

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1704

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EWING] at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 889, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 889, be instructed to form a conference agreement that does not add to the national deficit in the current fiscal year and cumulatively through fiscal year 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances, I would not be here making this motion that I am making today, because I think that under ordinary circumstances the administration would have every right to request an emergency appropriation for these items and the Congress would have every right to consider them on an emergency basis. In plain language, considering them on an emergency basis means that we would not have to offset the expenditures in this bill, and they could be treated as an emergency and could, therefore, add to the deficit and still be within the rules of the House.

The problem, however, is that while I personally feel that under normal circumstances it would be perfectly appropriate for these items not to be offset, I do not think we are operating under ordinary circumstances. In fact, we have seen this House pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, even though the other body has not concurred, and we have seen a great deal of effort expended over the past 60 days on efforts that were described as efforts to "reduce the deficit." But in fact those efforts have not done that.

So I am offering this proposal today in the spirit of truth in advertising. It simply directs the House conferees to produce a conference report that does not add to the deficit, period. Now, we have had two recent examples that illustrate the need for the motion which I am making today.

First of all, when this bill first passed the House, we were told by the committee that even though the bill was not balanced on the outlay side, it was in fact balanced in budget authority and did not add to the deficit.

The problem, however, is that after the bill passed, the committee's own documents which the committee produced showed that the bill added over \$250 million in outlays and \$186 million in budget authority to the deficit, and over 5 years, added to the deficit to the tune of \$650 million. So I think that was misstatement No. 1 on the way to a so-called balanced budget.

Last week on the rescission bill, in order to get the votes for the rescission bill that targeted kids and old folks for major reductions, the Republican leadership said, after first having all of the Republicans vote against the Murtha amendment in committee, the Republican leadership then did an about face and indicated that they would in fact use the dollars produced in that rescission bill last week, the dollars that were not going to be used for the California earthquake relief, that they would use the remainder of those dollars for deficit reduction. But after the rule had passed, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget then was reported to say that the action in indicating that those funds would be used to reduce the deficit was just a game, and that in fact they were going to be allocated to finance the tax cuts, which contain a number of items which many of us on this side of the aisle feel are simply rewards for the wealthy that we cannot afford at a time of multibillion-dollar deficits.

Despite the fact that that money which was indicated would go for deficit reduction for one day, and then was later used for tax cuts, we were still given lectures about deficit reduction. It seems to me what we need to do is to cut through those lectures and get to a real intent to reduce the deficit, or at least certainly not to add to it.

This bill itself was produced out of subcommittee 1 day after the House passed the balanced budget constitu-

tional amendment, and the bill as it left the committee, as I said, added significantly to the deficit, some \$650 million over 5 years.

In contrast to the House bill, the Senate bill, which we will meet when we go to conference, is fully offset. It does not add one dime to the deficit, and in my view, if the other body can produce a bill for conference which does not add one dime to the deficit, the House ought to be able to do the same thing.

Now, this motion makes one concession. It does not even require that all of the amounts be totally offset within the defense function of the budget. It simply says that all of the funds should be offset, period. While I certainly do not approve of using domestic reductions in order to offset Defense Department add-ons, as an indication of conciliatory spirit I am willing to offer a motion that simply says the funds should be fully offset so they do not add one dime to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me that after the House has, in my view, been misled twice about whether or not funds in legislation before this House would add to the deficit or would reduce the deficit, it seems to me, after the House has been misled twice on it, the House finally needs to make a statement with great clarity that we do not want this process used to in any way add to the deficit.

As I said originally, under ordinary circumstances, absent the great pressure on the deficit and absent the House action in passing the constitutional amendment on the balanced budget, I would not be here insisting that this bill be fully offset, because I think in the real world there are emergencies which require emergency treatment. But the House has indicated that it is going to be in pursuit of deficit reduction, and it seems to me if that is the case, we ought to get on to it, and we certainly should not produce a conference report which will add to the deficit either on the budget authority side or the outlay side. That is the reason I make this motion this afternoon.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and that I might include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to instruct conferees. The gentleman's motion would instruct the conferees to bring back a conference agreement that was offset not only in budget authority, but in outlays as

well. This instruction would indeed inhibit the full and free nature of the conference.

My friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], who sits here, has pointed out that the gentleman who just spoke before me, the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, often talks about posing for holy pictures. I have to say that I think that this motion to instruct is kind of an exercise in connoisseurship of holy pictures.

In just the last 2 months this Republican majority has done more than almost all the previous Congresses to provide offsets. Never before has the Democrat majority in previous Congresses ever offset a supplemental request of any magnitude.

The fact is that the Senate amendments to H.R. 889 contain many spending reductions that are going to be unacceptable to the House. If the conferees are instructed to achieve outlay neutrality, then there must be a source of acceptable spending reductions. I think it will be very difficult to find such a source in the Senate amendments. The only other way to find acceptable spending cuts would be to go beyond the scope of the bill and the Senate amendments. We should not accept an instruction that encourages that approach.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana is strongly for deficit reduction. I think the record of the Committee on Appropriations, as I have pointed out, for the 104th Congress speaks for itself in this area. The House has already passed over \$20 billion of spending reductions. When viewed in total we have more than offset over \$8.7 billion in supplemental appropriations. So during the conference on this bill, I will try to achieve outlay neutrality. It will be difficult. I hope we can do it. But this instruction should not be accepted. We should not straitjacket ourselves.

It is getting later in the fiscal year. Achieving significant outlay savings gets harder and harder. We hear that agencies are spending money rapidly so we are not sure how much is available as a source of offsets.

The instruction would put forward constraints that may not be achievable or which would severely restrict our ability to provide the necessary support for our national security needs.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense needs this emergency supplemental appropriation now. They need it right away. They needed it yesterday. We should not suggest needless or impossible procedural hurdles that would delay or make more difficult our ability to achieve a good conference agreement on this bill, which is something that the Democratic administration wants.

We should stop fooling around and get on with this very, very important conference.

I urge the body to reject this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not regard the motion that I am making today as "fooling around."

What I do regard as fooling around is the action of the House leadership in twice over the last month talking about deficit reduction but, in fact, producing bills which either add to the deficit or, after they have promised that the funds would be used to reduce the deficit, instead announcing a day later that they really did not mean it. They simply said that to get votes and that what they are really going to do is to use it for their tax cut package for very wealthy people.

I would also point out that I do not think that this motion to instruct is in any significant way delaying our ability to go to conference and produce a bill in a timely fashion. As far as I am concerned, if this motion to go to conference is passed by the House today, we could go into conference at 5 or at 6 tonight. We certainly can deal in conference with the issue tomorrow. And we can produce a bill in plenty of time, if Members are serious, both about providing the Pentagon the funds they need and, if they are serious about it, deficit reduction.

I thank it is, frankly, nonsense to suggest that this motion in any way prevents our being able to produce that bill in a timely fashion.

I would point out that suggesting that this motion in any way delays our ability to produce a bill is about like saying that after a basketball coach takes a 20-second time-out, with 1 minute left to go in the game, that somehow that is the reason that you had a 4-hour basketball game.

The fact is this bill has already taken an unusually long period of time to move through each stage of the process, compared to past supplemental appropriation bills. A good example is the emergency supplemental bill our committee moved through the process just 1 year ago.

The chairman will recall that conferees met during snowstorms that paralyzed this city and produced a conference report in short order because of the urgency of the matter at hand. Last year's emergency supplemental took a total of 19 calendar days to move through the entire process. The bill we have before us today, by contrast, has been lingering for some 60 calendar days, three times as long.

I would suggest that the most rapid way for us to reach agreement in conference, since the Senate has already, in my judgment, met its responsibility by providing full offsets for the new spending that they contemplate in their bill, I would suggest the fastest way for us to get an agreeable result in the conference is for the House to do

the same. And that is why I am offering my motion.

My LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply point out that actually we could have gone to conference yesterday, but the gentleman objected on Friday. So I do not think that the question is whether or not we are taking an inordinately lengthy period of time. The question is whether we are going to put ourselves in a straitjacket that prevents us from expeditiously getting this matter resolved as quickly as possible. If we do not get it resolved, if it does get hog-tied in the rigors of internal legislative warfare, I would like to request the gentleman from Florida to rise and I would like him to tell us some of the problems that the Defense Department will face.

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

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

First I would like to make the comment that we have run out of time on this issue. The Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force and the Coast Guard have spent the money for these contingency operations that we are trying to replace now. I do not recall anybody coming here from the administration to check with Congress to see if it was okay to go to Rwanda or to Somalia or to Bosnia or any of those contingencies. But yet they did it. And we are being asked to pay the bill. We are prepared to do that. We understand the importance.

The House, despite what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just implied, the House subcommittee on national security passed out this bill on January 27. That was even before we got the official request from the administration. And within 2 weeks we had gone through the full committee and were on the way to the House floor. And the House has expedited this entire issue, as it needs to be expedited.

And when the gentleman suggests that there has been delay and the bill has been held out there, he should point the finger at where it belongs. The House has moved expeditiously to meet this responsibility and here is why, in response to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Based on a January public hearing with Secretary Perry and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili, here is what we were told, and the commanders in chief, and field commanders have confirmed this throughout the hearing process since we voted this emergency supplemental out of subcommittee.

Unless we get this money appropriated and quick, all U.S.-based units under the Forces Command will have to stop most major training by May 31.

The National Training Center rotations and JCS exercises will be canceled. Flight hours and spare parts stocks will be cut, and all active Army divisions will be degraded in readiness.

I do not want that to happen. I do not think my colleagues in the House want that to happen.

In the Navy, four carrier airwings will be forced to stand down. The first stand down will happen in April. More than 500 aircraft would have to be grounded, and 30,000 flight hours cut.

Required maintenance on two carriers and seven other ships will be deferred or reduced and ship and aviation spare parts reserves will be drawn down by 30 days worth of requirement.

The Marine Corps, since unfunded contingency requirements equate to approximately 80 percent of the Marine Corps's operation forces budget, the corps will see severe readiness impact starting in July. Training for Marine expeditionary forces, in both the Atlantic and Pacific, with the exception of those forces already deployed, will be halted.

All categories of training as well as maintenance and spare parts will face deep reductions, and marine air squadrons will be forced to stand down and suffer reduced readiness.

For the Air Force, flight hours for fighter, bomber, tanker, and airlift squadrons will have to be reduced by 50 percent over a 12-week period. Ten JCS and tactical training exercises will be canceled. Over 24,000 permanent change of station moves will be frozen and aircraft and engine repair as well as scheduled runway and real property maintenance will be deferred.

Mr. Speaker, those are just the highlights of what we are talking about if we do not replace this money. When I say "replace," that is exactly what I mean, because the money to pay for the contingencies in Bosnia, Rwanda and Somalia and Cuba and Haiti and Korea, et cetera, has already been borrowed from those training and those operation and maintenance accounts.

What we are trying to do is pay it back before the services have to stand down their training. And would it not be a shame to stand down the training and then have to turn around and stand it back up again with a tremendous additional cost. And what happens if a young soldier out there, his training is not maintained and he is not quite up to par because of the lack of training? What if he gets hurt or what if he hurts someone else because his training is not at the level that it should be?

I do not think any of us want to carry that burden on our shoulders. We want readiness today. We want readiness in the mid-term. And we want readiness for our forces in the long-term.

This is one of the first major steps that we have to take to provide that readiness.

It is time to get on with this business. The gentleman from Wisconsin

[Mr. OBEY] is exactly right. This has dragged on too long. Not because of any fault of the House of Representatives, but it has dragged on too long.

We should have this bill completed by Thursday of this week, on the President's desk by Friday morning, if that is possible, and I think that it is.

