exceptional service of Army Chief Warrant Officer Bobby W. Hall II to his country and expresses commendation for his courage.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DESIGNATING MAJORITY MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution [H. Res. 11] and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 11**

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE:** Mr. Roberts, Chairman; Mr. Emerson; Mr. Gunderson; Mr. Combest; Mr. Allard; Mr. Barrett of Nebraska; Mr. Boehner; Mr. Ewing; Mr. Doolittle; Mr. Goodlatte; Mr. Pombo; Mr. Canady; Mr. Smith of Michigan; Mr. Everett; Mr. Lucas; Mr. Lewis of Kentucky; Mr. Baker of Louisiana; Mr. Crapo; Mr. Calvert; Ms. Chenoweth; Mr. Hostettler; Mr. Bryant of Tennessee; Mr. Latham; Mr. Cooley; Mr. Foley; Mr. Chambliss; and Mr. LaHood.

**COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS:** Mr. Livingston, Chairman; Mr. McDade; Mr. Myers of Indiana; Mr. Young of Florida; Mr. Regula; Mr. Lewis of California; Mr. Porter; Mr. Rogers; Mr. Skeen; Mr. Wolf; Mr. DeLay; Mr. Kolbe; Mrs. Vucanovich; Mr. Lightfoot; Mr. Packard; Mr. Callahan; Mr. Walsh; Mr. Taylor of North Carolina; Mr. Hobson; Mr. Istook; Mr. Bonilla; Mr. Knollenberg; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Dickey; Mr. Kingston; Mr. Riggs; Mr. Frelinghuysen; Mr. Wicker; Mr. Forbes; Mr. Nethercutt; Mr. Bunn; and Mr. Neumann.

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES:** Mr. Leach, Chairman; Mr. McCollum; Mrs. Roukema; Mr. Bereuter; Mr. Roth; Mr. Baker of Louisiana; Mr. Lazio; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Castle; Mr. King; Mr. Royce; Mr. Lucas; Mr. Weller; Mr. Hayworth; Mr. Metcalf; Mr. Bono; Mr. Ney; Mr. Ehrlich; Mr. Barr; Mr. Chrysler; Mr. Cremeans; Mr. Fox; Mr. Heineman; Mr. Stockman; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Watts of Oklahoma (when sworn); and Mrs. Kelly.

**COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET:** Mr. Kasich, Chairman; Mr. Hobson; Mr. Walker; Mr. Kolbe; Mr. Shays; Mr. Herger; Mr. Bunning; Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Allard; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Lazio; Mr. Franks of New Jersey; Mr. Smith of Michigan; Mr. Inglis; Mr. Hoke; Ms. Molinari; Mr. Nussle; Mr. Hoekstra; Mr. Largent; Mrs. Myrick; Mr. Brownback; Mr. Shadegg; Mr. Radanovich; and Mr. Bass.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE:** Mr. Bliley, Chairman; Mr. Moorhead; Mr. Fields of Texas; Mr. Oxley; Mr. Bilirakis; Mr. Schaefer; Mr. Barton of Texas; Mr. Hastert; Mr. Upton; Mr. Stearns; Mr. Paxon; Mr. Gillmor; Mr. Klug; Mr. Franks of Connecticut; Mr. Greenwood; Mr. Crapo; Mr. Cox; Mr. Burr; Mr. Bilbray; Mr. Whitfield; Mr. Ganske; Mr. Frisa; Mr. Norwood; Mr. White; and Mr. Coburn.

**COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES:** Mr. Goodling, Chairman; Mr. Petri; Mrs. Roukema; Mr. Gunderson; Mr. Fawell; Mr. Ballenger; Mr. Barrett of Nebraska; Mr. Cunningham; Mr. Hoekstra; Mr. McKeen; Mr. Castle; Mrs. Meyers of Kansas; Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas; Mr. Talent; Mr. Greenwood; Mr. Hutchinson; Mr. Knollenberg; Mr. Riggs; Mr. Graham; Mr. Weldon of Florida; Mr. Funderburk; Mr. Souder; Mr. McIntosh; and Mr. Norwood.

**COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT:** Mr. Clinger, Chairman; Mr. Gilman; Mr. Burton of Indiana; Mrs. Morella; Mr. Shays; Mr. Schiff; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr.

Zeliff; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Horn; Mr. Mica; Mr. Blute; Mr. Davis; Mr. McIntosh; Mr. Fox; Mr. Tate; Mr. Chrysler; Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Souder; Mr. Martini; Mr. Scarborough; Mr. Shadegg; Mr. Flanagan; Mr. Bass; Mr. LaTourette; Mr. Sanford; and Mr. Ehrlich.

**COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT:** Mr. Thomas of California, Chairman; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Roberts; Mr. Boehner; Ms. Dunn; Mr. Diaz-Balart; and Mr. Ney.

**COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:** Mr. Gilman, Chairman; Mr. Goodling; Mr. Leach; Mr. Roth; Mr. Hyde; Mr. Bereuter; Mr. Smith of New Jersey; Mr. Burton of Indiana; Mrs. Meyers of Kansas; Mr. Gallegly; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr. Ballenger; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Manzullo; Mr. Royce; Mr. King; Mr. Kim; Mr. Brownback; Mr. Funderburk; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Sanford; and Mr. Salmon.

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY:** Mr. Hyde, Chairman; Mr. Moorhead; Mr. Sensenbrenner; Mr. McCollum; Mr. Gekas; Mr. Coble; Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Schiff; Mr. Gallegly; Mr. Canady; Mr. Inglis of South Carolina; Mr. Goodlatte; Mr. Buyer; Mr. Hoke; Mr. Bono; Mr. Heineman; Mr. Bryant of Tennessee; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Flanagan; and Mr. Barr.

**COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY:** Mr. Spence, Chairman; Mr. Stump; Mr. Hunter; Mr. Kasich; Mr. Bateman; Mr. Hansen; Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Dornan; Mr. Hefley; Mr. Saxton; Mr. Cunningham; Mr. Buyer; Mr. Torkildsen; Mrs. Fowler; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Talent; Mr. Everett; Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Mr. McKeon; Mr. Lewis of Kentucky; Mr. Watts of Oklahoma (when sworn); Mr. Thornberry; Mr. Hostettler; Mr. Chambliss; Mr. Hilleary; Mr. Scarborough; Mr. Jones; Mr. Longley; Mr. Tiahrt; and Mr. Hastings of Washington.

**COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES:** Mr. Young of Alaska, Chairman; Mr. Hansen; Mr. Saxton; Mr. Gallegly; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Hefley; Mr. Doolittle; Mr. Allard; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Pombo; Mr. Torkildsen; Mr. Hayworth; Mr. Cremeans; Ms. Cubin; Mr. Cooley; Ms. Chenoweth; Ms. Smith of Washington; Mr. Radanovich; Mr. Jones; Mr. Thornberry; Mr. Hastings of Washington; Mr. Metcalf; Mr. Longley; and Mr. Shadegg.

**COMMITTEE ON RULES:** Mr. Solomon, Chairman; Mr. Quillen; Mr. Drier; Mr. Goss; Mr. Linder; Ms. Pryce; Mr. Diaz-Balart; Mr. McInnis; and Ms. Waldholtz.

**COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE:** Mr. Walker, Chairman; Mr. Sensenbrenner; Mr. Boehlert; Mr. Fawell; Mrs. Morella; Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Schiff; Mr. Barton of Texas; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Baker of California; Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Wamp; Mr. Weldon of Florida; Mr. Graham; Mr. Salmon; Mr. Davis; Mr. Stockman; Mr. Cutknecht; Ms. Seastrand; Mr. Tiahrt; Mr. Largent; Mr. Hilleary; Ms. Cubin; Mr. Foley; and Mrs. Myrick.

**COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS:** Mrs. Meyers of Kansas, Chairman; Mr. Hefley; Mr. Zeliff; Mr. Talent; Mr. Manzullo; Mr. Torkildsen; Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Ms. Smith of Washington; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Wamp; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. Chrysler; Mr. Longley; Mr. Jones; Mr. Salmon; Mr. Hilleary; Mr. Souder; Mr. Brownback; Mr. Chabot; Mrs. Myrick; Mr. Funderburk; and Mr. Metcalf.

**COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE:** Mr. Shuster, Chairman; Mr. Young of Alaska; Mr. Clinger; Mr. Petri; Mr. Boehlert; Mr. Bateman; Mr. Emerson; Mr. Coble; Mr. Duncan; Ms. Molinari; Mr. Zeliff; Mr. Ewing; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Hutchinson; Mr. Baker of California; Mr. Kim; Mr. Horn;

Mr. Franks of New Jersey; Mr. Blute; Mr. Mica; Mr. Quinn; Mrs. Fowler; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Weller; Mr. Wamp; Mr. Latham; Mr. LaTourette; Ms. Seastrand; Mr. Tate; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. LaHood; and Mr. Martini.

**COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS:** Mr. Stump, Chairman; Mr. Smith of New Jersey; Mr. Bilirakis; Mr. Spence; Mr. Hutchinson; Mr. Everett; Mr. Buyer; Mr. Quinn; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Stearns; Mr. Ney; Mr. Fox; Mr. Flanagan; Mr. Barr; Mr. Stockman; Mr. Weller; Mr. Hayworth; and Mr. Cooley.

**COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS:** Mr. Archer, Chairman; Mr. Crane; Mr. Thomas of California; Mr. Shaw; Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut; Mr. Bunning; Mr. Houghton; Mr. Herger; Mr. McCrery; Mr. Hancock; Mr. Camp; Mr. Ramstad; Mr. Zimmer; Mr. Nussle; Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas; Ms. Dunn; Mr. Collins of Georgia; Mr. Portman; Mr. English of Pennsylvania; Mr. Ensign; and Mr. Christensen.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 12) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 12**

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and they are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE**

E (Kika) de la Garza, Texas; George E. Brown, Jr., California; Charlie Rose, North Carolina; Charles W. Stenholm, Texas; Harold L. Volkmer, Missouri; Tim Johnson, South Dakota; Gary A. Condit, California; Collin C. Peterson, Minnesota; Calvin M. Dooley, California; Eva M. Clayton, North Carolina; David Minge, Minnesota; Earl F. Hilliard, Alabama; Earl Pomeroy, North Dakota; Tim Holden, Pennsylvania; Cynthia McKinney, Georgia; Scotty Baesler, Kentucky; Karen L. Thurman, Florida; Sanford Bishop, Georgia; Bennie G. Thompson, Mississippi; Sam Farr, California; Ed Pastor, Arizona; John Baldacci, Maine.

**COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS**

David R. Obey, Wisconsin; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Louis Stokes, Ohio; Tom Bevill, Alabama; John P. Murtha, Pennsylvania; Charles Wilson, Texas; Norman D. Dicks, Washington; Martin Olav Sabo, Minnesota; Julian C. Dixon, California; Vic Fazio, California; W.G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina; Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland; Richard J. Durbin, Illinois; Ronald D. Coleman, Texas; Alan B. Mollohan, West Virginia; Jim Chapman, Texas; Marcy Kaptur, Ohio; David E. Skaggs,

Colorado; Nancy Pelosi, California; Peter J. Visclosky, Indiana; Thomas M. Foglietta, Pennsylvania; Esteban Edward Torres, California; Nita M. Lowey, New York; Ray Thornton, Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas; John J. LaFalce, New York; Bruce F. Vento, Minnesota; Charles E. Schumer, New York; Barney Frank, Massachusetts; Paul E. Kanjorski, Pennsylvania; Joseph P. Kennedy II, Massachusetts; Floyd H. Flake, New York; Kweisi Mfume, Maryland; Maxine Waters, California; Bill Orton, Utah; Carolyn B. Maloney, New York; Luis V. Gutierrez, Illinois; Lucille Roybal-Allard, California; Thomas M. Barrett, Wisconsin; Nydia M. Velázquez, New York; Albert R. Wynn, Maryland; Cleo Fields, Louisiana; Melvin Watt, North Carolina; Maurice Hinchey, New York; Gary Ackerman, New York; Ken Bentsen, Texas.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Martin Olav Sabo, Minnesota; Charles Stenholm, Texas; Louise M. Slaughter, New York; Mike Parker, Mississippi; William J. Coyne, Pennsylvania; Alan B. Mollohan, West Virginia; Jerry F. Costello, Illinois; Harry Johnston, Florida; Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii; Bill Orton, Utah; Earl Pomeroy, North Dakota; Glen Browder, Alabama; Lynn Woolsey, California; John Olver, Massachusetts; Lucille Roybal-Allard, California; Carrie Meek, Florida; Lynn Rivers, Michigan; Lloyd Doggett, Texas.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

John D. Dingell, Michigan; Henry A. Waxman, California; Edward J. Markey, Massachusetts; W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, Louisiana; Ron Wyden, Oregon; Ralph M. Hall, Texas; John Bryant, Texas; Rick Boucher, Virginia; Thomas J. Manton, New York; Edolphus Towns, New York; Gerry E. Studds, Massachusetts; Frank Pallone, Jr., New Jersey; Sherrod Brown, Ohio; Blanche Lambert, Arkansas; Bart Gordon, Tennessee; Elizabeth Furse, Oregon; Peter Deutsch, Florida; Bobby Rush, Illinois; Anna Eshoo, California; Ron Klink, Pennsylvania; Bart Stupak, Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

William (Bill) Clay, Missouri; George Miller, California; Dale E. Kildee, Michigan; Pat Williams, Montana; Matthew G. Martinez, California; Major R. Owens, New York; Thomas C. Sawyer, Ohio; Donald M. Payne, New Jersey; Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii; Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey; Jack Reed, Rhode Island; Tim Roemer, Indiana; Eliot L. Engel, New York; Xavier Becerra, California; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Virginia; Gene Green, Texas; Lynn Woolsey, California; Carlos Romero-Barceló, Puerto Rico; Mel Reynolds, Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Lee H. Hamilton, Indiana; Sam Gejdenson, Connecticut; Tom Lantos, California; Robert G. Torricelli, New Jersey; Howard L. Berman, California; Gary L. Ackerman, New York; Harry Johnston, Florida; Eliot L. Engel, New York; \*Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, American Samoa (Delegate); Matthew G. Martinez, California; Donald M. Payne, New Jersey; Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey; Robert Menendez, New Jersey; Sherrod Brown, Ohio; Cynthia McKinney, Georgia; Alcee L. Hastings, Florida; Albert R. Wynn, Maryland; Michael R. McNulty, New York; James P. Moran, Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

John Conyers, Jr., Michigan; Patricia Schroeder, Colorado; Barney Frank, Massa-

chusetts; Charles E. Schumer, New York; Howard L. Berman, California; Rick Boucher, Virginia; John Bryant, Texas; Jack Reed, Rhode Island; Jerrold Nadler, New York; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Virginia; Melvin Watt, North Carolina; Xavier Becerra, California; Jose Serrano, New York; Zoe Lofgren, California; Sheila Jackson-Lee, Texas.

