

Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoke  
Holden  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones

Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meek  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Mink  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Norwood  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman

## NAYS—105

Allard  
Andrews  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bonior  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chapman  
Christensen  
Clay  
Coburn  
Collins (IL)

Conyers  
Cooley  
Dingell  
Duncan  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Fattah  
Flake  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Furse  
Ganske  
Green  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hilliard  
Hinchey

Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Nadler  
Neal  
Neumann  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Petri  
Rahall

Ramstad  
Rangel  
Roemer  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Schroeder  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (WA)  
Souder

Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Yates  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—10

Clinger  
Collins (MI)  
Hutchinson  
Moakley

Packard  
Roberts  
Schumer  
Shaw

Torkildsen  
Wilson

□ 1116

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1817, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1854, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials and charts.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1854.

□ 1119

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to present the legislative branch appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1996. The bill H.R. 1854 and the report, House Report Number 104-141, were reported by the Committee on Appropriations on Thursday, June 15.

Before I begin, I want to acknowledge the members of the subcommittee who have shared in crafting this bill. I am particularly grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking minority member of the committee and former chairman of this committee for many years. He has been my mentor on the committee and has been an extremely great person to work with.

In addition, we have the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], who has served as the ranking minority member for years on this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

On the minority side, in addition to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], we have the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON]. They have all helped craft this bill and have been very helpful in and cooperative in bringing about what I consider a very good piece of legislation.

We also have the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee, who has sat in on our meetings and sits on the subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the full committee.

The bill covers appropriations for the operations of the House, the joint committees, our support agencies, the CBO, the Congressional Research Service, General Accounting Office, the Architect of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office. Funds for the Senate will be added by the other body when the bill is taken up in the Senate.

The bill summary is as follows:

It includes \$1.7 billion in budget authority. It reduces from this current year's budget \$154.9 million. It also reduces by \$333 million under the requests received in the President's budget. It is \$26.6 million under the discretionary 602(b) allocation and, again, the Senate items are excluded from this bill.

The bill makes significant reductions and changes in our operations. We have calculated that if the entire Federal budget were reduced in proportion to

the reduction in the legislative budget before us today, the deficit would go down by \$133 billion in 1 year. That is three-fifths of the way toward a balanced budget in 1 year, if the rest of the Government followed our lead.

We have cut 2,350 FTE's, that is full-time equivalent employees, from the rolls of this branch of Government. There are several privatization initiatives that we have included. The report directs the Architect of the Capitol to obtain proposals to contract out custodial care and buildings maintenance. The flag raising function, the taxpayer subsidized perk, has not been funded, which will allow the Capitol Historical Society to take over that operation. Again, it will no longer be a tax-supported operation.

That is \$320,000 a year subsidy to provide the flags. They will still be available but under the direction of the Historical Society.

The bill eliminates the beauty shop and the barber shop's revolving funds. It paves the way to contract operations for these services, and it has already been approved by the Committee on House Oversight.

The GAO has been directed to outsource administrative work, and the GAO also will be funded to outsource more of their audit and program analysis.

There are several eliminations of programs and other activities in this bill. The Office of Technology Assessment will be eliminated. The Joint Committee on Printing will be eliminated. Constituent copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the United States Code subscriptions for Members will be eliminated. One House parking lot is to be turned back to the District of Columbia.

One warehouse is to be eliminated, and a congressional board is to be eliminated.

You will find key reductions in the bill. All agencies have been asked to absorb the COLA's for this year out of this year's level spending. In other words, we are asking every agency to absorb the COLA's and still live within the level of spending from the 1996 budget year. All agencies are held to this year's level funding or below, with the exception of the Library of Congress.

The savings made possible by significant reforms of several House operations approved by the Committee on House Oversight have been reflected in this bill. The GAO is downsized by 15 percent on the way to a 25-percent cut over the next 2-year period. CBO has been asked to absorb unfunded mandate workload, an additional workload, but out of current level funding.

There are several cutbacks in congressional printing. For example, a reduction in the number of printed hearings and the bound annual CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, which have been placed on CD ROM's. In addition, more electronic format will be substituted for the far more expensive print-on-

paper documents. And then also to be reduced, the Joint Economic Committee is being downsized by 25 percent. We will also be streamlining some of the agencies. The House postal operations are being turned over to the U.S. Postal Service. Members' allowances are being funded in a single appropriation. That is the three allowances, the clerk hire, the official expense, and the mailing allowances are all being combined into one allowance, and the Committee on House Oversight in future months will actually give us flexibility to combine those funds into a single allowance.