But Mr. OBEY's motion to instruct will certainly carry on this delay considerably further than we would like it to. I say let us vote against the ObeY motion and get on with the conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst things that can happen to you in this town is you begin to believe your own baloney. I have just heard an awful lot of baloney, with all the due respect to my good friend.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The baloney, if you are talking about the information that I read here, came from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. OBEY. No, with all due respect, the baloney that I am hearing is coming from a different source. It is not the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Let me suggest, no one is suggesting, not one person in this House is suggesting that this money not be replaced. We are simply suggesting that it be replaced in a way which does not add to the deficit. That is all we are saying. There are not going to be any aircraft that are required to stand down. There will not be any maintenance that will not be provided because we are asking the House to do what the Senate did, which is to simply pay for the bill before us.

The gentleman from Louisiana suggests that somehow if we pass this motion to instruct that we will be putting the Congress in a straitjacket.

My God, I thought we did that when this House passed the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That document requires us to balance the budget. I assume an awful lot of Members of this House are going to proceed to try to deal with fiscal matters as though the budget should be balanced. If that is the case, why start in the hereafter? Why not start in the here and now? Why not start with this bill?

That is all we are saying. We are saying do not add to the deficit.

I would point out that the Senate bill does exactly what we are asking. For 1995, the Senate bill cuts the deficit by \$72 million; whereas, the House adds to the deficit to the tune of \$250 million. Over 5 years the Senate bill cuts the deficit by \$341 million; whereas, the House bill adds \$650 million to the deficit.

□ 1730

That is a swing of nearly \$1 billion. All we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is

that the House on this bill show the same degree of fiscal discipline shown by the other body, even though I will readily grant that the other body added a number of items which do not appropriately belong in this conference, and they ought to be taken out.

However, in spite of that mistake, the Senate has at least met its obligation not to add to the deficit. I do not think the House is any less capable of doing that. That is the purpose of my motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that this administration's Defense Department has expressed to us vociferously and repeatedly that they like our bill, they do not like the Senate bill. Moreover, I might add, I think it is ironical to start straitjacketing the Republican majority when in fact the Democrats were in control of this House of Representatives for 40 years and never employed the principle devised by the gentleman's motion.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge a "no" vote on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that, with all due respect, our good friends from the Department of Defense do not have to vote on budgets. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs does not have to go to constituents and explain why the budget is not balanced. We do.

It seems to me, given that difference in responsibilities, we ought to meet our responsibilities to the Department of Defense to reimburse them for the funds that they have had to expend, but we ought to do it in a way which does not add to the deficit. That is all I ask.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. OBEY. 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.

This is a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 240, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—179

Abercrombie Furse Pallone
Ackerman Gejdenson Parker
Andrews Gibbons Pastor
Baesler Gordon Payne (NJ)
Baldacci Green Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI) Hall (OH)
Becerra Hamilton Peterson (FL)
Beilenson Harman Peterson (MN)
Bentsen Hastings (FL)
Berman Hilliard Pomeroy
Bonior Hinchey Poshard
Borski Holden Rahall
Boucher Hoyer Ramstad
Brewster Jackson-Lee Rangel
Browder Jacobs Reed
Brown (CA) Johnson (SD)
Brown (FL) Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH) Johnston Roemer
Brownback Kanjorski Roybal-Allard
Cardin Kaptur Sabo
Chabot Kennedy (MA)
Chapman Kennedy (RI)
Clement Kennelly
Clyburn Kildee
Coleman Kleczka
Collins (IL) LaFalce
Collins (MI) Lantos Serrano
Condit Levin Shays
Conyers Lewis (GA)
Costello Lincoln Slaughter
Coyne Lipinski Smith (MI)
Danner Lofgren Spratt
Deal Lowey Stark
DeFazio Luther Stenholm
DeLauro Maloney Stokes
Dellums Manton Studds
Deutsch Markey Stupak
Dingell Martinez Tanner
Dixon Mascara Thompson
Doggett Matsui Thornton
Dooley McCarthy Thurman
Doyle McDermott Torres
Duncan McKinney Torricelli
Durbin McNulty Towns
Edwards Meehan Tucker
Ehlers Meek Vento
Engel Menendez Visclosky
Ensign Mfume Volkmer
Eshoo Miller (CA) Ward
Evans Mineta Waters
Farr Minge Watt (NC)
Fattah Mink Waxman
Fazio Moakley Williams
Fields (LA) Morella Wise
Filner Neal Woolsey
Flake Neumann Wyden
Foglietta Oberstar Wynn
Frank (MA) Obey Yates
Franks (NJ) Olver Zimmer
Frost Owens