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Ronald V. Dellums, California; G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Mississippi; Patricia Schroeder, Colorado; Ike Skelton, Missouri; Norman Sisisky, Virginia; John M. Spratt, Jr., South Carolina; Solomon P. Ortiz, Texas; Owen B. Pickett, Virginia; Lane Evans, Illinois; John S. Tanner, Tennessee; Glen Browder, Alabama; Gene Taylor, Mississippi; Neil Abercrombie, Hawaii; Chet Edwards, Texas; Frank Tejeda, Texas; Martin T. Meehan, Massachusetts; \*Robert A. Underwood, Guam (Delegate); Jane Harman, California; Paul McHale, Pennsylvania; Pete Geren, Texas; Peter Peterson, Florida; Bill Jefferson, Louisiana; Rosa DeLauro, Connecticut; Mike Ward, Kentucky; Patrick Kennedy, Rhode Island.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

John J. LaFalce, New York; Ron Wyden, Oregon; Norman Sisisky, Virginia; Kweisi Mfume, Maryland; Floyd H. Flake, New York; Glenn Poshard, Illinois; Eva M. Clayton, North Carolina; Martin T. Meehan, Massachusetts; Nydia M. Velázquez, New York; Cleo Fields, Louisiana; Walter R. Tucker, California; Earl F. Hilliard, Alabama; Pete Peterson, Florida; Bennie Thompson, Mississippi; Chaka Fattah, Pennsylvania; Ken Bentsen, Texas; Karen McCarthy, Missouri; Bill Luther, Minnesota; Patrick Kennedy, Rhode Island.

COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND COMPETITIVENESS

George E. Brown, Jr., California; Ralph M. Hall, Texas; James A. Traficant, Jr., Ohio; James A. Hayes, Louisiana; John S. Tanner, Tennessee; Pete Geren, Texas; Tim Roemer, Indiana; Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Alabama; James Barcia, Michigan; Paul McHale, Pennsylvania; Jane Harman, California; Eddie Bernice Johnson, Texas; David Minge, Minnesota; John Olver, Massachusetts; Alcee Hastings, Florida; Lynn Rivers, Michigan; Karen McCarthy, Missouri; Mike Ward, Kentucky; Zoe Lofgren, California; Lloyd Doggett, Texas; Michael Doyle, Pennsylvania; Sheila Jackson-Lee, Texas; Bill Luther, Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Norman Y. Mineta, California; James L. Oberstar, Minnesota; Nick Joe Rahall II, West Virginia; Robert A. Borski, Pennsylvania; William O. Lipinski, Illinois; Robert Wise, West Virginia; James A. Traficant, Jr., Ohio; Peter A. DeFazio, Oregon; James A. Hayes, Louisiana; Bob Clement, Tennessee; Jerry F. Costello, Illinois; Mike Parker, Mississippi; Greg Laughlin, Texas; Glenn Poshard, Illinois; Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Alabama; Barbara-Rose Collins, Michigan; Eleanor Holmes Norton, D.C. (Delegate); Jerrold Nadler, New York; Pat Danner, Missouri; Robert Menendez, New Jersey; James E. Clyburn, South Carolina; Corrine Brown, Florida; Nathan Deal, Georgia; James A. Barcia, Michigan; Bob Filner, California; Walter R. Tucker, California; Eddie Bernice Johnson, Texas; Bill Brewster, Oklahoma.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Mississippi; Lane Evans, Illinois; Joseph P. Kennedy II,

Massachusetts; Chet Edwards, Texas; Maxine Waters, California; Bob Clement, Tennessee; Bob Filner, California; Frank Tejeda, Texas; Luis V. Gutierrez, Illinois; Scotty Baesler, Kentucky; Sanford Bishop, Georgia; James E. Clyburn, South Carolina; Corrine Brown, Florida; Michael Doyle, Pennsylvania; Frank Mascara, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Sam Gibbons, Florida; Charles B. Rangel, New York; Fortney Pete Stark, California; Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Indiana; Harold E. Ford, Tennessee; Robert T. Matsui, California; Barbara B. Kennelly, Connecticut; William J. Coyne, Pennsylvania; Sander M. Levin, Michigan; Benjamin L. Cardin, Maryland; Jim McDermott, Washington; Gerald D. Kleczka, Wisconsin; John Lewis, Georgia; L.F. Payne, Virginia; Richard E. Neal, Massachusetts.

Mr. FAZIO of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the resolution 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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD SANDERS OF VERMONT TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a separate privileged resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 13

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committees:

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Bernard Sanders of Vermont.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Bernard Sanders of Vermont.

Mr. FAZIO of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution 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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377, the Chair appoints as members of the House of Representatives page board the following Members of the House: Mr. EMERSON of Missouri, and Mr. KOLBE of Arizona.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C., 175 and 176, the

Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. ARMEY], as a member of the House Office Building Commission, to serve with himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 1 of rule 48 and clause 6(f) of rule 10, the Chair appoints as Members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence the following Members of the House:

Mr. COMBEST, of Texas, Chairman;  
Mr. DORNAN, of California;  
Mr. YOUNG, of Florida;  
Mr. HANSEN, of Utah;  
Mr. LEWIS, of California;  
Mr. GOSS, of Florida;  
Mr. SHUSTER, of Pennsylvania;  
Mr. MCCOLLUM, of Florida;  
Mr. CASTLE, of Delaware;  
Mr. DICKS, of Washington;  
Mr. RICHARDSON, of New Mexico;  
Mr. DIXON, of California;  
Mr. TORRICELLI, of New Jersey;  
Mr. COLEMAN, of Texas;  
Ms. PELOSI, of California; and  
Mr. LAUGHLIN, of Texas.

#### POLICIES OF THE CHAIR

The SPEAKER. The Chair customarily takes this occasion on the opening day of a Congress to announce his policies with respect to particular aspects of the legislative process. The Chair will insert in the RECORD announcements by the Speaker concerning: first, privileges of the floor; second, the introduction of bills and resolutions; third, unanimous consent requests for the consideration of bills and resolutions; fourth, recognition for 1-minute speeches and special orders; fifth, decorum in debate; sixth, the conduct of votes by electronic device; and seventh, requests for leave of committees to sit during the 5-minute rule.

These announcements, where appropriate, will reiterate the origins of the stated policies. The Speaker intends to continue in the 104th Congress the policies reflected in these statements. The policy announced in Congresses prior to the 103d Congress with respect to requests for committees to sit during the 5-minute rule is once again pertinent. The policy announced in the 102d Congress with respect to jurisdictional concepts related to clause 5(b) of rule XXI—tax and tariff measures—will continue to govern but need not be reiterated, as it is adequately documented as precedent in the *House Rules and Manual*.

##### 1. Privileges of the Floor

The Speaker's announced instructions to the former Doorkeeper and the Sergeant-at-Arms in the 98th Congress on January 25, 1983, and in the 99th Congress on January 21, 1986, regarding strict enforcement of rule

XXXII, specifying those persons having the privileges of the floor during sessions of the House, will be applied during the 104th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 25, 1983

The Speaker. Rule XXXII strictly limits those persons to whom the privileges of the floor during sessions of the House are extended, and that rule prohibits the Chair from entertaining requests for suspension or waiver of that rule. As reiterated as recently as August 22, 1974, by Speaker Albert under the principle stated in Deschler's Procedure, chapter 4, section 3.4, the rule strictly limits the number of committee staff permitted on the floor at one time during the consideration of measures reported from their committees. This permission does not extend to Members' personal staff except when a Member has an amendment actually pending during the 5-minute rule. To this end, the Chair requests all Members and committee staff to cooperate to assure that not more than the proper number of staff are on the floor, and then only during the actual consideration of measures reported from their committees. The Chair will again extend this admonition to all properly admitted majority and minority staff by insisting that their presence on the floor, including the areas behind the rail, be restricted to those periods during which their supervisors have specifically requested their presence. The Chair stated this policy in the 97th Congress, and an increasing number of Members have insisted on strict enforcement of the rule. The Chair has consulted with and has the concurrence of the Minority Leader with respect to this policy and has directed [the Doorkeeper and] the Sergeant at Arms to assure proper enforcement of the rule.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 21, 1986

The Speaker. Rule XXXII strictly limits those persons to whom the privileges of the floor during sessions of the House are extended, and that rule prohibits the Chair from entertaining request for suspension or waiver of that rule. As reiterated by the Chair on January 25, 1983, and January 3, 1985, and as stated in chapter 4, section 3.4 of Deschler-Brown's Procedure in the House of Representatives, the rule strictly limits the number of committee staff on the floor at one time during the consideration of measures reported from their committees. This permission does not extend to Members' personal staff except when a Member's amendment is actually pending during the 5-minute rule. It also does not extend to personal staff of Members who are sponsors of pending bills or who are engaging in special orders. The Chair requests the cooperation of all Members and committee staff to assure that only the proper number of staff are on the floor, and then only during the consideration of measures reported from their committees. The Chair is making this statement and reiterating this policy because of concerns expressed by many Members about the number of committee staff on the floor during the last weeks of the first session. The Chair requests each chairman, and each ranking minority member, to submit to the [Doorkeeper] Sergeant at Arms a list of staff who are to be allowed on the floor during the consideration of a measure reported by their committee. Each staff person should exchange his or her ID for a "committee staff" badge which is to be worn while on the floor. The Chair has consulted with the Minority Leader and will continue to consult with

him. The Chair has furthermore directed the [Doorkeeper and] Sergeant at Arms to assure proper enforcement of rule XXXII.

##### 2. Introduction of Bills and Resolutions

The Speaker's statement in the 98th Congress on January 3, 1983, regarding the signing of bills and resolutions by their first sponsors, will continue to apply in the 104th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 3, 1983

The Speaker. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions. As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress, several hundred bills have been introduced. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible, but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all the bills that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today.

The Chair has advised all officers and employees of the House that are involved in the processing of bills that every bill, resolution, memorial, petition or other material that is placed in the hopper must bear the signature of a Member. Where a bill or resolution is jointly sponsored, the signature must be that of the Member first named thereon. The bill clerk is instructed to return to the Member any bill which appears in the hopper without an original signature. This procedure was inaugurated in the 92d Congress. It has worked well, and the Chair thinks that it is essential to continue this practice to insure the integrity of the process by which legislation is introduced in the House.

SPECIAL RULE FOR BILL SPONSORSHIP ON OPENING DAY OF 104TH CONGRESS

The Speaker. The House adopted a special rule earlier today which allows the first 20 bills and the first two joint resolutions introduced in the 104th Congress to have more than one Member reflected as a "first" sponsor. Those bills must bear not only the signature of the sponsor first listed but the signatures of all "first" sponsors listed.

##### 3. Unanimous-Consent Requests for the Consideration of Bills and Resolutions

The Speaker's policy with respect to recognition for unanimous-consent requests for the consideration of unreported bills and resolutions and for the consideration of House bills with Senate amendments (other than requests to go to conference), as initially announced in the 98th Congress on January 25 and April 26, 1984, will apply during the 104th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 25, 1984

The Speaker. As indicated in section [757] of the *House Rules and Manual*, the Chair has established a policy of conferring recognition upon Members to permit consideration of bills and resolutions by unanimous consent only when assured that the majority and minority floor leadership and committee and subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members have no objection. Consistent with that policy, and with the Chair's inherent power of recognition under clause 2 of the rule XIV, the Chair, and any occupant of the Chair appointed as Speaker pro tempore pursuant to clause 7 of rule I, will decline recognition for unanimous consent request for consideration of bills and resolutions without assurances that the request has been

cleared by that leadership. This denial of recognition by the Chair will not reflect necessarily any personal opposition on the part of the Chair to orderly consideration of the matter in question, but will reflect the determination upon the part of the Chair that orderly procedures will be followed; that is, procedures involving consultation and agreement between floor and committee leadership on both sides of the aisle.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, APRIL 26, 1984

The Speaker. With respect to unanimous consent requests to dispose of Senate amendments to House bills on the Speaker's table, the Chair will entertain such a request only if made by the chairman of the committee with jurisdiction, or by another committee member authorized to make the request.

#### 4. Recognition for 1-Minute Speeches and Special Orders

The Speaker's statement in the 98th Congress on January 25, 1984, with respect to the Speaker's policy for recognition for 1-minute speeches will apply during the 104th Congress. The Speaker today announces a residual policy for the recognition of special order speeches absent an agreement between the leaderships to the contrary.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, AUGUST 8, 1984, RELATIVE TO RECOGNITION FOR ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

The Speaker. After consultation with and concurrence by the Minority Leader, the Chair announces that he will institute a new policy of recognition for "1-minute" speeches and for special order requests. The Chair will alternate recognition for 1-minute speeches between majority and minority Members, in the order in which they seek recognition in the well under present practice from the Chair's right to the Chair's left, with possible exceptions for Members of the leadership and Members having business requests. The Chair, of course, reserves the right to limit 1-minute speeches to a certain period of time or to a special place in the program on any given day, with notice to the leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 4, 1995, RELATIVE TO "RESIDUAL" POLICY FOR RECOGNITION FOR SPECIAL ORDER SPEECHES

The Speaker. Absent an agreement between the leadership regarding recognition for requests to address the House for "special order speeches" at the end of legislative business, the Chair will decline recognition for permission to address the House for any period extending more than one week in advance of the request. In accordance with the Speaker's policy as enunciated on August 8, 1984, the Chair will first recognize Members who wish to address the House for 5 minutes or less, alternating between majority and minority Members in the order in which those permissions were granted by the House. Thereafter, the Chair will recognize Members who wish to address the House for longer than 5 minutes up to 1 hour, again alternating between majority and minority Members in the order in which those permissions were granted by the House. However, unlike the Speaker's policy of August 8, 1984, the Chair will alternate daily between parties recognition for the first special order longer than five minutes regardless of the order in which permissions were granted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER JANUARY 4, 1995, RELATIVE TO SPECIAL ORDER SPEECHES AND MORNING HOUR DEBATE

The Speaker. Upon consultation with the Minority Leader, the Chair announces that the format for recognition for "morning

hour" debate and restricted special order speeches, which began on February 23, 1994, will continue until February 16, 1995, as outlined below:

On Tuesdays, following legislative business, the Chair may recognize Members for special order speeches up to midnight, and such speeches may not extend beyond midnight. On all other days of the week, the Chair may recognize Members for special order speeches up to four hours after the conclusion of five minute special orders speeches. Such speeches may not extend beyond the four-hour limit without the permission of the Chair, which may be granted only with advance consultation between the leaderships and notification to the House. However, at no time shall the Chair recognize for any special order speeches beyond midnight.

The Chair will first recognize Members for five-minute special order speeches, alternating initially and subsequently between the parties regardless of the date the order was granted by the House. The Chair will then recognize longer special orders speeches. The four-hour limitation will be divided between the majority and minority parties. Each party is entitled to reserve its first hour for respective leaderships or their designees. Recognition will alternate initially and subsequently between the parties, regardless of the date the order was granted by the House.

The allocation of time within each party's two-hour period (or shorter period if prorated to end by midnight) is to be determined by a list submitted to the Chair by the respective leaderships. Members may not sign up for any special order speeches earlier than one week prior to the special order, and additional guidelines may be established for such sign-ups by the respective leaderships.

Pursuant to clause 9(b)(1) of rule I, the television cameras will not pan the chamber, but a "crawl" indicating Morning Hour or that the House has completed its legislative business and is proceeding with special order speeches will appear on the screen. Other television camera adaptations during this period may be announced by the Chair.

The continuation of this format for recognition by the Speaker is without prejudice to the Speaker's ultimate power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XIV should circumstances so warrant.

