

Federal Government is telling our elderly citizens to stay at home, and not to pursue gainful employment. That is not the message that I want to send to the seniors in the 3d Congressional District of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's seniors have too much to offer for us to simply turn them away. We need their wisdom, their expertise and their zeal.

Older Americans have tremendous potential to contribute to our communities, both in terms of professional expertise and productivity. It is a shame to lose those invaluable resources. Furthermore, Seniors who are active live longer and lead happier lives.

I strongly support the Senior Citizen's Right to Work Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice some concerns with H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act. Although I will support the bill on final passage, I am concerned about the effect that some of the more obscure provisions in the legislation may have on the rights of senior citizens.

Included in this bill are provisions which remove the Social Security Administration from the process of payment of attorneys' fees. Currently, the Social Security Administration [SSA] approves the fees that an attorney may charge to represent a person in administrative proceedings, usually related to a denial of disability benefits. When the applicant is successful, SSA withholds the lesser of \$4,000 or 25 percent of the benefits to pay the attorney. H.R. 2684 would change the law such that SSA would no longer be involved in the process and attorneys could negotiate fees up to a \$4,000 limit.

This portion of H.R. 2684, while seeming sublime on the surface, may result in attorneys choosing to stop representing disabled individuals in their administrative proceedings. Since the fee would no longer be withheld, attorneys are fearful that they may not be paid for the service they provide, and thus may choose to avoid this type of representation.

While I will support the legislation, I regret that the leadership has chosen to bring this legislation to the floor in such a fashion so as to preclude amendments, and I hope to work with the Senate and the White House concerning the availability of competent representation for Social Security claimants.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1995, and commend its sponsor, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] for all of his hard work on this measure.

Under current law, this country's senior citizens from age 65 to age 69 are limited to earn only \$11,280 in additional income before they suffer penalties of \$1 in Social Security benefits for every \$3 of income earned above that limit. Mr. BUNNING's measure will allow seniors by the year 2000, to earn up to \$30,000 in outside income without being forced to give up Social Security benefits.

While this bill is certainly a step in the right direction, I believe that we should go further and eliminate this anachronistic limitation and thereby allow our seniors to continue to work to the best of their capabilities in order to sustain themselves in a time of an increasing cost of living. We must allow older Americans who choose to work to earn appropriate pay with-

out losing any of their hard-earned Social Security benefits.

Mr. BEILINSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us obviously enjoys very broad support among our colleagues. However, we ought to pause for a moment and give serious thought to what we are doing by passing this measure.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that we will spend more than \$350 billion on Social Security benefits in 1996—more than one-fifth of the budget, and more than we are spending on any other single Federal program. Working Americans—no matter how little they make—6.2 percent of their paycheck—with their employers paying the same amount—to finance these benefits. Yet not only have we taken this huge program off the budget negotiating table, we are now actually moving to increase it—at a time when we are trying to cut back just about everything else the Government spends money on.

We need to give serious thought to whether it makes sense to increase these benefits—when the majority of that increase will go to those who are already relatively well off—at a time when we are moving to cut benefits for people who really need them.

We also need to give serious thought to whether it is wise to make what will be a huge move toward turning Social Security into a benefit which one is automatically entitled to receive upon reaching age 65, rather than a program to compensate for lost earnings due to retirement, as was originally intended. We need to ask: Does it make sense to do that when people are living so much longer than they used to, and when our population of older Americans is going to begin growing enormously in just a few years?

And, we ought to consider whether we are inviting early retirees—ages 62–64—to ask for the same thing we are about to grant retirees aged 65–69. Once we increase the earnings limitation for recipients who are aged 65–69, will early retirees ask for a liberalization of the definition of "retired" using the very same arguments that are being made by those aged 65–69?

The title of this bill, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act, is a misnomer. Senior citizens have every right to work; what this does is give older working Americans the right to collect more Social Security benefits than they are currently entitled to. At a time when we ought to be curbing entitlement spending, not expanding it, passing this legislation seems most unwise.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2684, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2684, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—REQUEST FOR REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT REGARDING COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution—on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON]—which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker Newt Gingrich;

Whereas the Committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent, non-partisan, outside counsel—a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the Committee was established;

Whereas—although complaints against Speaker Gingrich have been under consideration for more than 14 months—the Committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel;

Whereas the Committee has also deviated from other long-standing precedents and rules of procedure; including its failure to adopt a Resolution of Preliminary Inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony;

Whereas these procedural irregularities—and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent, outside counsel—have led to widespread concern that the Committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House;

Whereas a resolution calling for a status report on the Gingrich investigation was tabled by the House without debate on November 17, 1995;

Whereas a second resolution calling for a status report on the Gingrich investigation was tabled by the House without debate on November 30, 1995;

Whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people in the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Therefore be it resolved that;

The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House, no later than December 19, 1995, concerning:

(1) the status of the Committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker Gingrich;

(2) the Committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a non-partisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation;

(3) a timetable for Committee action on the complaints.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the

chair in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce designation at a later time. In the meantime, the form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Florida will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not at this point making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated by the Chair for consideration of the resolution.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-381) on the resolution (H. Res. 289) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, 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.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1058, PRIVATE SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-382) on the resolution (H. Res. 290) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1058) to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today, in the order in which the motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 869, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 965, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 1804, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 2684, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

