

Brownback	Hayes	Pombo
Bryant (TN)	Hayworth	Pomeroy
Bunn	Hefley	Porter
Bunning	Hefner	Portman
Burr	Heineman	Poshard
Burton	Herger	Pryce
Buyer	Hilleary	Quillen
Callahan	Hobson	Quinn
Calvert	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Camp	Hoke	Rahall
Canady	Holden	Ramstad
Chabot	Hostettler	Regula
Chambliss	Hunter	Riggs
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Roberts
Christensen	Hyde	Roemer
Chrysler	Inglis	Rogers
Clement	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Clinger	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Coburn	Jones	Roukema
Collins (GA)	Kasich	Royce
Combest	Kim	Salmon
Cooley	King	Sanford
Costello	Kingston	Saxton
Cox	Knollenberg	Scarborough
Cramer	LaFalce	Schaefer
Crane	LaHood	Seastrand
Crapo	Largent	Sensenbrenner
Cremeans	Latham	Shadegg
Cubin	LaTourette	Shaw
Cunningham	Laughlin	Shuster
Danner	Lewis (CA)	Sisisky
Davis	Lewis (KY)	Skeen
de la Garza	Lightfoot	Skelton
Deal	Linder	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Dickey	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Doolittle	Longley	Solomon
Dornan	Lucas	Souder
Dreier	Manton	Spence
Duncan	Manzullo	Spratt
Dunn	Martini	Stearns
Edwards	McCollum	Stenholm
Ehlers	McCrery	Stockman
Ehrlich	McHugh	Stump
Emerson	McInnis	Stupak
Everett	McIntosh	Talent
Ewing	McKeon	Tanner
Fawell	McNulty	Tate
Fields (TX)	Metcalf	Tauzin
Forbes	Meyers	Taylor (MS)
Fowler	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Tejeda
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Thornberry
Frisa	Mollohan	Tiahrt
Funderburk	Montgomery	Upton
Galleghy	Moorhead	Visclosky
Ganske	Myers	Vucanovich
Gekas	Myrick	Waldholtz
Geren	Nethercutt	Walker
Gillmor	Neumann	Walsh
Goodlatte	Ney	Wamp
Goodling	Norwood	Watts (OK)
Gordon	Nussle	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Ortiz	Weller
Graham	Orton	Whitfield
Gutknecht	Oxley	Wicker
Hall (OH)	Packard	Wilson
Hall (TX)	Parker	Wise
Hamilton	Paxon	Wolf
Hancock	Payne (VA)	Young (AK)
Hansen	Peterson (MN)	Young (FL)
Hastert	Petri	Zeliff
Hastings (WA)	Pickett	Zimmer

NOES—172

Abercrombie	Clayton	Evans
Ackerman	Clyburn	Farr
Andrews	Coleman	Fattah
Baldacci	Collins (IL)	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Filner
Barton	Condit	Flake
Becerra	Conyers	Flanagan
Beilenson	Coyne	Foglietta
Bentsen	DeFazio	Foley
Berman	DeLauro	Ford
Bishop	Dellums	Frank (MA)
Blute	Deutsch	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Dicks	Frelinghuysen
Bonior	Dingell	Frost
Bono	Dixon	Furse
Borski	Doggett	Gejdenson
Brown (CA)	Dooley	Gephardt
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Gibbons
Brown (OH)	Durbin	Gilchrest
Bryant (TX)	Engel	Gilman
Cardin	English	Gonzalez
Castle	Ensign	Green
Clay	Eshoo	Greenwood