#### 5. Decorum in Debate

The Speaker's statement in the 102d Congress on January 3, 1991, with respect to decorum in debate, will apply during the 104th Congress as supplemented by an announcement made by the Speaker earlier today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 3, 1991

The Speaker. It is essential that the dignity of the proceedings of the House be preserved, not only to assure that the House conducts its business in an orderly fashion but to permit Members to properly comprehend and participate in the business of the House. To this end, and in order to permit the Chair to understand and to correctly put the question on the numerous requests that are made by Members, the Chair requests that Members and others who have the privileges of the floor desist from audible conversation in the Chamber while the business of the House is being conducted. The Chair would encourage all Members to review rule XIV to gain a better understanding of the proper rules of decorum expected of them, and especially: First, to avoid "personalities" in debate with respect to references to other Members, the Senate, and the President; second, to address the Chair

while standing and only when and not beyond the time recognized, and not to address the television or other imagined audience; third, to refrain from passing between the Chair and the Member speaking, or directly in front of a Member speaking from the well; fourth, to refrain from smoking in the Chamber; and generally to display the same degree of respect to the Chair and other Members that every Member is due.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, JANUARY 4, 1995

The Speaker. The Chair would like all Members to be on notice that the Chair intends to strictly enforce time limitations on debate. Before gaveling Members down precisely when their time has expired, the Chair will lightly tap the gavel as a warning that a Member has 10 seconds remaining. Furthermore, the Chair may immediately interrupt Members in debate who transgress rule XIV by failing to avoid "personalities" in debate with respect to references to the Senate, the President, and other Members, rather than wait for Members to complete their remarks.

Finally, it is not in order to speak disrespectfully of the Speaker; and under the precedents the sanctions for such violations transcend the ordinary requirements for timeliness of challenges. This separate treatment is recorded in volume 2 of Hinds' Precedents, at section 1248.

#### 6. Conduct of Votes by Electronic Device

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER JANUARY 4, 1995

The Chair wishes to enunciate a clear policy with respect to the conduct of electronic votes.

As Members are aware, clause 5 of rule XV provides that Members shall have not less than 15 minutes in which to answer an ordinary rollcall vote or quorum call. The rule obviously establishes 15 minutes as a minimum. Still, with the cooperation of the Members, a vote can easily be completed in that time. The events of October 30, 1991, stand out as proof of this point. On that occasion, the House was considering a bill in the Committee of the Whole under a special rule that placed an overall time limit on the amendment process, including the time consumed by rollcalls. The Chair announced, and then strictly enforced, a policy of closing electronic votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed period of 15 minutes. Members appreciated and cooperated with the Chair's enforcement of the policy on that occasion.

The Chair desires that the example of October 30, 1991, be made the regular practice of the House. To that end, the Chair enlists the assistance of all Members in avoiding the unnecessary loss of time in conducting the business of the House. The Chair encourages all Members to depart for the Chamber promptly upon the appropriate bell and light signal. As in recent Congresses, the cloakrooms should not forward to the Chair requests to hold a vote by electronic device, but should simply apprise inquiring Members of the time remaining on the voting clock.

Although no occupant of the Chair would prevent a Member who is in the well of the chamber before the announcement of the result from casting his or her vote, each occupant of the Chair will have the full support of the Speaker in striving to close each electronic vote at the earliest opportunity. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the chamber.

*7. Requests for Leave of Committees to Sit During the Five-Minute Rule*

The Speaker's statement in the 98th Congress on March 3, 1983, with respect to requests for leave of committees to sit during the five-minute rule, will again apply during the 104th Congress, except that the Chair, under clause 2 of rule XI, may entertain a motion of the Majority Leader granting such leave to one or more committees.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, MARCH 3, 1983**

The Speaker. The Chair announces that he will recognize Members to make requests for committees to sit during the 5-minute rule only at certain times during the legislative day. While the precedents indicate that such requests when pending are not votes requiring the presence of a quorum, the Chair wishes to avoid the need for a call of the House pending such requests but at the same time to assure predictability as to when he will accord recognition. Therefore, the Speaker intends to set up the following guidelines:

First as has been established by precedent, permission to sit shall require unanimous consent if the permission pertains to a day for which the program has not been announced. Thus, prior to the announcement of the legislative program for the following week, only one objection would be required to prevent a committee from sitting. Following the announcement by the Majority Leader, or his designee, of the program for the next week, the Chair would entertain requests for committees to sit during the following week and 10 objections would then be required. The Chair wants it to be clearly understood that the first available opportunity in the House following the announcement of the program is an appropriate time for considering requests pertaining to the following week if the announcement comes before the completion of all legislative business.

Second, the Chair will not entertain requests on days when all votes on legislative matters have been postponed to a later date; however, the Chair will accept requests for committee hearings to be held later in the week if the request has the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee.

Third, on days when legislative business is to be conducted, and when rollcall votes are in order on legislation, the Chair will recognize during the 1-minute period only when he is assured that the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee involved supports the requests for the hearings or meetings.

Requests that have been objected to by 10 or more Members pursuant to clause 2(1) of Rule XI may not be renewed on the same day unless the Chair is assured that the objections have been withdrawn. The Chair will in no instance entertain requests after the legislative business of the day has been concluded; that is, after leaves of absence have been laid down or unanimous consent requests from the majority and minority tables have been entertained at the end of the day.

□ 0220

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 4, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER. Under Clause 4 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Ms. Linda Nave, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which she would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 104th Congress or until modified by me.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER**

The SPEAKER. If I might before the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] moves to adjourn, let the Chair say to the Members that the House has now been in session for some 14 hours and 25 minutes. I think it has been not only the longest and most working-like opening session, but one of the most productive sessions for any single day in House history. The Chair wants to thank both the Democrat Members and the Republican Members for participating. The Chair wants to thank the freshmen on both sides because there was very vigorous and effective involvement, and that is the way it should be. We are in an age when people get elected to do the job from day one, and we are very grateful for their participation. The Chair wishes to express to all Members his immense gratitude for this opening day and how much he hopes this augurs well for the future and what we can do together.

**INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION**

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing five pieces of legislation that received overwhelming bipartisan support in the last Congress. They cover a range of important issues the 104th Congress must address: telecommunications reform, Superfund reform, safe drinking water, and interstate waste and flow control.

These bills are largely the same as the final versions of the legislation written or acted upon by the Commerce Committee or the House in the last Congress. Interstate waste and flow control passed the House by unanimous consent. Safe drinking water was approved under the suspension calendar. Superfund was approved by a 44-0 margin in committee. And the House approved telecommunications reform by a vote of 423-5.

The telecommunications legislation will reform our Nation's outdated telecommunications laws, and create an environment where competition, rather than government regulation, will govern the services that customers will have available. The text of the bill that I am introducing today is identical to last year's, with two exceptions:

First, the requirement for the Justice Department to hold a hearing in every case in which a Bell Operating Company requests relief has been deleted. This requirement imposed administrative burdens on the Justice Department, yet served no useful purpose. At the request of the Justice Department, it has been deleted.

Second, there was some confusion last year about a provision that could have delayed Bell Company entry into certain long distance markets as a result of an ambiguity in the statute. During the House consideration of the legislation, Chairman Brooks and I engaged in a colloquy to clarify that ambiguity. I have made changes in the text of the legislation I am introducing today to conform the statutory text with the colloquy.

The interstate waste and flow control bills resolve some long-standing disputes between State and municipal governments, and between different regions of the country. The Superfund reform had the support of a broad coalition of industry, small business, State and local governments, the environmental community, banks, and many others. It will make the cleanup of toxic waste sites more efficient and more economical, and will restore some sense of reason and fairness to the liability system. The Safe Drinking Water Act revisions uphold water quality standards while accounting for the special needs of smaller communities.

All of these bills were the product of extensive discussions and negotiations involving the full range of interests. While these are good bills in their current form, I neither expect nor ask the 104th Congress to enact these measures without full discussion or amendment. I am prepared, and even eager, to work with my Republican colleagues in fashioning productive legislation that achieves the same solid degree of consensus we were able to reach last year. I am introducing these bills today in that spirit of cooperation.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 10:15 p.m. on account of illness.

**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 Member (at the request of Mr. FAZIO of California) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DINGELL for 5 minutes today.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. LAZIO of New York) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. EHLERS for 5 minutes on January 5.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, January 5, 1995, at 10 a.m.

#### OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 103d Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25. Honorable Steve Largent, 1st District Oklahoma.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

FEBRUARY 12, 1994

H.R. 3759. An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 16, 1994

H.R. 1303. An Act to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 402 East State Street in Trenton, New Jersey, as the "Clarke S. Fisher Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2223. An Act to designate the Federal Building located at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, Texas, as the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building".

H.R. 2555. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 100 East Fifth Street in

Cincinnati, Ohio, as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse".

H.R. 3186. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located in Houma, Louisiana, as the "George Arceneaux, Jr., United States Courthouse".

H.R. 3356. An Act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 611 Broad Street, in Lake Charles, Louisiana, as the "Edwin Ford Hunter, Jr., United States Courthouse".

MARCH 9, 1994

H.R. 2339. An Act to revise and extend the programs of the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals With Disabilities Act of 1988, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3617. An Act to amend the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, and for other purposes.

MARCH 30, 1994

H.R. 3345. An Act to provide temporary authority to Government agencies relating to voluntary separation incentive payments, and for other purposes.

MARCH 31, 1994

H.R. 1804. An Act to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes.

H.R. 4122. An Act to temporarily extend certain provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

APRIL 6, 1994

H.J. Res. 329. Joint Resolution designating March 23, 1994, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.".

APRIL 30, 1994

H.R. 2333. An Act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4066. An Act to suspend temporarily the duty on the personal effects of participants in, and certain other individuals associated with, the 1994 World Cup Soccer Games, the 1994 World Rowing Championships, the 1995 Special Olympics World Games, the 1996 Summer Olympics, and the 1996 Paralympics.

MAY 4, 1994

H.R. 821. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to persons who have 20 years of service creditable for retired pay as members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces and to their dependents.

H.R. 2884. An Act to establish a national framework for the development of School-to-Work Opportunities systems in all States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3693. An Act to designate the United States courthouse under construction in Denver, Colorado, as the "Byron White United States Courthouse".

MAY 16, 1994

H.J. Res. 239. Joint Resolution to authorize the President to proclaim September 1994 as "Classical Music Month".

H.R. 4204. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 711 Washington Street in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "Jean Mayer Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging".

MAY 19, 1994

H.R. 1134. An Act to provide for the transfer of certain public lands located in Clear Creek County, Colorado, to the Forest Service, the State of Colorado, and certain local governments in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1727. An Act to establish a program of grants to States for arson research, prevention, and control, and for other purposes.

MAY 25, 1994

H.J. Res. 303. Joint Resolution to designate June 6, 1994, as "D-Day National Remembrance Day".

H.R. 2868. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 600 Camp Street in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "John Minor Wisdom United States Court of Appeals Building", and for other purposes.

MAY 31, 1994

H.R. 2139. An Act to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.

JUNE 10, 1994

H.R. 3863. An Act to designate the Post Office building located at 401 E. South Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "Medgar Wiley Evers Post Office".

JUNE 13, 1994

H.R. 1632. An Act to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, and Part C of title IV of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to remove gender-specific references.

JUNE 16, 1994

H.R. 965. An Act to provide for toy safety and for other purposes.

JUNE 28, 1994

H.R. 3676. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Spouse Equity Act of 1988 to provide for coverage of the former spouses of judges of the District of Columbia courts.

H.R. 4205. An Act to amend title 11, D.C. Code, to clarify that blind individuals are eligible to serve as jurors in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

JULY 5, 1994

H.R. 1183. An Act to validate conveyance of certain lands in the State of California that form part of the right-of-way granted by the United States to the Central Pacific Railway Company.

H.R. 1758. An Act to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to transportation, as subtitles II, III, and V-X of title 49, United States Code, "Transportation", and to make other technical improvements in the Code.

H.R. 2559. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 601 East 12th Street in Kansas City, Missouri, as the "Richard Bolling Federal Building" and the United States Courthouse located at Ninth and Locust Streets, in Kansas City, Missouri, as the "Charles Evans Whittaker United States Courthouse".

H.R. 3724. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located in Bridgeport, Connecticut, as the "Brien McMahon Federal Building".

H.R. 4568. An Act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4581. An Act to provide for the imposition of temporary fees in connection with the handling of complaints of violations of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930.

H.R. 4635. An Act to extend the Export Administration Act of 1979.

JULY 21, 1994

H.R. 3567. An Act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to transfer operating responsibilities to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

JULY 22, 1994

H.R. 4322. An Act to amend the Small Business Act to increase the authorization for the development company program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4454. An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 1, 1994

H.R. 572. An Act for the relief of Melissa Johnson.

H.R. 1346. An Act to designate the Federal building located on St. Croix, Virgin Islands, as the "Almeric L. Christian Federal Building".

H.R. 1873. An Act to require certain payments made to victims of Nazi persecution to be disregarded in determining eligibility for the amount of benefits or services based on need.

H.R. 2532. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse in Lubbock, Texas, as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 3770. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located at 940 Front Street in San Diego, California, and the Federal building attached to the courthouse as the "Edward J. Schwartz Courthouse and Federal Building".

H.R. 3840. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 100 East Houston Street in Marshall, Texas, as the "Sam B. Hall, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

AUGUST 11, 1994

H.R. 374. Joint Resolution designating August 2, 1994, as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day".

H.R. 2457. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a salmon captive broodstock program.

AUGUST 12, 1994

H.R. 4429. An Act to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.

AUGUST 15, 1994

H.R. 4277. An Act to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency and to make other improvements in the old-age survivors, and disability insurance program.

AUGUST 16, 1994

H.R. 868. An Act to strengthen the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to protect consumers in connection with sales made with a telephone, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 19, 1994

H.R. 4790. An Act to designate the United States courthouse under construction in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Thomas F. Eagleton United States Courthouse".

AUGUST 23, 1994

H.J. Res. 131. Joint Resolution designating December 7 of each year as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day".

H.J. Res. 175. Joint Resolution designating October 1994 as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month".

H.R. 1426. An Act to provide for the maintenance of dams located on Indian lands by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or through contracts with Indian tribes.

H.R. 1631. An Act to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to increase the maximum amount in controversy permitted for cases under the jurisdiction of the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1933. An Act to authorize appropriations for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, to extend such Commission, and to support the planning and performance of national service opportunities in conjunction with the Federal legal holiday honoring the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.

H.R. 2739. An Act to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4426. An Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4453. An Act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 25, 1994

H.R. 4812. An Act to direct the Administrator of General Services to acquire by transfer the Old U.S. Mint in San Francisco, California, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 26, 1994

H.R. 2178. An Act to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2243. An Act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend the authorization of appropriations in such Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2815. An Act to designate a portion of the Farmington River in Connecticut as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 2942. An Act to designate certain lands in the Commonwealth of Virginia as the George Washington National Forest Mount Pleasant Scenic Area.

H.R. 2947. An Act to amend the Commemorative Works Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3197. An Act to redesignate the postal facility located at 2100 North 13th Street in Reading, Pennsylvania, as the "Gus Yatron Postal Facility".