All committee funding has been combined under a single heading in the bill. The bill reassigns security resources to the Sergeant at Arms. Also the bill combines the Capitol guide service and the special service offices, again, a combining of offices and operations in the Government.

The Botanic Garden is being transferred to the National Arboretum. The GAO claims and judgments work is transferred to the executive branch. We are keeping the pressure on agencies to standardize their accounting systems. This is a long-term savings measure. And then there is language in the bill which requires the publishing agencies, including the Congress, to pay the cost of paper-based documents being sent by the Superintendent of Documents to the Federal depository libraries.

We are simply asking the agencies to pay their own printing costs rather than having this committee do it.

Finally, we have included some innovative programs. We have funded a project called Office 2000, which will take the House into the age of the cyber Congress, modernizing our offices with electronic equipment. We have also funded the National Digital Library in the Library of Congress which aims at making the collections of the Library of Congress accessible to electronic storage and distribution systems, making that information available throughout the country and perhaps throughout the world.

We have initiated a study to determine if the Digital Library can be applied to the Federal documents collections under the control of the Superintendent of Documents.

And finally, a major emphasis throughout the bill has been placed on moving the legislative branch into electronic documents storage and information sharing. We want to take advantage of the on-line distribution of congressional information as the Congress enters the cyber age.

There are a number of housekeeping provisions in the bill. Many of these are carried from year to year to facilitate the operations of the House and other agencies. Some are new, and I have mentioned most of them.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this bill is a significant step in the way of not only balancing the budget but of showing the American people that we can downsize, that we can right size our

budget, but also that we can modernize the Congress and make it more effective, more efficient, and we are asking our agencies to do more with less.

We will use great talent that exists in the private sector to privatize many of the things that heretofore Government has been doing. We simply want to stop doing what we can do without.

I urge Members to support this bill. It is a very good piece of work. It does set us on a glide path toward a zero deficit. We have set the pattern, and I want to thank my committee members for the cooperation we received.

At this point, I would like to include my prepared remarks.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to present H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 to the House.

The bill and report, House Report No. 104-141, were filed on Thursday, June 15, 1995.

I do not intend to go into every detail. The report and the bill have been available, and I know that many Members and staff have gone over it very thoroughly.

Before I begin, I want to thank each member of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations.

First of all, we have VIC FAZIO, the gentleman from California, our ranking minority member. VIC FAZIO has been a Member of Congress since 1979, and since 1981 served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative until this Congress. I believe—and I hope he agrees—we have worked together in bringing this bill to the floor.

In addition to Mr. FAZIO, the other members of the subcommittee: Mr. LIVINGSTON of Louisiana, also chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations; Mr. YOUNG of Florida; Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina; Mr. MILLER of Florida; Mr. WICKER of Mississippi; Mr. THORNTON of Arkansas; and Mr. DIXON of California.

Mr. OBEY, the ranking minority member of the full committee, is an ex-officio member of the subcommittee.

I should point out that we work very closely with the Committee on House Oversight, and I also want to express my appreciation to the members and leadership of that committee, primarily the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking minority member of that committee.

#### CONTENT OF THE BILL

This is the annual appropriation for the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

This is an important occasion in a symbolic sense. With this bill, I believe we begin to show the way to a balanced budget. We have applied our own resources—the legislative branch agencies and the funds to operate the House of Representatives—what we must apply to the entire Federal bureaucracy—restraint, downsizing, and streamlining—with some innovations thrown in.

It is true that we are a small part of the total budget picture. This bill only constitutes twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent—0.12 percent—about one-tenth of 1 percent of the entire budget.

Our activities include the House of Representatives and the Senate—and our support agencies such as the Architect of the Capitol, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Congressional Research Service.

There is also the agency that ferrets out waste, fraud, and abuse, and conducts financial audits of Government programs—the General Accounting Office.

We also include the Government Printing Office, and Library of Congress.

Several other programs are also included: the Copyright Office; Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped; the National Library Service; and the Depository Library Program.

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House totals \$1.73 billion—\$1,727,351,000—in budget authority for fiscal year 1996.

This figure does not include Senate items that will be added when the bill goes over to the other body.

#### COMPARED WITH LAST YEAR'S BILL

Last year, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995, appropriated \$1.88 billion—\$1,882,221,600—for the activities covered in H.R. 1854. This bill cuts spending \$155 million—\$154,870,600—an 8.2 percent reduction. We expect that the other body will be adding to the reduction.