NAYS—240

Allard Canady Fawell
Archer Castle Fields (TX)
Armey Chambliss Flanagan
Bachus Chenoweth Foley
Baker (CA) Christensen Forbes
Baker (LA) Chrysler Fowler
Ballenger Clinger Fox
Barcia Coble Franks (CT)
Barr Coburn Frelinghuysen
Barrett (NE) Collins (GA) Frisa
Bartlett Combust Funderburk
Barton Cooley Gallegly
Bass Cox Ganske
Bateman Cramer Gekas
Bereuter Crane Geren
Bevill Crapo Gilchrist
Bilbray Cremeans Gillmor
Bilirakis Cubin Gilman
Bishop Cunningham Gonzalez
Bliley Davis Goodlatte
Blute de la Garza Goodling
Boehlert DeLay Goss
Boehner Diaz-Balart Graham
Bonilla Dickey Greenwood
Bono Dicks Gunderson
Bryant (TN) Doolittle Gutknecht
Bunn Dornan Hall (TX)
Bunning Hancock Hancok
Burr Dunn Hansen
Burton Ehrlich Hastert
Buyer Emerson Hastings (WA)
Callahan English Hayworth
Calvert Everett Hefley
Camp Ewing Heineman

Herger McHugh Schaefer
Hilleary McInnis Schiff
Hobson McIntosh Seastrand
Hoekstra McKeon Shadegg
Hoke Metcalf Shaw
Horn Meyers Shuster
Hostettler Mica Sisisky
Houghton Miller (FL) Skeen
Hunter Molinari Skelton
Hutchinson Mollohan Smith (NJ)
Hyde Montgomery Smith (TX)
Inglis Moorhead Smith (WA)
Istook Moran Solomon
Johnson (CT) Murtha Souder
Johnson, Sam Myers Spence
Jones Myrick Stearns
Kasich Nethercutt Stockman
Kelly Ney Stump
Kim Norwood Talent
King Nussle Tate
Kingston Ortiz Tauzin
Klink Oxley Taylor (MS)
Klug Packard Taylor (NC)
Knollenberg Paxon Tejeda
Kolbe Pickett Thomas
LaHood Pombo Thornberry
Largent Porter Tiahrt
Latham Portman Torkildsen
LaTourette Pryce Traficant
Laughlin Quillen Upton
Lazio Quinn Vucanovich
Leach Radanovich Waldholtz
Lewis (CA) Regula Walker
Lewis (KY) Richardson Walsh
Lightfoot Riggs Wamp
Linder Roberts Watts (OK)
Livingston Rogers Weldon (FL)
LoBiondo Rohrabacher Weldon (PA)
Longley Ros-Lehtinen Weller
Lucas Roth White
Manzullo Roukema Whitfield
Martini Royce Wicker
McCollum Salmon Wolf
McCrery Sanford Young (AK)
McDade Saxton Young (FL)
McHale Scarborough Zeliff

NOT VOTING—15

Bryant (TX) Gutierrez Orton
Clay Hayes
Clayton Hefner Rush
Ford Jefferson Velazquez
Gephardt Nadler Wilson

□ 1751

Messrs. MOLLOHAN, TAUZIN, BEVILL, and CRAMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. DUNCAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

For consideration of Senate amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10 through 25, and the Senate amendment to the title of the bill:

Messrs. LIVINGSTON, MYERS of Indiana, YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, LEWIS of California, PORTER, ROGERS, and WOLF, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Messrs. CALLAHAN, OBEY, YATES, STOKES, WILSON, HEFNER, COLEMAN, and MOLLOHAN.