H.R. 4506. An Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4603. An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and making supplemental appropriations for these departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1994

H.R. 3355. An Act to control and prevent crime.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1994

H.R. 3474. An Act to reduce administrative requirements for insured depository institutions to the extent consistent with safe and sound banking practices, to facilitate the establishment of community development financial institutions, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1994

H.R. 4624. An Act making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1994

H.R. 3841. An Act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for interstate banking and branching.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

H.R. 4539. An Act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4554. An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4556. An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4602. An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4606. An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4649. An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4650. An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 3, 1994

H.R. 4190. An Act to designate the building located at 41-42 Norre Gade in Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the United States Postal Service, as the Alvaro de Lugo Post Office; and to amend title 39, United States Code to make applicable with respect to the United States Postal Service certain exclusionary authority relating to the treatment of reemployed annuitants under the civil service retirement laws, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 6, 1994

H.J. Res. 363. Joint Resolution to designate October 1994 as "Crime Prevention Month".

H.R. 1779. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 South Washington Street in Chillicothe, Missouri, as the "Jerry L. Litton United States Post Office Building", and to authorize travel and transportation expenses for certain Federal career appointees, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2144. An Act to provide for the transfer of excess land to the Government of Guam, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3679. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a program to be known as the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3839. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 220

South 40th Avenue in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, as the "Roy M. Wheat Post Office".

H.R. 4177. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 1601 Highway 35 in Middletown, New Jersey, as the "Candace White Post office".

H.R. 4191. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 9630 Estate Thomas in Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, as the "Aubrey C. Ottley Post Office".

H.R. 4230. An Act to amend the American Indian Religious Freedom Act to provide for the traditional use of peyote by Indians for religious purposes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4569. An Act to extend and make amendments to the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992.

H.R. 4647. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Imperial Beach, California, approximately 1 acre of land in the Tijuana Slough National Wildlife Refuge.

OCTOBER 10, 1994

H.R. 5060. An Act to provide for the continuation of certain fee collections for the expenses of the Securities and Exchange Commission for fiscal year 1995.

OCTOBER 13, 1994

H.R. 995. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve reemployment rights and benefits of veterans and other benefits of employment of certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4217. An Act to reform the Federal crop insurance program, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 14, 1994

H.J. Res. 389. Joint Resolution to designate the second Sunday in October of 1994 as "National Children's Day".

H.J. Res. 398. Joint Resolution to establish the fourth Sunday of July as "Parents' Day".

H.J. Res. 415. Joint Resolution designating the week beginning October 16, 1994, as "National Penny Charity Week".

H.R. 734. An Act to amend the Act entitled, "An Act to provide for the extension of certain Federal benefits, services, and assistance to the Pascua Yaqui Indians of Arizona, and for other purposes".

H.R. 3694. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit the garnishment of an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System or the Federal Employees' Retirement System, if necessary to satisfy a judgment against an annuitant for physically, sexually, or emotionally abusing a child.

H.R. 4299. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4543. An Act to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at 907 Richland Street in Columbia, South Carolina, as the "Matthew J. Perry, Jr. United States Courthouse".

OCTOBER 18, 1994

H.R. 810. An Act for the relief of Elizabeth M. Hill.

OCTOBER 19, 1994

H.J. Res. 401. Joint Resolution designating the months of March 1995 and March 1996 as "Irish-American Heritage Month".

H.J. Res. 417. Joint Resolution providing for temporary extension of the application of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Rail-

way Labor Act with respect to the dispute between the Soo Line Railroad Company and certain of its employees.

H.R. 1520. An Act to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act.

H.R. 2826. An Act to provide for an investigation of the whereabouts of the United States citizens and others who have been missing from Cyprus since 1974.

H.R. 2902. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to reauthorize the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3485. An Act to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

H.R. 4308. An Act to authorize appropriations to assist in carrying out the North American Wetlands Conservation Act for fiscal years 1995 through 1998, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4379. An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to enhance the ability of the banks for cooperatives to finance agricultural exports, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4653. An Act to settle Indian land claims within the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5155. An Act to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.

OCTOBER 20, 1994

H.R. 6. An Act to extend for five years the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for certain other purposes.

OCTOBER 22, 1994

H.J. Res. 425. Joint Resolution providing for the convening of the First Session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

H.R. 2135. An Act to provide for a National Native American Veterans' Memorial.

H.R. 2266. An Act for the relief of Orlando Wayne Naraysingh.

H.R. 2294. An Act to redesignate the Post Office building located at 1000 Lamar Street in Wichita Falls, Texas, as the "Graham B. Purcell, Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2411. An Act for the relief of Leteane Clement Monatsl.

H.R. 4192. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3000 Veterans Drive in Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, as the "Arturo R. Watlington, Sr. Post Office".

H.R. 4278. An Act to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act.

H.R. 4361. An Act to amend chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that an employee of the Federal Government may use sick leave to attend to the medical needs of a family member, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4535. An Act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to the extension of unlisted trading privileges for corporate securities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4896. An Act to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

H.R. 4924. An Act to assist in the conservation of rhinoceros and tigers by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations whose activities directly or indirectly affect rhinoceros and tiger populations, and of the CITES Secretariat.

H.R. 4950. An Act to extend the authorities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5053. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend for one year Water Bank Act agreements that are due to expire on December 31, 1994.

H.R. 5116. An Act to amend title 11 of the United States Code.

OCTOBER 25, 1994

H.R. 512. An Act to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that group life insurance benefits under such chapter may, upon application, be paid out to an insured individual who is terminally ill; to provide for continuation of health benefits coverage for certain individuals enrolled in health benefits plans administered by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency or the Office of Thrift Supervision, and for other purposes.

H.R. 783. An Act to amend title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes in the laws relating to nationality and naturalization.

H.R. 808. An Act for the relief of James B. Stanley.

H.R. 2056. An Act to redesignate the Post Office building located at 600 Princess Anne Street in Fredericksburg, Virginia, as the "Samuel E. Perry Post Office Building".

H.R. 2440. An Act to amend the Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4833. An Act to reform the management of Indian Trust Funds, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4842. An Act to specify the terms of contracts entered into by the United States and Indian tribal organizations under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act and to provide for tribal Self-Governance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4922. An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, to make clear a telecommunications carrier's duty to cooperate in the interception of communications for law enforcement purposes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5034. An Act to make certain technical amendments relating to the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, and other provisions of law.

OCTOBER 29, 1994

H.R. 2970. An Act to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 31, 1994

H.R. 3499. An Act to amend the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

H.R. 3678. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate agreements for the use of Outer Continental Shelf sand, gravel, and shell resources.

H.R. 4196. An Act to ensure that timber-dependent communities adversely affected by the Forest Plan for a Sustainable Economy and a Sustainable Environment qualify for loans and grants from the Rural Development Administration.

H.R. 4455. An Act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States to provide financing for the export of nonlethal defense articles and defense services the primary end use of which will be for civilian purposes.

H.R. 4778. An Act to codify without substantive change recent laws related to transportation and to improve the United States Code.

H.R. 5084. An Act to amend title 13, United States Code, to improve the accuracy of census address lists, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5176. An Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to San

Diego ocean discharge and waste water reclamation.

H.R. 5252. An Act to amend the Social Security Act and related Acts to make miscellaneous and technical amendments, and for other purposes.

NOVEMBER 2, 1994

H.J. Res. 271. Joint Resolution designating the month of November in each of calendar years 1993 and 1994 a "National American Indian Heritage Month".

H.J. Res. 326. Joint Resolution designating January 16, 1995, as "National Good Teen Day".

H.R. 1348. An Act to establish the Ouinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3050. An Act to expand the boundaries of the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area.

H.R. 3059. An Act to establish a National Maritime Heritage Program to make grants available for educational programs and the restoration of America's cultural resources for the purpose of preserving America's endangered maritime heritage.

H.R. 3313. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring veterans' health care programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3984. An Act to designate the building located at 216 Coleman Avenue in Waveland, Mississippi, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Longo, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 4180. An Act to provide for the annual publication of a list of federally recognized Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4193. An Act to designate the building located at 100 Vester Gade, in Cruz Bay, Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "Ubaldo Simmons Post Office".

H.R. 4452. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 115 North Chester in Ruleville, Mississippi, as the "Fannie Lou Hamer Post Office".

H.R. 4497. An Act to award a congressional gold medal to Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson.

H.R. 4551. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 301 West Lexington Street in Independence, Missouri, as the "William J. Randall Post Office".

H.R. 4571. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 103-104 Estate Richmond in Saint Croix, Virgin Islands, as the "Wilbert Armstrong Post Office".

H.R. 4595. An Act to designate the building at 4021 Laclede in St. Louis, Missouri, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "Marian Oldham Post Office".

H.R. 4598. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System, and to authorize appropriations to carry out the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

H.R. 4709. An Act to make certain technical corrections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4757. An Act to provide for the settlement of the claims of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation concerning their contribution to the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4777. An Act to make technical improvements in the United States Code by

amending provisions to reflect the current names of congressional committees.

H.R. 4781. An Act to facilitate obtaining foreign-located antitrust evidence by authorizing the Attorney General of the United States and the Federal Trade Commission to provide, in accordance with antitrust mutual assistance agreements, antitrust evidence to foreign antitrust authorities on a reciprocal basis; and for other purposes.

H.R. 4814. An Act to grant the consent of the Congress to amendments to the Central Midwest Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact.

H.R. 4867. An Act to authorize appropriations for high-speed rail transportation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4967. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located at 231 West Lafayette Street in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Theodore Levin United States Courthouse" and to designate the postal facility located at 1401 West Fort Street in Detroit, Michigan, as the "George W. Young Post Office".

H.R. 5102. An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to certain crimes relating to Congressional medals of honor.

H.R. 5161. An Act to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to permit the prompt sharing of timber sale receipts of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

H.R. 5200. An Act to resolve the 107th meridian boundary dispute between the Crow Indian Tribe and the United States.

H.R. 5220. An Act to provide for the acceptance by the Secretary of Education of applications submitted by the local educational agency serving the Window Rock Unified School District, Window Rock, Arizona, under section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress) for fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

H.R. 5244. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve veterans' benefits programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5246. An Act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to make certain corrections relating to international narcotics control activities, and for other purposes.

NOVEMBER 9, 1994

H.J. Res. 390. Joint Resolution designating September 17, 1994, as "Constitution Day".

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

FEBRUARY 22, 1994

S.J. Res. 119. Joint Resolution to designate the month of March 1994 as "Irish-American Heritage Month".

MARCH 17, 1994

S. 1789. An Act to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the use of funds under the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program for seismic retrofit of bridges, and for other purposes.

MARCH 24, 1994

S.J. Res. 56. Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning April 11, 1994, as "National Public Safety Telecommunications Week".

S.J. Res. 162. Joint Resolution designating March 25, 1994, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy".

S.J. Res. 163. Joint Resolution to proclaim March 20, 1994, as "National Agriculture Day".

S.J. Res. 171. Joint Resolution to designate March 20 through March 26, 1994, as "Small Family Farm Week".

MARCH 25, 1994

S. 1926. An Act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to modify the requirements relating to monthly reporting and staggered issuance of coupons for households residing on Indian reservations, to ensure adequate access to retail food stores by food stamp households, and to maintain the integrity of the food stamp households, and to maintain the integrity of the food stamp program, and for other purposes.

APRIL 6, 1994

S. 1284. An Act to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to modify certain provisions relating to programs for individuals with developmental disabilities, Federal assistance for priority area activities for individuals with developmental disabilities, protection and advocacy of individual rights, university affiliated programs, and projects of national significance, and for other purposes.

S. 1913. An Act to extend certain compliance dates for pesticide safety training and labeling requirements.

APRIL 11, 1994

S. 476. An Act to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1299. An Act to amend section 203 of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978 to provide for the disposition of multifamily properties owned by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to provide for other reforms in programs administered by the Secretary, and to make certain technical amendments, and for other purposes.

APRIL 14, 1994

S. 1206. An Act to redesignate the Federal building at 380 Trapelo Road in Waltham, Massachusetts, as the "Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center".

APRIL 28, 1994

S. 2004. An Act to extend until July 1, 1996, the exemption from ineligibility based on a high default rate for certain institutions of higher education.

APRIL 30, 1994

S. 1636. An Act to authorize appropriations for the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 and to improve the program to reduce the incidental taking of marine mammals during the course of commercial fishing operations, and for other purposes.

MAY 4, 1994

S. 375. An Act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Rio Grande in New Mexico as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

S. 1574. An Act to authorize appropriations for the Coastal Heritage Trail Route in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 143. Joint Resolution providing for the appointment of Frank Anderson Shrontz as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 144. Joint Resolution providing for the appointment of Manuel Luis Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 150. Joint Resolution to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1994, as "Public Service Recognition Week".

MAY 6, 1994

S. 2005. An Act to make certain technical corrections, and for other purposes.

MAY 11, 1994

S. 1930. An Act to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the administration of claims and obligations of the Farmers Home Administration, and for other purposes.

MAY 16, 1994

S.J. Res. 146. Joint Resolution designating May 1, 1994, through May 7, 1994, as "National Walking Week".

MAY 18, 1994

S. 2000. An Act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Head Start Act, the Community Services Block Grant Act, and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, and for other purposes.

MAY 19, 1994

S. 341. An Act to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and Eagle and Pitkin Counties in Colorado, and for other purposes.

MAY 25, 1994

S.J. Res. 168. Joint Resolution designating May 11, 1994, as "Vietnam Human Rights Day".

MAY 26, 1994

S. 636. An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, to assure freedom of access to reproductive services.

S. 2024. An Act to provide temporary obligational authority for the airport improvement program and to provide for certain airport fees to be maintained at existing levels for up to 60 days, and for other purposes.

S. 2087. An Act to extend the time period for compliance with the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990 for certain products packaged prior to August 8, 1994.

MAY 31, 1994

S. 1654. An Act to make certain technical corrections.

S.J. Res. 179. Joint Resolution to designate the week of June 12 through 19, 1994, as "National Men's Health Week".

JUNE 30, 1994

S. 24. An Act to reauthorize the independent counsel law for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes.

JULY 1, 1994

S. 1904. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the organization and procedures of the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

JULY 20, 1994

S.J. Res. 187. Joint Resolution designating July 16 through July 24, 1994, as "National Apollo Anniversary Observance".

JULY 22, 1994

S. 273. An Act to remove certain restrictions from a parcel of land owned by the city of North Charleston, South Carolina, in order to permit a land exchange, and for other purposes.

S. 1402. An Act to convey a certain parcel of public land to the County of Twin Falls, Idaho, for use as a landfill, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 1, 1994

S. 537. An Act for the relief of Tania Gil Compton.

S. 832. An Act to designate the plaza to be constructed in the Federal Triangle property in Washington, DC, as the "Woodrow Wilson Plaza".

S. 1880. An Act to provide that the National Education Commission on Time and Learning shall terminate on September 30, 1994.

S.J. Res. 172. Joint Resolution designating May 29, 1995, through June 6, 1995, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II".

AUGUST 11, 1994

S.J. Res. 195. Joint Resolution to designate August 1, 1994, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day".

AUGUST 17, 1994

S. 1458. An Act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish time limitations on certain civil actions against aircraft manufacturers, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 18, 1994

S.J. Res. 204. Joint Resolution recognizing the American Academy in Rome, an American overseas center for independent study and advanced research, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding.