Gunderson	Markey	Sanders
Gutierrez	Martinez	Sawyer
Hastings (FL)	Mascara	Schiff
Hilliard	Matsui	Schroeder
Hinchey	McCarthy	Schumer
Horn	McDermott	Scott
Houghton	McHale	Serrano
Hoyer	McKinney	Shays
Jackson-Lee	Meehan	Skaggs
Jacobs	Meek	Slaughter
Jefferson	Menendez	Stark
Johnson (CT)	Mfume	Stokes
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (CA)	Studds
Johnston	Minge	Thomas
Kanjorski	Mink	Thompson
Kaptur	Moran	Thurman
Kelly	Morella	Torkildsen
Kennedy (MA)	Nadler	Torres
Kennedy (RI)	Neal	Torricelli
Kennelly	Oberstar	Towns
Kildee	Olver	Traficant
Kleczka	Owens	Velazquez
Klink	Pallone	Vento
Klug	Pastor	Ward
Kolbe	Payne (NJ)	Waters
Lantos	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Lazio	Peterson (FL)	Waxman
Leach	Rangel	White
Levin	Reed	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Woolsey
Lincoln	Rivers	Wyden
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Wynn
Lowe	Roybal-Allard	Yates
Luther	Rush	
Maloney	Sabo	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—10

Chapman	Moakley	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Harman	Thornton	
McDade	Tucker	

□ 1840

Mr. BONO, Mr. BALDACCI, and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. NEY and Mr. FORBES changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2446) 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, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-304) on the resolution (H. Res. 253) waiving points of order against the further conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department

of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes 733 and 734, I was unavoidably detained and was not here to vote.

Mr. Speaker, had I been here to vote, I would have voted, "aye" on rollcall vote 733 and "aye" on rollcall vote 734.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on House Oversight, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on National Security, Committee on Resources, Committee on Science, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the 5-minute special orders granted today to Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CLINGER be transposed.

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

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSE TO DYING ON THE VINE

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I just must respond to the comments made by the gentleman before me because they are simply not true.

What the Speaker has said in a speech last week was he would like for the Health Care Financing Administration to wither on the vine. So would I. So would everyone.

As we take Medicare into more private markets with managed care opportunities and private insurance opportunities, we hope that the Health

Care Financing Administration, which has strangled health care with regulatory burdens, does indeed die on the vine.

Let me also point out that in 1965 when Medicare was passed, nearly half of the Republicans then in this House voted in favor of it. That should be pointed out again. Nearly half of the Republicans supported it. Over half support it now. Nearly all of us want to fix it, preserve it, protect it. But allowing erroneous statements to be made simply is not helping the process.

HCFA, the Health Care Financing Administration, should wither on the vine. Medicare will be better for it.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the speech by Speaker GINGRICH follows:

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 27, 1995]

GINGRICH SAYS HALT MONOPOLY

Text of House Speaker Newt Gingrich's remarks before a conference of Blue Cross and Blue Shield on Tuesday.

Now let me talk a little bit about Medicare. Let me start at the vision level so you understand how radically different we are and why it's so hard for the press corps to cover us. Medicare is the 1964 Blue Cross plan codified into law by Lyndon B. Johnson, and it is about what you'd—I mean, if you all went out in the marketplace tomorrow morning and said, "Hi, I've got a 1964 Blue Cross plan," I'll let you decide how competitive you'd be. But I don't think very.

So what we're trying to do, first of all, is say, OK, here is a government monopoly plan. We're designing a free-market plan. Now, they're very different models. You know, we tell Boris Yeltsin, "Get rid of centralized command bureaucracies. Go to the marketplace." OK, what do you think the Health Care Financing Administration is? It's a centralized command bureaucracy. It's everything we're telling Boris Yeltsin to get rid of. Now we don't get rid of it in Round 1 because we don't think that that's politically smart and we don't think that's the right way to go through a transition. But we believe it's going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it—voluntarily. Notice the difference, again, from the Clinton plan. No one under our plan is coerced into doing anything.

□ 1845

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HEARING "PROP" INCIDENT DOES NOT MERIT ETHICS INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Halloween is over and it is time to take off the masks and reveal to the American public the truth about the so-called ethics matter regarding a prop used at a recent subcommittee hearing in the Government Reform and Oversight

Committee. The truth is that this issue is really about partisan politics. I shouldn't have to be here tonight, or for that matter none of us should be. I find it truly discouraging when Congress has so many urgent matters at hand, balancing the budget, health care, and education, just to name a few, we find ourselves having to spend time and money addressing a matter that deserves nothing more than a brief explanation and an apology. Both of which have already been done.