For consideration of Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9:

Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, MCDADE, LIVINGSTON, LEWIS of California, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, NEUMANN, MURTHA, DICKS, WILSON, HEFNER, SABO, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON TO CLOSE PORTIONS OF CONFERENCE MEETINGS

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Livingston moves pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a) of the House rules that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, relating to amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration; provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6, rule XXVIII the vote on this motion must be a rollcall vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 14, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie Coble Fowler
Ackerman Coburn Fox
Allard Coleman Franks (CT)
Andrews Collins (GA) Franks (NJ)
Archer Collins (IL) Frelinghuysen
Armey Collins (MI) Frisa
Bachus Combust Frost
Baesler Conyers Funderburk
Baker (CA) Cooley Furse
Baker (LA) Costello Gallegly
Baldacci Cox Ganske
Ballenger Coyne Gejdenson
Barcia Cramer Gekas
Barr Crane Geren
Barrett (NE) Crapo Gibbons
Barrett (WI) Cremeans Gilchrist
Bartlett Cubin Gillmor
Barton Cunningham Gilman
Bass Danner Gonzalez
Bateman Davis Goodlatte
Becerra de la Garza Goodling
Beilenson Deal Gordon
Bentsen DeLauro Goss
Bereuter DeLay Green
Berman Dellums Greenwood
Bevill Deutsch Gunderson
Bilirakis Diaz-Balart Gutierrez
Bishop Dickey Gutknecht
Bliley Dicks Hall (OH)
Blute Dingell Hall (TX)
Boehlert Dixon Hamilton
Boehner Doggett Hancock
Bonilla Dooley Hansen
Bonior Doolittle Harman
Bono Dornan Hastert
Borski Doyle Hastings (FL)
Boucher Dreier Hastings (WA)
Brewster Duncan Hayes
Browder Dunn Hayworth
Brown (CA) Durbin Hefley
Brown (FL) Edwards Hefner
Brownback Ehlers Heineman
Bryant (TN) Ehrlich Herger
Bunn Emerson Hilleary
Bunning Engel Hobson
Burr English Hoekstra
Burton Ensign Hoke
Buyer Eshoo Holden
Callahan Evans Horn
Callaghan Everrett Hostettler
Camp Ewing Houghton
Canady Farr Hoyer
Cardin Fattah Hunter
Cardin Fawell Hutchinson
Castle Fazio Hyde
Chabot Fields (LA) Inglis
Chambliss Fields (TX) Istook
Chapman Flake Jackson-Lee
Chenoweth Flanagan Jacobs
Christensen Chrysler Johnson (CT)
Chrysler Foglietta Johnson (SD)
Clement Foley Johnson, E. B.
Clinger Forbes Johnson, Sam
Clyburn Ford