AUGUST 19, 1994

S.J. Res. 178. Joint Resolution to proclaim the week of October 16 through October 22, 1994, as "National Character Counts Week".

AUGUST 26, 1994

S. 2099. An Act to establish the Northern Great Plains Rural Development Commission, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 153. Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning on November 20, 1994 and ending on November 26, 1994, as "National Family Caregivers Week".

S.J. Res. 196. Joint Resolution to designate September 16, 1994, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1994

S. 1066. An Act to restore Federal services to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians.

S. 1357. An Act 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.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1994

S. 859. An Act to reduce the restrictions on lands conveyed by deed under the Act of June 8, 1926.

OCTOBER 5, 1994

S. 2182. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 6, 1994

S. 716. An Act to require that all Federal lithographic printing be performed using ink made from vegetable oil and materials derived from other renewable resources, and for other purposes.

S. 1406. An Act to amend the Plant Variety Protection Act to make such Act consistent with the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants of March 19, 1991, to which the United States is a signatory, and for other purposes.

S. 1703. An Act to expand the boundaries of the Piscataway Park, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 8, 1994

S.J. Res. 221. Joint Resolution to express the sense of the Congress in Commemoration of the 75th anniversary of Grand Canyon National Park.

OCTOBER 13, 1994

S. 1587. An Act to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 2170. An Act to provide a more effective, efficient, and responsive Government.

OCTOBER 14, 1994

S. 316. An Act to establish the Saguaro National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes.

S. 1233. An Act to resolve the status of certain lands in Arizona that are subject to a claim as a grant of public lands for railroad purposes, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 157. Joint Resolution to designate 1994 as "The Year of Gospel Music".

S.J. Res. 185. Joint Resolution to designate October 1994 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month".

S.J. Res. 198. Joint Resolution designating 1995 as the "Year of the Grandparent".

OCTOBER 18, 1994

S. 2406. An Act to amend title 17, United States Code, relating to the definition of a local service area of a primary transmitter, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 220. Joint Resolution to designate October 19, 1994, as "National Mammography Day".

OCTOBER 19, 1994

S. 2475. An Act to authorize assistance to promote the peaceful resolution of conflicts in Africa.

OCTOBER 20, 1994

S. 922. An Act to provide that a State court may not modify an order of another State court requiring the payment of child support unless the recipient of child support payments resides in the State in which the modification is sought or consents to the seeking of the modification in that court.

OCTOBER 22, 1994

S. 340. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the application of the Act with respect to alternate uses of new animal drugs and new drugs intended for human use, and for other purposes.

S. 455. An Act to amend title 31, United States Code, to increase Federal payments to units of general local governments for entitlement lands, and for other purposes.

S. 528. An Act to provide for the transfer of certain United States Forest Service lands located in Lincoln County, Montana, to Lincoln County in the State of Montana.

S. 720. An Act to clean up open dumps on Indian lands, and for other purposes.

S. 1225. An Act to authorize and encourage the President to conclude an agreement with Mexico to establish a United States-Mexico Border Health Commission.

S. 1312. An Act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 in order to provide for the availability of remedies for certain former pension plan participants and beneficiaries.

S. 1457. An Act to amend the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands Restitution Act to increase authorization for appropriation to compensate Aleut villages for church property lost, damaged, or destroyed during World War II.

S. 2060. An Act to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

S. 2073. An Act to designate the Warren B. Rudman United States Courthouse, the Jamie L. Whitten Federal Building, and the William H. Natcher Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

S. 2395. An Act to designate the United States Courthouse in Detroit, Michigan, as

the "Theodore Levin Courthouse", and for other purposes.

S. 2466. An Act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectively, and for other purposes.

S. 2500. An Act to enable producers and feeders of sheep and importers of sheep and sheep products to develop, finance, and carry out a nationally coordinated program for sheep and sheep product promotion, research, and information, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 90. Joint Resolution to recognize the achievements of radio amateurs, and to establish support for such amateurs as national policy.

OCTOBER 25, 1994

S. 784 An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish standards with respect to dietary supplements, and for other purposes.

S. 1927. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans, to revise and improve veterans' benefits programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2372. An Act to amend the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983.

S. 2407. An Act to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts, and for other purposes.

S. 2534. An Act to revise and improve the process for disposing of buildings and property at military installations under the base closure laws.

S.J. Res. 227. Joint Resolution approving the location of a Thomas Paine Memorial and a World War II Memorial in the Nation's Capital.

S.J. Res. 229. Joint Resolution regarding United States policy toward Haiti.

OCTOBER 31, 1994

S. 21. An Act to designate certain lands in the California Desert as wilderness, to establish the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Parks, to establish the Mojave National Preserve, and for other purposes.

S. 1146. An Act to provide for the settlement of water rights claims of the Yavapai-Prezcott Indian Tribe in Yavapai County, Arizona, and for other purposes.

NOVEMBER 2, 1994

S. 1614. An Act to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the National School Lunch Act to promote healthy eating habits for children and to extend certain authorities contained in such Acts through fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

**MESSAGES AND COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FOLLOWING THE SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 103RD CONGRESS AND FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION OF THE FINAL ADDITION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THE 103RD CONGRESS**

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL, MINORITY LEADER  
OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 21, 1994.

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker, House of Representatives  
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 904(b) of Public Law 103-236, I hereby appoint

the following individuals to the Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy: Representative Larry Combest of Texas and Mr. Martin Faga of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

BOB MICHEL,  
Republican Leader.

**APPOINTMENTS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT AND FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION OF THE FINAL EDITION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THE 103RD CONGRESS**

Pursuant to the provisions of section 303(a) of Public Law 103-3, and the order of the House of Friday, October 7, 1994 authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint commissions, boards and committees authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Thursday, December 22, 1994 did appoint to the Commission on Leave the following Member of the House to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mrs. SCHROEDER of Colorado.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 270002 of Public Law 103-322, and the order of the House of Friday, October 7, 1994 authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint commissions, boards and committees authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Thursday, December 22, 1994, did appoint to the National Commission on Crime Prevention and Control the following members on the part of the House:

Mr. Thomas F. Railsback, Moline, IL.  
Mr. Werner W. Brandt, Arlington, VA.

And on January 3, 1995 did also appoint:

Mr. Jeffrey A. Teitz, Newport, RI.  
Mr. Larry Erickson, Spokane, WA.  
Mr. Jonathan R. Yarowsky, Washington, DC.

Mr. Michael J. O'Neil, Oakton, VA.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of 2 U.S.C. 154, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 102-246, and the order of the House of Friday, October 7, 1994 authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Friday, December 23, 1994 did appoint to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board the following members on the part of the House:

Mr. Peter Lynch, Boston, MA to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Robert Rubin.

Mr. Thomas S. Foley, Washington, DC, to a 4-year term.

And on Tuesday, January 3, 1995 did also appoint:

Mr. Lawrence Tisch, New York, NY, to a 2-year term.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling \$1.2 billion, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(c) (H. Doc. No. 104-8); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling \$32,200,000 in budget authority for the Departments of Housing and Urban Affairs, and Commerce, and to designate these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 104-9); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's first special impoundment message for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 104-14); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Controller, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Army, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5. A letter from the Comptroller, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

6. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the President's Executive order updating the "Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984"; to the Committee on National Security.

7. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Indonesia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final priorities—Special Studies Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

9. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final priorities—rehabilitation training programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

10. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final priorities—special demonstrations; and projects with industry, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

11. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

12. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Work-Study, and Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

13. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning two project arrangements to be conducted under the 1992 agreement with Australia on cooperation in radar

activities (Transmittal No. 13-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

14. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the fiscal year 1994 annual report on the operation of the special defense acquisition fund, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2795b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

15. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 of the AECA concerning the unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2314(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

16. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an unclassified report on the Loan Guarantees to Israel Program and on economic conditions in Israel, pursuant to section 226(k) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

17. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the second monthly report on the situation in Haiti, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

18. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the third monthly report on the situation in Haiti, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

19. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-monthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

20. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the final part of his report on the extent to which federally funded international exchange programs share similar objectives, pursuant to section 229(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1994; to the Committee on International Relations.

21. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on developments since his last report concerning the national emergency with respect to the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (H. Doc. No. 104-5); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

22. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the Libyan emergency is to continue in effect beyond January 7, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d) (H. Doc. No. 104-7); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

23. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to Public Law 102-1, section 3 (105 Stat. 4) (H. Doc. No. 104-11); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

25. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C.

112b(a); to the Committees on International Relations.

26. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's certification and justifications that the Republic of Belarus, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, and Ukraine are committed to the courses of action described in section 1201 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1994; to the Committee on International Relations.

27. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his fourth report on the continuing deployment of a United States Army peacekeeping contingent as part of the U.N. Protection Force [UNPROFOR] in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia [FYROM], consistent with the War Powers Resolution (H. Doc. No. 104-6); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

28. 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 1999 resulting from passage of H.R. 5110, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

29. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his report on the implementation of locality-based comparability payments for General Schedule employees for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5304(d)(3) (H. Doc. No. 104-13); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the semi-annual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

31. A letter from the inspector general, Department of Commerce, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

32. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the semi-annual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

33. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

34. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

35. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the semi-annual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, together with the Secretary's report on audit followup, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

36. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-347, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 120, S.O. 91-8, Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

37. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-344, "Armory Board Interim Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

38. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-346, "Public Assistance and Day Care Policy Temporary Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

39. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-345, "Prevention of the Spread of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome Temporary Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

40. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-343, "Qualified Massage Therapists Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

41. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-340, "Medicaid Benefits Protection Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

42. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-341, "Respiratory Care Practice Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

43. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-342, "Moratorium on the Issuance of New Retailer's Licenses Class B Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

44. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Review of the Implementation of Audit Recommendations For the Public Access Corporation of the District of Columbia," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

45. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Program Review of the District of Columbia Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board For Fiscal Years 1988 Through 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

46. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in November 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

47. A letter from the Chairman, Armed Forces Retirement Home Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of

the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

48. A letter from the Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

49. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National Service, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

50. A letter from the Chairman, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

51. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

52. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the Secretary's semiannual report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

53. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (96 Stat. 750, 102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

54. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

55. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

56. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the Department's management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526, 2640); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

57. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General covering the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the

semiannual management report, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

58. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

59. A letter from the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

60. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

61. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Department's inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

62. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

63. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

64. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

65. A letter from the Acting Archivist, National Archives, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

66. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

67. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

68. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers'

Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

69. A letter from the President, National Endowment for Democracy, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

70. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

71. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 1994 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act amendments of 1988, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

72. A letter from the Chairman, National Science Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

73. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period of April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and management response for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

74. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(C)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

75. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

76. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

77. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

78. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

79. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the management report on final actions, pursuant to Public Law 95-452,

section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

80. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

81. A letter from the Executive Director, State Justice Institute, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

82. A letter from the Chairman, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

83. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

84. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general's activities for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 99-399, section 412(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

85. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 99-399, section 412(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

86. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

87. A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

88. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

89. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

90. A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to

44 U.S.C. 3903 (102 Stat. 2531); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

91. A letter from the Director, U.S. Soldiers' & Airmen's Home, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

92. A letter from the Director, Woodrow Wilson Center, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

93. A letter from the Clerk of the House, transmitting a list of reports pursuant to clause 2, rule III of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 104-15); to the Committee on House Oversight and ordered to be printed.

94. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on standards for assessing and enhancing the seismic safety of existing buildings constructed for or leased by the Federal Government, pursuant to Public Law 101-614, section 8 (104 Stat. 3237); to the Committee on Science.

95. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Bulgaria, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-10); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

96. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report concerning emigration laws and policies of the Russian Federation, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-12); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

97. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the U.S. Government annual report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 331(c); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

98. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's final sequestration report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### 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:

*[Submitted December 22, 1994]*

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Summary of legislative activities of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, 103d Congress (Rept. 103-877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Activities report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, 103d Congress (Rept. 103-878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Submitted December 23, 1994]*

Mr. GLICKMAN: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Report on the activities of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence during the 103d Congress (Rept.

103-879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Submitted December 29, 1994]*

Mr. HAMILTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Legislative review activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. Report of the activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Submitted January 2, 1995]*

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. Report on the activities of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on the activities of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-883). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on the activities of the Committee on Government Operations during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LAFALCE: Committee on Small Business. Summary of activities of the Committee on Small Business during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. Report on activities of the Committee on Agriculture during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-886). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Final report on the activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, 103d Congress (Rept. 103-887). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of California: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Summary of activities of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (Rept. 103-888). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the activities of the Committee on Appropriations (Rept. 103-889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### 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. SHAYS, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. THOMAS (for themselves, and Mr. McHALE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr.

BONILLA, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BURR, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EWING, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HEFLY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARTINI, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PORTER, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. DANNER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. REED, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1. A bill to make certain laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, Government Reform and Oversight, Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. NEUMANN, and Mr. PARKER (for themselves, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr.

BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TATE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRlich, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 2. A bill to give the President item veto authority over appropriation acts and targeted tax benefits in revenue acts; to the committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BREWSTER (for themselves, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONO, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. CREMEANS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GIL-

MAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TATE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRlich, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 3. A bill to control crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. LATOURETTE (for themselves, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. EWING, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOX, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BONO, Mr. FRISA, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HORN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TATE, Mr. MICA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of

Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. EHRlich):

H.R. 4. A bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence:

Title I, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title II, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title III, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title IV, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Commerce, Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Judiciary, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title V, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title VI-VII, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; and

Title VIII, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Budget, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Banking and Financial Services, Commerce, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. DAVIS (for themselves, and Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MICA, Mr. HORN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FOX, Mr. WALSH and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 5. A bill to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRANE, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. SALMON (for themselves, Mr. AL-

LARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONO, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOLEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EWING, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TATE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRlich, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 6. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for families, to reform the marriage penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES (for themselves, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. KIM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRlich, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. COX, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. EWING, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LARGENT,

Mr. WELLER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOX, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. BURR, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BONO, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. FRISA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARR, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. TATE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MICA, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 7. A bill to revitalize the national security of the United States:

Title I, referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title II, referred to the Committee on National Security;

Title III, referred to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Section 401, referred to the Committee on National Security; and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Section 402, referred to the Committee on International Relations;

Title V, referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on National Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title VI, referred to the Committee on International Relations; and

Title VII, referred to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. KELLY, and Mrs. THURMAN (for themselves, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOKE, Mr. FRISA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARR, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HORN, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. TATE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KIM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SCHAEFER,

Mr. FILNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PAXON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. COX, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOX, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. COOLEY, and Mr. BONO):

H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the earnings limit, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the tax on social security benefits and to provide incentives for the purchase of long-term care insurance, and for other purposes:

Titles I-III, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; and

Title IV, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SEXTON, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington (for themselves, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KIM, Mr. MICA, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HOKE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. COX, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TALENT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MYRICK, Mr. EWING, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOX, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr.