We expect a final bill going down to the President which cuts \$200 million. If the total Federal budget were reduced the same way, over \$130 billion would be saved in fiscal year 1996.

#### COMPARISON WITH 602(b) ALLOCATION

Under section 602(b) of the Budget Act, our committee allocated \$2.262 billion for the legislative bill. The bill before us contains \$1.727 billion in discretionary budget authority. That means we are \$535 million—\$535,569,000—under the target—a large amount because Senate operations are not included in the bill before us.

With the amounts we have reserved for the Senate, we are \$27 million below the 602(b) target.

We did a similar analysis of our outlay target. Our calculation is that the bill is about \$78.5 million—\$78,477,000—under the 602(b) outlay ceiling.

#### LEGISLATIVE RIGHTSIZING

This bill is the first step in reaching the right size, and shape, of the legislative branch. The full-time equivalent work force is reduced by 2,350—8.6 percent below fiscal year 1995.

We have restructured several activities and programs not in direct support of legislative work. The Botanic Garden is transferred to the National Arboretum; the Office of Technology Assessment is eliminated; the costs of distributing Federal documents to depository libraries are shifted to the publishing entity; and work appropriate to the executive branch is shifted there from the General Accounting Office, while GAO audit work not essential to its primary mission in support of Congress is outsourced.

We have also eliminated a vast amount of print-on-paper congressional printing. Several incentives have been placed in the bill for all agencies to convert to electronic format—a substantial cost and space saver.

Other activities in the bill are held at or below last year's level with one exception—an exception that leads me to another theme of this bill.

#### THE "CYBER" CONGRESS

Earlier this year, the Speaker characterized the 104th Congress as the "cyber" Congress. This bill reinforces that sense.

The single increase in this bill, \$1.5 million, is in support of the National Digital Library project at the Library of Congress.

Another important policy shift in this bill charges the costs of paper and microfiche documents and their distribution to the agency producing the documents. If the document is electronic and is requisitioned from or through GPO, the Superintendent of Documents office will bear the cost.

Beyond placing the cost in the appropriate place, this bill makes electronic information attractive; and it is compatible with the reinventing Government proposals and current executive branch information management policies.

#### MAJOR ITEMS IN THE BILL

The bill provides \$671.6 million for the House and is based on the reorganized operations of the House established early in the 104th Congress. The reduction of 833 FTE's reflects the one-third cut in committee staff and initiatives of the Committee on House Oversight to reduce the administrative support offices. The bill does allow a small COLA for legislative agency staff, based on current law and the House budget resolution. The bill provides funding for Office 2000, a project to bring the House into a "cyber" Congress status.

There are no funds provided to purchase Historical Society calendars or subscriptions to the U.S. Code; Members can purchase calendars through their official allowance and can access the Code online.

Also, we have not funded one warehouse used by the House, and one parking lot. We have eliminated the Flag Office—we believe the Capitol Historical Society can take that over and eliminate the subsidy of taxpayer funds.

#### JOINT ITEMS

We have allowed \$85.8 million for joint items, including the Capitol Police, the joint committees of the House and Senate, the guide service, and the attending physician.

The Capitol Police civilian strength is increased by 18—by transferring 5 security apparatus design staff and funds from the Architect, and by adding 13 security aide positions with a comparative decrease in gallery door attendant staff under the Sergeant at Arms.

One joint committee receives reduced funds—a 25-percent reduction for JEC. The Joint Committee on Printing has not been funded, those functions will be carried out by the House and Senate authorizing committees—while the Joint Committee on Taxation remains level funded.

#### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

We have allowed \$124.7 million overall, including the Botanic Garden and Library buildings and grounds maintenance, for the Architect of the Capitol. This level reflects a 5-percent reduction in FTE's and the elimination of the Flag Office. Provision is made for the Architect to undertake the transfer of the Botanic Garden to the National Arboretum. The first installment of the renovation of the Conservatory is funded, fulfilling a commitment of Congress, but it is limited to the original estimate of \$21 million.

The AOC's parking attendants are transferred to the House Sergeant at Arms, who will bring that activity within the security function.

#### STUDY AGENCIES

Funds are not provided for the Office of Technology Assessment. Study of science policy questions can be carried out by staff within

CRS or GAO, or contracts for specific analyses can be bid out to scientific organizations with appropriate expertise.