Johnston	Mollohan	Shays
Jones	Montgomery	Shuster
Kanjorski	Moorhead	Sisisky
Kaptur	Moran	Skaggs
Kasich	Morella	Skeen
Kelly	Murtha	Skelton
Kennedy (RI)	Myers	Smith (MI)
Kennelly	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Neal	Smith (TX)
Kim	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)
King	Neumann	Solomon
Kingston	Ney	Souder
Klecza	Norwood	Spence
Klink	Nussle	Spratt
Klug	Oberstar	Stark
Knollenberg	Obey	Stearns
Kolbe	Olver	Stenholm
LaFalce	Ortiz	Stockman
LaHood	Owens	Stokes
Lantos	Oxley	Studds
Largent	Packard	Stump
Latham	Pallone	Stupak
LaTourette	Parker	Talent
Laughlin	Pastor	Tanner
Lazio	Paxon	Tate
Leach	Payne (NJ)	Tauzin
Levin	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (FL)	Tejeda
Lewis (KY)	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
Lightfoot	Petri	Thompson
Linder	Pickett	Thornberry
Lipinski	Pombo	Thornton
Livingston	Pomeroy	Thurman
LoBiondo	Porter	Tiahrt
Longley	Portman	Torkildsen
Lowe	Poshard	Torres
Lucas	Quillen	Torricelli
Luther	Quinn	Towns
Maloney	Radanovich	Trafficant
Manton	Rahall	Tucker
Manzullo	Ramstad	Upton
Markey	Rangel	Vento
Martinez	Reed	Visclosky
Martini	Regula	Volkmer
Mascara	Reynolds	Vucanovich
Matsui	Richardson	Waldholtz
McCarthy	Riggs	Walker
McCollum	Rivers	Walsh
McCrery	Roberts	Watt (NC)
McDade	Roemer	Watts (OK)
McDermott	Rogers	Waxman
McHale	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
McInnis	Roth	Weller
McIntosh	Roukema	White
McKeon	Royce	Whitfield
McKinney	Sabo	Wicker
McNulty	Salmon	Williams
Meehan	Sanford	Wise
Meek	Sawyer	Wolf
Menendez	Saxton	Wyden
Metcalf	Scarborough	Wynn
Meyers	Schaefer	Yates
Mfume	Schiff	Young (AK)
Mica	Schumer	Young (FL)
Miller (CA)	Scott	Zeliff
Miller (FL)	Seastrand	Zimmer
Mineta	Sensenbrenner	
Minge	Serrano	
Moakley	Shadegg	
Molinari	Shaw	

NAYS—14

Brown (OH)	Lincoln	Schroeder
DeFazio	Lofgren	Slaughter
Filner	Mink	Waters
Hinchey	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
Kennedy (MA)	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—17

Bilbray	Gephardt	Pryce
Bryant (TX)	Graham	Rose
Clay	Hilliard	Rush
Clayton	Jefferson	Velazquez
Condit	Nadler	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Orton	

□ 1809

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 831, PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTION FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 831) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain on sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GIBBONS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I only reserve the right to object to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from Florida will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees, and will I be recognized, if this unanimous consent request is agreed to, to then present my motion to instruct conferees?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct; yes, he will.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I do not object, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GIBBONS moves that the Managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 831 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 5 of the Senate amendment which change the tax treatment of U.S. citizens relinquishing their citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, do I understand in this debate I have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

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

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to depart from my usual practice of speaking extemporaneously and read a statement because the statement is so serious and the names that I will mention here are names of Americans and I do not want to defame them, I want to be very accurate in what I say, and so I am going to read from a prepared statement these remarks.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, section 5 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 831 changes the tax treatment of U.S. citizens who renounce their citizenship. Under the Senate proposal, individuals who renounce their citizenship would be subject to income taxes on the unrealized gains which they accrued while they enjoyed the benefits of being a U.S. citizen.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious loophole in our tax laws, and is one that the Senate has picked up and one that we must close immediately, because the amounts of money here are large, and the equities are very unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these provisions should be enacted for two reasons. The Senate provisions, first, as a matter of fairness, individuals who have enjoyed the benefits of being a citizen of the United States and who have amassed enormous fortunes should not be permitted to not pay taxes on these gains by merely renouncing their citizenship. Mr. Speaker, this proposal that the Senate has put forward that I ask the Members to instruct the conferees to adopt, this proposal does not punish anyone for renouncing their citizenship. But it merely ensures that these people who renounce their citizenship will pay a tax comparable to that paid by many patriotic wealthy individuals who have not abrogated their responsibility through renouncing their citizenship. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there are many wealthy and fine patriotic Americans who pay their taxes. They do not like them. I do not blame them. But they pay them. There are only a few who escape paying their regular taxes by renouncing their citizenship.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this amendment raises substantial amounts of revenue that should be devoted to deficit reduction as intended by the Senate. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that these provisions will raise \$3.6 billion over the 10-year period. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker: This is not a small loophole. This is not just a careless amount of money. Our joint committee estimates that the savings from this to the rest of us American taxpayers will amount to \$3.6 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, last week we debated welfare reform which reduced Federal