ROYCE, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BONO, Mr. FRISA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. TATE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 9. A bill to create jobs, enhance wages, strengthen property rights, maintain certain economic liberties, decentralize and reduce the power of the Federal Government with respect to the States, localities, and citizens of the United States, and to increase the accountability of Federal officials:

Titles I-II, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means;

Title III, referred to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title IV, referred to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Government Reform and Oversight, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title V, referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight;

Title VI-IX, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary;

Title X, referred to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

Title XI, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned; and

Title XII, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. CHENOWETH, and Mr. CONDIT (for themselves, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONO, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. GIL-

MAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIM, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TATE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 10. A bill to reform the Federal civil justice system; to reform product liability law:

Title I, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned; and

Title II, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. WELLER (for themselves, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SEXTON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. KIM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOX, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. SOLOMON,

Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BONO, Mr. FRISA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. TATE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 11. A bill to strengthen the rights of parents:

Titles I-II, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means;

Title III, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary;

Title IV, referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and

Title V, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 12. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the gross estate the value of land subject to a qualified conservation easement if certain conditions are satisfied, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 13. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 14. A bill to repeal the exemption from disclosure requirement for municipal securities, and to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to public model disclosure forms to facilitate compliance with the disclosure requirements; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 15. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the appointment of the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 17. A bill to establish the Federal Bank Agency, to abolish the positions of the Comptroller of the Currency and Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, to consolidate and reform the regulation of insured depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 18. A bill to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing prudential framework for the affiliation of banks and securities firms; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH and Mr. SCHUMER (for themselves, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 19. A bill to encourage foreign countries to accord national treatment to United States banking, securities, and insurance organizations that operate or seek to operate in those countries; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Service, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 20. A bill to provide a framework to improve risk management techniques at financial institutions, including the prudential use of derivative products; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 21. A bill to amend section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to more accurately determine the median income for Rockland County, NY, for purposes of housing programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 22. A bill to establish the position of Coordinator for Counterterrorism within the

office of the Secretary of State; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a schedule of preventive health care services and to provide for coverage of such services in accordance with such schedule under private health insurance plans and health benefit programs of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Government Reform and Oversight, Veterans' Affairs, and National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. MINGE):

H.R. 24. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide congressional authorization for State control over transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLILEY:

H.R. 25. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections relating to the enactment of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 26. A bill to provide for return of excess amounts from official allowances of Members of the House of Representatives to the Treasury for deficit reduction; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HOKE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KING, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PARKER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ALLARD, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mrs. FOWLER):

H.R. 27. A bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 28. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector

the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 29. A bill to provide that of amounts available to a designated agency for a fiscal year that are not obligated in the fiscal year, up to 50 percent may be used to pay bonuses to agency personnel and the remainder shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury and used exclusively for deficit reduction; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 30. A bill to amend and extend certain laws relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 31. A bill to enhance the supervision and regulation of the derivatives activities of financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 32. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that charitable beneficiaries of charitable remainder trusts are aware of their interests in such trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LAMBERT LINCOLN:

H.R. 33. A bill to transfer the Fish and Farming Experimental Laboratory in Stuttgart, AR, to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 34. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to retroactively restore a 100 percent deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAWELL:

H.R. 35. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide security for workers, to improve pension funding, to limit growth in insurance exposure, to protect the single-employer plan termination insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 36. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and related provisions to improve pension plan funding, to limit growth in insurance exposure, to protect the single-employer plan termination insurance program by clarifying the status of claims of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and the treatment of insolvent pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 37. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve pension plan funding; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. LINCOLN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 38. A bill to eliminate the disparity between the periods of delay provided for ci-

vilian and military retiree cost-of-living-adjustments in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 39. A bill to amend the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve fisheries management; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mrs.

JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COX, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PACKARD, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 40. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the deductibility of certain home office expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DEAL, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. MINGE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 41. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide taxpayers engaged in certain agriculture-related activities a credit against income tax for property used to control environmental pollution and for soil and water conservation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 42. A bill to reauthorize the Ryan White Care Act of 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 43. A bill to improve the regulation of explosives and explosive materials, and to prevent the use of explosives against persons and the unlawful use of explosives against property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 44. A bill to provide that certain service of members of the U.S. merchant marine during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of any law administered by the Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 45. A bill to apply the antitrust laws of the United States to major league baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 46. A bill to delay for 2 years the required implementation date for enhanced ve-

hicle inspection and maintenance programs under the Clean Air Act, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to reissue regulations relating to such programs, to provide for the redesignation of certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

H.R. 47. A bill to require approval by law of agency rules and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 48. A bill to provide grants for the integration of academic and vocational curriculum and professional development; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 49. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees and to limit contributions in House of Representatives elections from persons other than individual in-State residents; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 50. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the State of Wisconsin lands and improvements associated with the LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project for flood control and allied purposes, Kickapoo River, WI, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 51. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. MINGE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KIM, Mr. COYNE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. WISE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska):

H.R. 52. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the 25 percent deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals for 1994 and to provide a 100 percent deduction for such costs beginning in 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY (for himself, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 53. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act with respect to public health pesticides; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOOLEY (for himself and Mr. POMBO):

H.R. 54. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to provide greater access to credit for family farmers who grow specialty crops or operate in high land cost areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr.

MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 55. A bill to protect voting rights of homeless citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. DUNN, Ms. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CANADY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. FRISA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. COX, and Mr. LEACHE):

H.R. 56. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide all taxpayers with a 50 percent deduction for capital gains, to index the basis of certain capital assets, and to allow the capital loss deduction for losses on the sale or exchange of an individual's principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 57. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on the exclusion under section 911 of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 58. A bill to require analysis and estimates of the likely impact of Federal legislation and regulations upon small businesses, the private sector, and State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for considerations of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARCIA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 59. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the assessment and collection of the excise tax on arrows; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 60. A bill to provide that compliance by the States with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 shall be voluntary; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 61. A bill to abolish the ex officio positions on the Federal Election Commission; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 62. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified estate and gift tax credit to an amount equivalent to a \$1,200,000 exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 63. A bill to prohibit the admission to the United States as refugees of individuals who served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 64. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that a reasonable at-

torney's fee shall be awarded as a part of the cost to prevailing defendants in Federal civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. TEJEDA):

H.R. 65. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive military retired pay concurrently with veterans' disability compensation; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 66. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to guarantee the repayment of loans made by private lenders for the development costs of multifamily rural rental housing for low- and moderate-income families in rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 67. A bill to extend the Conservation Reserve Program for 10 years and the Wetlands Reserve Program for 5 years to protect vulnerable soil and water resources by facilitating the transition of our Nation's most environmentally sensitive land to conservation uses by enabling farmers to meet conservation compliance requirements through the early withdrawal, modification, re-enrollment, or enrollment of lands in the conservation reserve; to best achieve such conservation purposes with sharply limited resources by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to negotiate reduced annual rental payments in exchange for granting farmers increased flexibility to withdraw, enroll, or re-enroll parts of land parcels in the Conservation Reserve Program and for permitting limited uses on lands enrolled in the conservation reserve, to permit the transfer of crop bases among owners upon the expiration of enrollment; and to authorize the establishment of demonstration projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself and Mr. COMBEST):

H.R. 68. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide for disclosures by consumers reporting agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for counterintelligence purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 69. A bill to amend section 424 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 to modify the requirements for minimum property standards regarding individual residential water purification and treatment units for properties subject to mortgages insured under the Single-family Housing Mortgage Insurance Program; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 70. A bill to permit exports of certain domestically produced crude oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSS (for himself, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 71. A bill to reduce the official mail allowance of Members of the House and to prohibit certain other mailing practices, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida):

H.R. 72. A bill imposing certain restriction and requirements on the leasing under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of lands offshore Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 73. A bill to protect the ecologically fragile coastal resources of south Florida by prohibiting offshore oil and gas activities and by canceling Federal leases in the area of the Outer Continental Shelf adjacent to the south Florida coast; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 74. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to provide for State disapproval of issuance of permits for the taking of marine mammals in protected State waters; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 75. A bill to prohibit travel by Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives at lobbyist expense; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. BROWDER):

H.R. 76. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 1-year extension of the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CANADY, Mr. SENSEBRENNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. WALSH, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DICKEY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HORN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. KIM, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HEINEMAN, and Mr. COX):

H.R. 77. A bill to permit Members of the House of Representatives to use their unspent official allowances for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CHRYSLER, and Mr. SCHAEFER):

H.R. 78. A bill to protect the right to obtain firearms for security, and to use firearms in defense of self, family, or home, and to provide for the enforcement of such right; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 79. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 80. A bill to foster economic growth, create new employment opportunities, and strengthen the industrial base of the United States by providing credit for businesses and by facilitating the transfer and commercialization of government-owned patents, licenses, process, and technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Science, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 81. A bill to oppose Cuba's admission as a member of international financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 82. A bill to deny visas to aliens involved with the foreign expropriation of property of U.S. Persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 83. A bill to provide for the withholding of contributions to certain organizations that assist Iraq, Iran, Libya, and Cuba; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 84. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of sugar from countries that import sugar from Cuba; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 85. A bill to provide for greater disclosure of and accountability for Federal Government travel; to the Committee on Government Reform Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 86. A bill to establish a Commission to examine the costs and benefits, and the impact on voter turnout, of changing the deadline for filing Federal income tax returns to the date on which Federal elections are held; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 87. A bill to establish the Department of Energy Laboratory Facilities Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 88. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax equity and fairness by imposing an alternative minimum tax on corporations importing products into the United States at artificially inflated prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 89. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for rollover of gain from sale of farm assets into an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 90. A bill to appropriate 2 percent of Federal individual income tax revenues to

the States to fight crime; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 91. A bill to prohibit acquisitions of land or waters for the National Wildlife Refuge System if wildlife refuge revenue sharing payments have not been made for the preceding fiscal year; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 92. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain corporations and certain trusts to be shareholders of subchapter S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 93. A bill to provide that the prevailing party in a tort action is entitled to recover attorneys' fees from the nonprevailing party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 94. A bill entitled "The Volunteer Firefighter and Rescue Squad Worker Protection Act"; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLING, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 95. A bill to improve the interstate enforcement of child support and parentage court orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, Government Reform and Oversight, National Security, International Relations, the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, and House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MINETA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 96. A bill to amend section 1977A of the revised statutes to equalize the remedies available to all victims of intentional employment discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 97. A bill to establish a rapid deployment force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 98. A bill to clarify the tax treatment of certain disability benefits received by former police officers or firefighters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 99. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of accelerated death benefits under life insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 100. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out the

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and Museum Service Act; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 101. A bill to transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 102. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to exempt pesticide rinse water degradation systems from subtitle C permit requirements; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 103. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Civil Service retirement and disability fund be excluded from the budget of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 104. A bill to prohibit the provision of financial assistance from the Federal Government to any person who is more than 60 days delinquent in the payment of any child support obligations; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 105. A bill to amend the Act of September 30, 1961, to exclude professional baseball from the antitrust exemption applicable to certain television contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 106. A bill to provide that professional baseball teams, and leagues composed of such teams, shall be subject to the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 107. A bill to provide benefits under the survivor benefit plan to surviving spouses of certain members of the Armed Forces retired before September 21, 1972; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 108. A bill to modify the provision of law which provides a permanent appropriation for the compensation of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 109. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the effective date for discontinuance of compensation and pension paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall be the date on which the recipient dies, rather than the last day of the preceding month, in the case of a veteran with a surviving spouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 110. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a tax credit for hiring displaced homemakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 111. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make modifications to the small business and capital ownership development program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 112. A bill to amend section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 to prevent the harassment by computer modem or other electronic device; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 113. A bill to require automobile insurance insurers to provide rate setting information and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 114. A bill to establish a Minority Business Development Administration in the

Department of Commerce, to clarify the relationship between such Administration and the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 115. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the deduction for business use of the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 116. A bill to limit State authority to regulate certain activities on vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUTE (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 117. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to prevent persons having drug or alcohol use problems from occupying dwelling units in public housing projects designated for occupancy of elderly families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUTE:

H.R. 118. A bill to eliminate certain welfare benefits with respect to fugitive felons and probation and parole violators, and to facilitate sharing of information with police officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, Agriculture, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRYANT of Texas:

H.R. 119. A bill to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 120. A bill to apply the antitrust laws of the United States to major league baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 121. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the use of computers in or affecting commerce as a basis for Federal prosecution of certain obscenity offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H.R. 122. A bill to establish the Regulatory Sunset Commission to review regulations of executive agencies, and to provide for the automatic termination of regulations that are not authorized by the Commission to continue in effect; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DORNAN, Mr.

HANSEN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DICK- EY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. KING, Mr. CANADY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. FOWLER):

H.R. 123. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to employers for the cost of providing English language training to their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN (for himself, Mr.

BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WISE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MCCHERY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 125. A bill to repeal the ban on semi-automatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 126. A bill to repeal the provision of law under which pay for Members of Congress is automatically adjusted; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 128. A bill to give the President legislative, line-item veto authority over budget authority in appropriations bills in fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 129. A bill to repeal the provision of law under which pay for Members of Congress is automatically adjusted; to the Committee on Government Reform and Over-

sight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 130. A bill to ensure that Federal agencies establish the appropriate procedures for assessing whether or not Federal regulations might result in the taking of private property, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Congress with respect to such takings under programs of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child care credit for lower-income working parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable income credit for the recycling of hazardous wastes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of a principal residence by a first-time homebuyer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 134. A bill to suspend Federal education benefits to individuals convicted of drug offenses; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 135. A bill to prohibit a federally sponsored research pertaining to the legalization of drugs; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 136. A bill to require random drug testing within the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 137. A bill to increase opportunities for veterans with service-connected disabilities to participate in Department of Defense procurement actions; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 138. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require that courts, upon the criminal conviction under that act, notify the employer of the convicted person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 139. A bill to prohibit the entry into the United States of items produced, grown, or manufactured in the People's Republic of China with the use of forced labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 140. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 141. A bill to amend the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 to eliminate the discretion of the court in connection with the denial of certain Federal benefits upon conviction of certain drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 142. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit any Federal grant or contract from being awarded to any educational institution that does not allow the Secretary of Defense to have access to students on campuses or to obtain certain student information for recruiting purposes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 143. A bill to require preemployment drug testing with respect to applicants for Federal employment; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 144. A bill to establish a task force to recommend a uniform strategy to protect women against violent crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 145. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 146. A bill to impose mandatory sentences for violent felonies committed against individuals of age 65 or over, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 147. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the death penalty for drug kingpins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 148. A bill to require random drug testing of Federal legislative branch officers and employees; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 149. A bill to prohibit the export of satellites intended for launch from launch vehicles owned by the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 150. A bill to prohibit the importation of foreign-made flags of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 151. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the provision prohibiting certain State and local employees from seeking elective office; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 152. A bill to prohibit retroactive income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 153. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish Federal standards to ensure quality assurance of drug testing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 154. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide the penalty of death for certain murders of State and local correctional officers by incarcerated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 155. A bill to increase opportunities for veterans held as prisoners-of-war during the Vietnam era to participate in Department of Defense procurement actions; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a Federal income tax credit for tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the prior law exclusion for scholarships and fellowships and to restore the deduction for interest on education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow health insurance premiums to be fully deductible to the extent not in excess of \$3,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that tax-exempt interest shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of Social Security benefits included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 160. A bill to require random drug testing of Federal judicial branch officers