I hope tonight that once and for all we can put an end to discussing this issue—we are beating a dead horse. Many of us, like myself, are sick and tired of discussing this nonissue. Clearly, this whole incident has been exaggerated and blown way out of proportion.

Let me clarify exactly what happened. On September 28 as part of a hearing conducted by the National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs Subcommittee a prop was prepared to show that certain organizations received Federal grants. The prop, a large chart prepared by HIS, was a reproduction of the organization's letterhead and showed in red ink the amount of Federal funds received by several members of the organization. The exhibit was xeroxed on letter size paper so that those that might not otherwise be able to see the easel could review it, including members of the press, and was released before the prop itself. The prop did not include any identifying information on it as to who prepared it as many hearing props do not; it was to be used for questioning a witness as to whether the information on the chart was accurate. No one who saw the prop or document would believe that it was put out by the organization itself.

Was there a crime committed? Was there a conscious attempt to deceive? Was this a forgery? The answer to each of these questions is a resounding no. This whole incident is being blown out of proportion. What did occur is that a new staffer on the Hill simply made an error. A human error. Nothing more, nothing less. Our Democrat colleagues want to spend more taxpayer money on trying to pursue an ethics violation. However, if one looks at the history of the types of ethics investigations brought before the House in the past they are far more serious charges, such as bribery or sexual harassment. There is no basis for comparison. The one incident referenced last week regarding a staffer who in 1983 intentionally and maliciously altered transcripts, which are official records of the House was a concern because of the legal nature of the document as legislative history. There is a big distinction between a prop used at a hearing to question a witness and altering the official records of the House. There is absolutely no precedent in the history of the House for bringing up an ethics charge based upon the unintentional actions of a staffer creating a prop for

purposes of questioning a witness at a hearing.

In fact, we all make errors. I would like to expose some of the inaccuracies expressed last week in speeches given by my Democrat colleagues with regards to this incident. I will give them the benefit of the doubt, and assume that they too were errors. First, it was stated that Subcommittee Chairman MCINTOSH did not issue a letter of apology for some time, but in fact, a written letter of apology was issued that very same day. Second, it was stated the motion to table Mrs. SLAUGHTER's resolution was voted down twice—when in fact it was only voted down once by the House. Third, this incident is being mischaracterized as a criminal forgery. This is erroneous. For the record, according to the Perkins' casebook defining criminal law the term "forgery" means the fraudulent making of a false writing having apparent legal significance. This prop had no such legal significance; it was not done intentionally, and it was not done to deceive. It was intended to be used for the purposes of questioning a witness during a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, there was no forgery and there was no crime committed. What I find most embarrassing and upsetting about this entire incident is the amount of time and money spent by Members discussing it on the House floor. There is nothing more to discuss—so let's be done with it and get on with the business that the taxpayers sent us here to do.

HOLDING DEBT CEILING HOSTAGE WILL HURT WORKING AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in the past 220 years, America has been through 10 wars, the westward expansion, a Civil War, the Industrial Revolution, the Great Depression, Naziism, and Communism. This Capitol that we reside in right now was even burned in 1812, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, through it all, through all of that, for 220 years, the government has paid its bills. It has always paid its bills. But now Speaker GINGRICH is threatening to put it all at risk.

The Washington Times pointed out last Thursday, in order to force through the extreme Republican budget, they pointed out by the way which would cut Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy, they pointed out that the Speaker is threatening to throw the U.S. Government into default for the first time in our history.

In order to ram through their Medicare cuts, Speaker GINGRICH is willing to use the debt limit to blackmail the President, to hold America's working families hostage, and put us in league with some of the Third World nations who have not met their obligations over the years and who do not honor their promises.