#### THOMAS D. LAMBROS FEDERAL BUILDING AND U.S. COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business in the question of sus-

pending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 869, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 869, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 834]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Crane	Gutknecht
Ackerman	Crapo	Hall (OH)
Allard	Cremeans	Hall (TX)
Andrews	Cubin	Hamilton
Archer	Cunningham	Hancock
Armey	Danner	Hansen
Bachus	Davis	Harman
Baessler	de la Garza	Hastert
Baker (CA)	Deal	Hastings (FL)
Baker (LA)	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Baldacci	DeLay	Hayes
Ballenger	Dellums	Hayworth
Barcia	Deutsch	Hefley
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hefner
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Heineman
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Herger
Bartlett	Dixon	Hilleary
Barton	Doggett	Hilliard
Bass	Dooley	Hinchey
Bateman	Doolittle	Hobson
Becerra	Dornan	Hoekstra
Beilenson	Doyle	Hoke
Bentsen	Dreier	Holden
Bereuter	Duncan	Horn
Berman	Dunn	Hostettler
Bevill	Durbin	Houghton
Bilbray	Edwards	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Hunter
Bishop	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Bliley	Emerson	Hyde
Blute	Engel	Inglis
Boehlert	English	Istook
Boehner	Ensign	Jackson-Lee
Bonilla	Eshoo	Jacobs
Bonior	Evans	Jefferson
Bono	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Ewing	Johnson (SD)
Boucher	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Brewster	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Browder	Fawell	Johnston
Brown (CA)	Fazio	Jones
Brown (FL)	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Fields (TX)	Kaptur
Brownback	Filner	Kasich
Bryant (TN)	Flake	Kelly
Bunn	Flanagan	Kennedy (MA)
Bunning	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Foley	Kennelly
Burton	Forbes	Kildee
Buyer	Ford	Kim
Callahan	Fox	King
Calvert	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Camp	Franks (CT)	Klecicka
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Klink
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Klug
Castle	Frisa	Knollenberg
Chabot	Frost	Kolbe
Chambliss	Funderburk	LaFalce
Christensen	Furse	LaHood
Chrysler	Galleghy	Lantos
Clay	Ganske	Largent
Clayton	Gejdenson	Latham
Clement	Gekas	LaTourette
Clinger	Gephardt	Laughlin
Clyburn	Geren	Lazio
Coble	Gibbons	Leach
Coburn	Gilchrest	Levin
Coleman	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Collins (GA)	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Collins (IL)	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Collins (MI)	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Combest	Goodling	Lincoln
Condit	Gordon	Linder
Conyers	Goss	Lipinski
Cooley	Graham	Livingston
Costello	Green	LoBiondo
Cox	Greenwood	Lofgren
Coyne	Gunderson	Longley
Cramer	Gutierrez	Lowey

Lucas	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Luther	Payne (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Maloney	Payne (VA)	Solomon
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Souder
Manzullo	Peterson (MN)	Spence
Markey	Petri	Spratt
Martinez	Pickett	Stark
Martini	Pombo	Stearns
Mascara	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Matsui	Porter	Stockman
McCarthy	Portman	Stokes
McCollum	Poshard	Stump
McCrery	Pryce	Stupak
McDade	Quillen	Talent
McDermott	Quinn	Tanner
McHale	Radanovich	Tate
McHugh	Rahall	Tauzin
McIntosh	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
McKeon	Rangel	Taylor (NC)
McKinney	Reed	Tejeda
McNulty	Regula	Thomas
Meehan	Richardson	Thompson
Meek	Riggs	Thornberry
Menendez	Rivers	Thornton
Metcalfe	Roberts	Thurman
Meyers	Roemer	Tiahrt
Mfume	Rogers	Torkildsen
Mica	Rohrabacher	Torres
Miller (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Miller (FL)	Rose	Trafficant
Minge	Roth	Upton
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Moakley	Royce	Vento
Molinari	Sabo	Visclosky
Mollohan	Salmon	Volkmer
Montgomery	Sanders	Vucanovich
Moorhead	Sanford	Walker
Moran	Sawyer	Walsh
Morella	Saxton	Wamp
Murtha	Scarborough	Ward
Myers	Schaefer	Waters
Myrick	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Neal	Schroeder	Watts (OK)
Nethercutt	Schumer	Waxman
Neumann	Scott	Weldon (FL)
Ney	Seastrand	Weldon (PA)
Norwood	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Nussle	Serrano	White
Oberstar	Shadeegg	Whitfield
Obey	Shaw	Wicker
Olver	Shays	Williams
Ortiz	Shuster	Wise
Orton	Sisisky	Wolf
Owens	Skaggs	Woolsey
Oxley	Skeen	Wynn
Packard	Skelton	Yates
Pallone	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Parker	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Pastor	Smith (NJ)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Bryant (TX)	McInnis	Torricelli
Chapman	Nadler	Tucker
Chenoweth	Pelosi	Waldholtz
DeFazio	Roukema	Wilson
Dingell	Rush	Wyden
Fowler	Studds	Zeliff

□ 1747

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended as to read: "A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown, OH, as the 'Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building and United States Courthouse'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may