and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 161. A bill to discourage States and local governments from providing general welfare assistance to able-bodied individuals unless such individuals are participating in workfare programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 162. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent double counting of income in the conduct of needs analysis for student assistance under that Act; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 163. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to any benefit thereunder shall continue through the month of his or her death (without affecting any other person's entitlement to benefits for that month) and that such individual's benefit shall be payable for such month only to the extent proportionate to the number of days in such month preceding the date of such individual's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 164. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by reconstituting the Boards of Trustees of such trust funds by and the Managing Trustee of such trust funds to increase their independence, by providing for annual investment plans to guide investment of amounts in such trust funds, and by removing unnecessary restrictions on investment and disinvestment of amounts in such trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 165. A bill to make Members of Congress ineligible to participate in the Federal Employees' Retirement System; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 166. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for dental services under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 167. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance for emergency repairs in lower income housing projects operated by the Chicago Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 168. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to requiring State plans for appropriately responding to the closing of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 169. A bill to provide for the mandatory registration of handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 170. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish energy conservation standards for public housing projects and to carry out a program to demonstrate the effectiveness of energy

conservation measures in public housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 171. A bill to make it an unfair practice for any retailer to increase the price of certain consumer commodities once the retailer marks the price on any such consumer commodity, and to permit the Federal Trade Commission to order any such retailer to refund any amounts of money obtained by so increasing the price of such consumer commodity; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 172. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to fund adolescent health demonstration projects; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 173. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require State Medicaid Programs to provide coverage of screening mammography and screening pap smears; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 174. A bill to provide for the manufacturer, importer, or dealer of a handgun or an assault weapon to be held strictly liable for damages that result from the use of the handgun or assault weapon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 175. A bill to prohibit rental car companies from imposing liability on renters with certain exceptions, to prohibit such companies from selling collision damage waivers in connection with private passenger automobile rental agreements of not more than 30 days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 176. A bill to provide for disclosures for insurance in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 177. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to continue and improve efforts to promote diversity in media ownership, management, and programming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 178. A bill to provide that funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may not be used to purchase articles of packaged food not packaged in the United States or its possessions; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 179. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to the Congress a joint report addressing the question of United States Government responsibility for providing benefits and services to disabled individuals who served with certain voluntary organizations that provided significant assistance to the armed forces of the United States stationed in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 180. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to reduce infant mortality through improvement of coverage of services to pregnant women and infants under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 181. A bill to improve coordination in the formulation of telecommunications policy within the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 182. A bill to provide for disclosures for insurance to interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 183. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require lenders to post current interest rates charged for various categories of loans to consumers; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 184. A bill to amend the privacy provisions of title 5, United States Code, to improve the protection of individual information and to reestablish a permanent Privacy

Protection Commission as an independent entity in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 185. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish procedures for the discontinuance of mobile radio services to persons engaged in drug trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate the rehabilitation of public housing using the low-income housing credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 187. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to prescribe rules to lower market entry barriers for small business, business concerns owned by women and members of minority groups, and non-profit entities that are seeking to provide telecommunication services and information services; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 188. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit direct payment under the Medicare Program for services of registered nurses as assistants at surgery; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 189. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund) to provide for the recycling and management of used oil and to reduce emissions of lead into the ambient air, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 190. A bill to strengthen the authority of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce nondiscrimination policies in Federal employment; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 191. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to deny benefits under the program of aid to families with dependent children with respect to any child who has not received preventive health care or been immunized in accordance with recommendations issued by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act to require that child care providers that receive assistance, directly or indirectly, under such act require all children to be immunized in accordance with such recommendations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 192. A bill to amend the title IV of Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to require operators of emergency shelters and transitional housing assisted under

such title to determine the immunization status of children under the age of 6 occupying such housing; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 193. A bill to establish a comprehensive policy with respect to the provision of health care coverage and services to individuals with severe mental illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 194. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make matching contributions toward the purchase of the Sterling Forest in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 195. A bill entitled "Interstate Child Support Enforcement Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, National Security, and Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 196. A bill to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 197. A bill to encourage the use of remote sensing to promote better agricultural management in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. DORNAN):

H.R. 198. A bill to amend title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 to permit the conversion of wetlands that are 1 acre or less in size; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. CHRYSLER):

H.R. 199. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the deduction for depreciation shall be computed on a neutral cost recovery basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 200. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 201. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the earnings test over a 5-year period for individuals who

have attained retirement age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 202. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a demonstration project to establish a highway corridor from Chihuahua, Mexico, through El Paso, TX, to Denver, CO; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 203. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations concerning use of the term "fresh" in the labeling of poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 204. A bill to require the President to submit to the Congress each year an integrated justification for United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. CANADY):

H.R. 205. A bill to require the Federal Government to incarcerate or to reimburse State and local governments for the cost of incarcerating criminal aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 206. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that persons retiring from the Armed Forces shall be entitled to all benefits which were promised them when they entered the Armed Forces; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. COX:

H.R. 207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a land exchange involving the Cleveland National Forest, California, and to require a boundary adjustment for the national forest to reflect the land exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 208. A bill to repeal the statutory authority for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 209. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 to abolish the National Endowment for the Arts and National Council on the Arts; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 210. A bill to provide for the privatization of the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 211. A bill to limit United States contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 212. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the remedial jurisdiction relating to taxes of inferior Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue code of 1986 to provide for a maximum long-term capital gains rate of 15 percent and indexing of certain capital assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the income taxation of corporations, to impose a 10 percent tax on the earned income (and only the earned income) of individuals, to repeal the estate and gift taxes, to provide amnesty for all tax liability for prior taxable years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GOSS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KIM, and Mr. SCHAEFER):

H.R. 215. A bill to reform the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 216. A bill to provide that certain new Federal programs shall terminate no later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the law that establishes the programs; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 217. A bill to establish a Second National Blue Ribbon Commission to Eliminate Waste in Government; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 218. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 219. A bill to require a temporary moratorium on leasing, exploration, and development on lands of the Outer Continental Shelf of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 220. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to deny aid to families with dependent children to certain individuals for any week in which the individuals work or attend courses at an educational institution for fewer than 30 hours; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTSCH (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 221. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the manufacture, importation, and sale of polymer plastic ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 222. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from finding that a State Medicaid plan is not in compli-

ance with title XIX of the Social Security Act solely on the grounds that the plan does not cover abortions for pregnancies resulting from an act of rape or incest if coverage for such abortions is inconsistent with State law; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 223. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions by nonparty multicandidate political committees; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. DICKEY (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 224. A bill to eliminate fraud in the payment of supplemental security income benefits to children by reason of disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 225. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide congressional authorization for State control over transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 226. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to assure the safety of public water systems; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 227. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide congressional authorization for restrictions on receipt of out-of-State municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 228. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 229. A bill to impose certain requirements on medical malpractice liability claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DORNAN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 230. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent the misuse of certain antitrackteering laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction for medical expenses incurred for an abortion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for dividends paid by domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the limitation on the deductibility of capital losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 234. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make nondischargeable a debt for death or injury caused by the debtor's operation of watercraft while intoxicated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the percentage of completion method of accounting shall not be required to be used with respect to contracts for the manufacture of property

if no payments are required to be made before the completion of the manufacture of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 236. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to permit participating households to use food stamp benefits to purchase nutritional supplements of vitamins, minerals, or vitamins and minerals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 237. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 238. A bill to provide for the protection of wild horses within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and prohibit and removal of such horses; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 239. A bill to rescind the fee required for the use of public recreation areas at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 240. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers who attain age 65 in or after 1982 and to whom applies the 5-year period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 241. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tax-exempt status of Christa McAuliffe Fellowships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 242. A bill to extend the retroactive period during which farm insolvency transactions are exempt from the prior law alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 243. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the earnings test over a 5-year period for individuals who have attained age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KING, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 244. A bill to require certain entities receiving United States funds from the International Fund for Ireland to comply with the MacBride Principles; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 245. A bill concerning paramilitary groups and British security forces in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 246. A bill to repeal the Service Contract Act of 1965; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas:

H.R. 247. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize State maritime academies to reimburse qualified individuals for fees imposed for the issuance of certain entry level merchant seamen licenses and

merchant mariners' documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 248. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the conduct of expanded studies and the establishment of innovative programs with respect to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H.R. 249. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the medicare program of drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of individuals with multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 250. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of non-sporting handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 251. A bill to amend the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 to prevent any action to dissolve, diminish the scope of the mission of, or limit the activities of, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct during certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 252. A bill to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, House Oversight, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H.R. 253. A bill to amend the Act commonly referred to as the "Johnson Act" to limit the authority of States to regulate gambling devices on vessels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 254. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to establishing an unlawful employment practice based on disparate treatment; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself and Mrs. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 255. A bill to designate the Federal Justice Building in Miami, FL, as the "James Lawrence King Federal Justice Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 256. A bill to withdraw and reserve certain public lands and minerals within the State of Colorado for military uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 257. A bill to establish certain requirements relating to the transfer or disposal of public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 258. A bill to establish a non-Federal, for-profit Launch Services Corporation for providing space launch service to the Fed-

eral Government and other domestic and foreign customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. SCHAEFER):

H.R. 259. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to eliminate provisions of Federal law that provide special support for, or burdens on, the operation of Amtrak as a passenger rail carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 260. A bill to provide for the development of a plan and a management review of the National Park System and to reform the process by which areas are considered for addition to the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 261. A bill to provide relief to State and local governments from Federal regulation; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 262. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit multicandidate political committee contributions and expenditures in elections for Federal office; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 263. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane living conditions for calves raised for the production of veal; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 264. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require the slaughter of poultry in accordance with humane methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 265. A bill to require manufacturers of motor vehicles to provide for dissemination to the public all vehicle warranty and repair information provided dealers; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 266. A bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, delivery, or importation of school buses that do not have seat belts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 267. A bill to require that passenger vans shall be subject to the same Federal motor vehicle safety standards as are applicable to passenger motor vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to qualify additional institutions for programs under part B of title III of that Act; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 269. A bill to qualify Martin University of Indianapolis, Indiana, for participation in the program under part B of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 270. A bill to make "America, the Beautiful" the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 271. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the existing Federal employee bonus and incentive award programs and establish a program for incentive awards for Federal employees only for suggestions, inventions, or other personal efforts which cause a demonstrable monetary savings to the Government; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 272. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil service retirement credit to a Federal employee for any period of service performed with the American Red Cross abroad during a period of war; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 273. A bill to amend Public Law 85-745 to provide that a former President may not receive a monetary allowance thereunder except upon waiving the right to receive any other Government annuity or pension; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 274. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of advertising and related expenses in campaigns for the House of Representatives and to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees to candidates who accept such financing; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 275. A bill to prohibit candidates for Congress from accepting multicandidate political committee contributions; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 276. A bill to prohibit candidates for Federal office from using campaign contributions for inherently personal purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 277. A bill to require that any request by the President for a declaration of war include a cost/benefit statement, and to require that any declaration of war by the Congress include such a statement; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 278. A bill to establish the Federal right of every unemancipated child to be supported by such child's parent or parents and, therefore, to confer upon certain local courts of the District of Columbia and every State and territory of the United States jurisdiction to enforce such right regardless of such child's residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 279. A bill to categorize payments from lobbyists to, or on behalf of, Members of Congress as bribery under Federal criminal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 280. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit the next of kin of a deceased veteran to designate the style of flag to be furnished at the burial of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the tax on interest received by foreigners on certain portfolio investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the types of equipment which may be acquired with tax-exempt financing by volunteer fire departments and to provide a comparable treatment for emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 283. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the business deduction for any amount paid or incurred for regularly scheduled air transportation to the extent such amount exceeds the normal tourist class fare for such transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the section 170(e)(5) rules pertaining to gifts of publicly traded stock to certain private foundations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from income tax for certain common investment funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 286. A bill to prohibit States and localities from receiving certain Federal economic development assistance if the State or locality provides improper incentives for location of businesses or organizations within the State or locality; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 287. A bill to eliminate the exemption for Congress or for the United States from the application of certain provisions of Federal law relating to employment and privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 288. A bill to enhance the availability of credit to businesses in order to foster economic growth and stabilization and to create new employment opportunities in communities facing economic distress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 289. A bill to authorize civil actions for certain violations involving depository institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 290. A bill to institute management reforms and eliminate conflicts-of-interest on boards of directors of depository institutions and depository holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 291. A bill to amend the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to improve procedures for the implementation of State compacts providing for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for municipal and industrial solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 292. A bill to improve the collection and dissemination of information relating to the price and supply of home heating fuel, natural gas, and automotive fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 293. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 to establish a presumption of eligibility for disability benefits in the case of certain coal miners who filed claims under part C of such act between July 1, 1973, and April 1, 1980; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 294. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that an individual serving in a position in the competitive or excepted service, under an indefinite or temporary appointment, who performs at least 2 years of service in such a position within a 5-year period, and who passes a suitable non-competitive examination, shall be granted competitive status for purposes of transfer or reassignment; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 295. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into agreements with certain cities and counties for the withholding of city and county income and employment taxes from the pay of Federal employees who are residents of, or regularly employed in, such cities and counties; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 296. A bill to reform campaign practices for elections to the House of Representatives by limiting contributions from political action committees, establishing tax credits for individual campaign contributions, providing matching funds for individual small contributions, limiting the use of personal funds in a campaign, offsetting independent expenditures, encouraging the use of longer campaign commercials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 297. A bill to terminate all U.S. assistance to the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 298. A bill to amend section 3056 in title 18, United States Code, to limit Secret Service protection of former Presidents when they are traveling to engage in income-producing activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 299. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that performance of honor guard functions at funerals for veterans by members of the National Guard may be recognized as a Federal function for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 300. A bill to reauthorize economic development programs under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, to reenact the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as the Economic Development and Financing Act of 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 301. A bill to restore the grave marker allowance for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 302. A bill relating to the period during which certain retail dealer occupational taxes may be assessed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. TEJEDA):

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have service-connected disabilities to receive compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COX, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 304. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating a Federal implementation plan prior to the disapproval of State implementation plan revisions required pursuant to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts):

H.R. 305. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include peonage and slavery offenses as RICO predicates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 306. A bill to modify the project for navigation, Jones Inlet, NY; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KLINK:

H.R. 307. A bill to modify certain regulatory requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding motor vehicle inspection and maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 308. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands and improvements in Hopewell Township, PA, to a nonprofit organization known as the "Beaver County Corporation for Economic Development" to provide a site for economic development; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 309. A bill to require the Congress to comply with the laws which it requires others to comply with; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, Government Reform and Oversight, the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLUG:

H.R. 310. A bill to provide for the privatization of the Federal Power Marketing Administrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 311. A bill to prohibit further Federal funding for the gas turbine-modular helium reactor program of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science.

H.R. 312. A bill to prohibit funding to carry out the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 313. A bill to direct the President to develop a plan for transferring all real property, facilities, and equipment of the Tennessee Valley Authority to public and private entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 314. A bill to provide for monthly reporting of child support obligations to certain consumer reporting agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 315. A bill to offer States a national welfare reform option and incentives to implement the welfare reform option, to strengthen child support enforcement, to provide all States with the flexibility and resources necessary to promote work and self-sufficiency, to expand access to affordable child care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. MCCREY):

H.R. 316. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to clarify the due process protections applicable to directors and officers of insured depository institutions

and other institution-affiliated parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 317. A bill to amend the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 to reduce onerous recordkeeping and reporting requirements for regulated financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 318. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to establish a priority for the payment of claims for retiree health benefits in liquidation cases under chapters 7 and 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 319. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make the knowing disclosure of classified information by Federal officers and employees a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 320. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide civil and criminal forfeitures for certain offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 321. A bill to deem the Florida panther to be an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCINTOSH:

H.R. 322. A bill entitled the "Law Abiding Citizens Safety Act of 1995"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to a medical savings account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. PETRI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 324. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain disclosures with respect to phone bank communications; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 325. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles traveled in ozone nonattainment areas designated as severe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 326. A bill to provide that compliance by the States with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 shall be voluntary; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. McCRERY:

H.R. 327. A bill to assure that advertisements by States for participation in their lotteries are subject to regulation by the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contribution to individual investment accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the income tax imposed on estates and trusts shall be determined using the rate table applicable to married individuals filing separate returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINGE:

H.R. 330. A bill to require that excess funds provided for official allowances of Members

of the House of Representatives be dedicated to deficit reduction; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 331. A bill to require the Federal Government to consider as having arrived on time any sealed bid submitted in response to a solicitation for a procurement of goods or services if the bid was sent by an overnight message delivery service at least 2 working days before the date specified for receipt of bids; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 332. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for transportation by the Department of Defense of certain children requiring specialized medical services in the United States; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for capital gains for middle-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage savings by increasing the amount of deductible contributions which may be made to an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and increase the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. TEJEDA):

H.R. 336. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new medical facility for veterans in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 337. A bill to repeal the Truth in Savings Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. PACKARD:

H.R. 338. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect against code grabbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 339. A bill to provide for an increase in the number of Border Patrol agents, to provide for the deployment of Border Patrol agents at the Southwest border, and to provide for additional detention facilities for illegal aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 340. A bill to terminate certain Border Patrol traffic checkpoint operations in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 341. A bill to prohibit direct Federal financial benefits and unemployment benefits for illegal aliens; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H.R. 342. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide congressional authorization of State control over transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 343. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to reauthorize the Conservation Reserve Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 344. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to reinstate an exemption with respect to the employment of individuals as State and local firefighters and law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 345. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that public ceremonies for the admission of new citizens shall be considered solely in English; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 346. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a riverine patrol boat of the U.S.S. *Swift* class to Tidewater Community College, Portsmouth, VA; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 347. A bill to repeal the requirement that ships' stores of the Navy be operated as nonappropriated fund instrumentalities; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 348. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to use available amount to make grants to qualified ship repair yard to pay 75 percent of the cost of acquiring advanced ship repair technology and modern ship repair technology; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 349. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain periodical publications shall not be bound publications for mail classification purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 350. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny annuity benefits with respect to any Member of Congress convicted of a felony and to terminate the salary of any justice or judge of the United States who is convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 351. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to eliminate certain provisions relating to bilingual voting requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 352. A bill to establish uniform national standards for the resolution of medical malpractice claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 353. A bill to prohibit the export of American black bear viscera, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to a medical savings account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. CANADY):

H.R. 355. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent certain mass mailings from being sent as franked mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration for such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H.R. 356. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to ban activities of political action committees in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KLECZKA):

H.R. 357. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 358. A bill to repeal the authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia to requisition unlimited funds from the Treasury of the United States to meet the general expenses of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BONO, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. COX, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KIM, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. FRISA, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 359. A bill to restore the term of patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 360. A bill to provide for the deobligation of certain unexpended balances of funds made available for foreign economic assistance; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 361. A bill to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 362. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Federal district judge

for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 363. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage and to provide for an increase in such wage based on the cost of living; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. SCHAEFER:

H.R. 364. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to Federal facilities pollution control; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 365. A bill to apply the antitrust laws of the United States to major league baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 366. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to apply to Hispanic-serving institutions of higher education the same student loan default rate limitations applicable to historically Black colleges and universities; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 367. A bill to repeal the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 368. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to add bronchioloalveolar carcinoma to the list of diseases presumed to be service-connected for certain radiation-exposed veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 369. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study regarding Fort King, FL; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 370. A bill to repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 371. A bill to prohibit a State from imposing an income tax on the pension income of individuals who are not residents or domiciliaries of that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. CALLAHAN):

H.R. 372. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act regarding public charge status of aliens and the financial responsibility of sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 373. A bill to effect a moratorium on immigration by aliens other than refugees, priority workers, and the spouses and children of U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 374. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. CALLAHAN):

H.R. 375. A bill to provide for asylum reform, prohibition of Federal benefits to certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 376. A bill to provide for return of excess amounts from official allowances of Members of the House of Representatives to the Treasury for deficit reduction; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 377. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Burt Lake Band as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 378. A bill to require the transfer of certain Coast Guard property to the Traverse City Area Public School District in Traverse City, MI; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to define tar sands for purposes of the credit for producing fuels for nonconventional sources and to repeal the minimum tax preference for intangible drilling costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 380. A bill to protect home ownership and equity through enhanced disclosure of the risks associated with certain mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 381. A bill to improve health status in medically disadvantaged communities through comprehensive community-based managed care programs; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 382. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of affectional or sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 383. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Weather Information System Act of 1990 to improve the collection and distribution of weather information to assist agricultural producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 384. A bill to establish counseling programs for disabled police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 385. A bill to establish a commission responsible for making recommendations for laws that will control crime and formulating a national firearms policy without denying second amendment rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 386. A bill to provide that professional baseball teams and leagues composed of such teams shall be subject to the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 387. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign Department of Defense personnel to assist the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Customs Service perform their border protection functions; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 388. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in meeting the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for additional facilities, to select abandoned and underutilized facilities in depressed communities; to the Committee on Science.

H.R. 389. A bill to discourage domestic corporations from establishing foreign manufacturing subsidiaries in order to avoid Federal taxes by including in gross income of U.S. shareholders in foreign corporations the retained earnings of any such subsidiary which are attributable to manufacturing operations in runaway plants or tax havens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the burden of proof shall be on the Secretary of the Treasury in all tax cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the foreign tax credit and deduction for taxes paid in lieu of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate a 10-percent domestic investment tax credit, to provide a credit for the purchase of domestic durable goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 393. A bill to prohibit the commercial harvesting of Atlantic striped bass in the coastal waters and the exclusive economic zone; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 394. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit State taxation of certain pension income; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 395. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse and Federal building to be constructed at the southeastern corner of Liberty and South Virginia Streets in Reno, NV, as the "Bruce R. Thompson United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 396. A bill to require hearing loss testing for all newborns in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 397. A bill to apply arbitration to major league baseball, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 398. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 to provide for greater disclosure of lending to small businesses; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 399. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding false identification documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 400. A bill to provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 401. A bill entitled the "Kenai Natives Association Equity Act"; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 402. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 403. A bill to repeal the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, require the sale of all

loans made under such act, and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to electric generation and transmission cooperatives which are unable to obtain needed financing in the private sector; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 404. A bill to deny Federal benefits for 10 years to persons convicted of making a fraudulent representation with respect to residence in order to receive benefits from two or more States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 405. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty enhancement for the use of juveniles in Federal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 406. A bill to direct the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing a national angler's license; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 407. A bill to terminate the International Space Station Alpha Program; to the Committee on Science.

H.R. 408. A bill to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of business meals and entertainment made by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 409. A bill to repeal the increase in the tax on transportation fuels made by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 411. A bill to supersede the modification of final judgment entered August 24, 1982, in the antitrust action styled *United States v. Western Electric*, Civil Action No. 82-0192, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to regulate the manufacturing of Bell operating companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 420. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide, in the case of any person who is a party in interest with respect to an employee benefit plan, that information requested from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to assist such person with respect to the administration of such plan shall be provided at least once without charge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 421. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for the purchase of common stock of Cook Inlet Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HYDE,

Mr. TATE, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas (for themselves, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONO, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr.

CHRYSLER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CREMEANS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. EHRlich):

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr.

PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. LOBIONDO (for themselves, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BASS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FRISA, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HANCOCK,

Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. MCINNIS):

H.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FOX, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. METCALF, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BASS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KIM, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. COX, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROTH, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BONO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. TATE, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. TALENT):

H.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the period of time U.S. Senators and Representatives may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SEN-

SENBRENNER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DEAL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. FORBES):

H.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for 4-year terms for Representatives and to limit the number of terms Senators and Representatives may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COMBEST, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KLUG, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. POSHARD):

H.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CANADY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the terms of office for Representatives and Senators in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to require that congressional resolutions setting forth levels of total budget outlays and Federal revenues must be agreed to by two-thirds vote of both Houses of the Congress if the level of outlays exceeds the level of revenues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the proposal and

the enactment of laws by popular vote of the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the number of consecutive terms for Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit compelling the attendance of a student in a public school other than the public school nearest the residence of such student; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

H.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to voluntary school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLARD:

H.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for budgetary reform by requiring the reduction of the deficit, a balanced Federal budget, and the repayment of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the terms of offices of Members of Congress and increasing the term of Representatives to 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no person may be

elected to the House of Representatives more than three times, and providing that no person may be elected to the Senate more than once; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN (for himself, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HYDE, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ms. DANNER):

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States barring Federal unfunded mandates to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DEAL, Mr. AL-LARD, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BUNN, Mr. BUR-  
TON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COL-  
LINS of Georgia, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. PETE  
GEREN of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KIM, Mr. KLUK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MINGE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit terms of Representatives and Senators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the President to grant a pardon to an individual only after such individual has been convicted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for balanced budgets and elimination of the Federal indebtedness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to physical desecration of the flag of the United States and expenditure of money to elect public officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution for the relief of Alexander Vraicu; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. MCCRERY:

H.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the terms of office for Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that expenditures for a fiscal year shall neither exceed revenues for such fiscal year nor 19 per centum of the Nation's gross national product for the last calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the terms of Representatives and Senators, and to provide for a 4-year term for Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the number of consecutive years a person may serve in or be employed by the Government of the United States or be employed to affect the policies and programs of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restrict annual deficits by limiting the public debt of the United States and requiring a favorable vote of the people on any law to exceed such limits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United

States relative to the desecration of the American Flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding Presidential election voting rights for residents of U.S. territories; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the President to veto any item of appropriation or any provision in any act or joint resolution containing an item of appropriation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for 4 year terms for Members of the House of Representatives and to provide that Members may not serve more than three terms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation and to allow an item veto of appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations bills and an item veto on contract authority or taxation changes in any other bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution recognizing the sacrifice and courage of Army Warrant Officers David Hilemon and Bobby W. Hall II, whose helicopter was shot down over North Korea on December 17, 1994; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. COBLE:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not be subject to cost-of-living adjustments; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Office of Personnel Management should provide certain vocational rehabilitation services in its administration of the Civil Service Disability Retirement Program; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek to negotiate a new base rights agreement with the Government of Panama to permit the United States Armed Forces to remain in Panama beyond December 31, 1999, and to permit the United States to act independently to continue to protect the Panama Canal; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the right of all Americans to keep and bear arms in defense of life or liberty and in the pursuit of all other legitimate endeavors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution recognizing the cultural importance of the many languages spoken in the United States and indicating the sense of the House (the Senate concurring) that the United States should maintain the use of English as a language common to all peoples; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any Federal agency that utilizes the Draize rabbit eye irritancy test should develop and validate alternative ophthalmic testing procedures that do not require the use of animal test subjects; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the slaughter of Greek civilians in Kalavryta, Greece, during the Second World War; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek to negotiate a new base rights agreement with the Government of Panama to permit the United States Armed Forces to remain in Panama beyond December 31, 1999, and to permit the United States to act independently to continue to protect the Panama Canal; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the current Federal income tax deduction for interest paid on debt secured by a first or second home should not be further restricted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the expression of self-determination by the people of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution relating to the Republic of China's (Taiwan) participation in the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BOEHRNER:

H. Res. 1. Resolution electing officers of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 2. Resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled and of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 3. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the Congress; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 4. Resolution authorizing the Clerk to inform the President of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 5. Resolution providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 6) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 6. Resolution adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Res. 7. Resolution providing for the designation of certain minority employees; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 8. Resolution fixing the daily hour of meeting for the 104th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 9. Resolution providing amounts for the Republican Steering Committee and the Democratic Policy Committee; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 10. Resolution providing for the transfer of two employee positions; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOEHRNER:

H. Res. 11. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FAZIO:

H. Res. 12. Resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 13. Resolution electing Representative BERNARD SANDERS of Vermont to standing committees; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LINDER:

H. Res. 14. Resolution providing for the consideration of a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETRI, Ms. DANNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CANADY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. TORKILDSEN):

H. Res. 15. Resolution requiring that travel awards that accrue by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives be used only with respect to official travel; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Res. 16. Resolution requiring that the upcoming audit of House financial records and administrative operations include a thorough examination of certain aspects of official allowances for Members; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. Res. 17. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the

United States should seek a final and conclusive account of the whereabouts and definitive fate of Raoul Wallenberg; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 18. Resolution requiring Members of the House of Representatives to pay \$600 from the official expenses allowance for each instance of extraneous matter printed in that portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks"; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Res. 19. Resolution providing for enclosing the galleries of the House of Representatives with a transparent and substantial material; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H. Res. 20. Resolution to enhance public confidence in the U.S. Congress by amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to treat copyright royalties received by Members, officers, and employees as honoraria; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 21. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on POW and MIA Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLUG:

H. Res. 22. Resolution requiring that travel awards from official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives be used only for official travel; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H. Res. 23. Resolution prohibiting the use of appropriated funds for the purchase of certain calendars for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H. Res. 24. Resolution requiring the appropriate committees of the House to report legislation to transfer certain functions of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ORTON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 25. Resolution requesting that the Secretary of the Interior withdraw proposed regulations concerning right-of-way granted under section 2477 of the revised statutes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H. Res. 26. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a three-fifths vote of the House on passage of any measure carrying an income tax rate increase; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 27. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Appropriations to create a new Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 28. Resolution repealing rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 410. A bill for the relief of the estate of Wallace B. Sawyer, Jr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 412. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade

for the vessel *Finesse*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 413. A bill to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Smalley 6808* amphibious dredge; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 414. A bill to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *REEL TOY*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 415. A bill for the relief of Gerald Albert Carriere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 416. A bill for the relief of Sara Lou Hendricks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (by request):

H.R. 417. A bill for the relief of Charmaine Bleda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 418. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Carron, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 419. A bill for the relief of Benchmark Rail Group, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to air standards in places of employment; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Industry of the Month Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

3. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Peace Corps' World Wise Schools Program; to the Committee on International Relations.

4. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Osaka Prefectural Government; to the Committee on International Relations.

5. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Code Enforcement Week; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

6. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Italian Americans; to the Committee on House Oversight.

7. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the memorial highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Roger Van Den Broeke Memorial Plaque; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Veterans' Memorial Freeway; to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Veterans' Memorial Freeway; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Stone Turnpike Memorial Freeway; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

12. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to special highway designations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

13. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the H. Dana Bowers Memorial Vista Point; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

14. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to State trade and commerce with Japan and other Pacific rim nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Embassy of the Argentine Republic, relative to GATT; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.