The Congressional Budget Office is level funded. We believe, that by shifting resources from program analysis and support overhead, this allowance will be sufficient for the new priorities established by the unfunded mandates legislation, since CBO is already experienced in analyzing costs at the State and local level.

The Congressional Research Service is level funded.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (NON-CRS PART)

For the Library of Congress, \$324.7 million is allowed and there is authority to spend another \$138.1 million in receipts. In addition to the National Digital Library initiative, for which the bill provides \$3 million, relocation expenses to the remote storage project has been funded, as has the Global Legal Information Network, and the Copyright Office Electronic Registration, Recordation, and Deposit System and responsibilities under the GATT agreement. The Braille centralization project will proceed through savings.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A number of unnecessary congressional printing costs are eliminated. The shift of costs for distributing documents to depository libraries includes Congress paying its fair share in the congressional printing and binding account.

#### GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The allowance of \$392.9 million reflects a 15-percent cut, the first year of a 2-year 25-percent cut. By reordering priorities and staff, through outsourcing appropriate work, and through transferring to the executive branch activity appropriate to the executive, GAO is reduced and refocused.

#### GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

In addition to several housekeeping provisions in title I, sections 101 and 102 provides for deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts those monies collected for delivery of contractor-submitted mail in the House postal system and for rebates from the Government Travel Card Program.

Revolving accounts for the legislative service organizations are dissolved in section 106, while section 107 ends the revolving accounts for the House beauty and barber shops, the House recording studio, and the House restaurant.

Section 112 merges the Special Services Office with the Capitol Guide Service and eliminates the separate board for the Special Services Office.

In title II, there are several housekeeping provisions. In addition to these, section 208 limits CRS involvement in support of Interparliamentary development to incidental purposes, allowing for close-out of current work.

Section 209 brings into the Library's budgeting process the gift and trust fund obligations in excess of \$100,000.

Section 210 provides that components of the Government responsible for issuing documents shall bear the cost of distributing them to the depository library system—unless electronic documents are produced or procured through GPO.

Section 211 transfers the claims and settlements functions of the General Accounting Office to the executive branch.

In addition to the general provisions routinely carried in this bill, section 306 transfers the parking attendant staff to the Sergeant at Arms. Section 307 prohibits the use of funds appropriated in the bill to move Members' offices. Section 308 transfers the security apparatus design staff and funds of the Architect to the Capitol Police. Section 309 assigns the Board of the Office of Compliance the responsibility for submitting a report required under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995. Section 310 authorizes the military police at Fort Meade to make arrests on property owned by the legislative branch within that military installation. Section 311 transfers the Botanic Garden to the National Arboretum and provides for the Architect to complete the renovation of the Conservatory.

## SUMMARY

BA compared to: 1995 operating level: \$154.9 million (8.2 percent) reduction; 1996 request: \$332.8 million (16.2 percent) reduction; 602(b): \$26.6 million reduction under our 602(b)'s—Senate excluded.

Outlays compared to: 1995 operating level: \$158.6 million (8.5 percent) reduction; 1996 request: \$295.9 million (16.1 percent) reduction; 602(b): \$78.5 million (4.4 percent) reduction under pro rata share—Senate excluded.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes major reductions, clarifies the duties of the legislative branch, and makes a down payment on balancing the budget. I urge an "aye" vote on the bill.

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

□ 1130

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

Mr. Chairman, there is one statement of Chairman PACKARD's that I'll take issue with. It is that this year starts the process of cuts in our own backyard.

Cuts process started many years ago. Using 1979 as a benchmark:

Executive branch funding has increased by 30 percent during that time; judicial branch funding has doubled.

Legislative branch funding has decreased. How much?

CRS has issued a recent report comparing legislative appropriations in terms of constant dollars:

From fiscal year 1972 to fiscal year 1995, legislative budgets rose 21.2 percent overall.

However, after the legislative expansion of the early 1970's, including the formation of CBO, from fiscal year 1978 to fiscal year 1995, legislative budgets have been reduced 2.2 percent.

Budget authority has decreased in fiscal year 1993, fiscal year 1994, fiscal year 1995—a total decrease of 5.5 percent in total legislative BA and a decrease of 5.7 percent in direct congressional operations contained in title I.

These reductions stem primarily from a general decline in House and Senate committee funding, policy changes enacted since 1991 significantly reducing mail costs, and several other factors, but they represent significant deductions.

In this bill, we have an 8.6-percent reduction in FTE's, primarily due to the cuts in committee staff and support organizations.

This comes on the heels of a 7.5-percent reduction in FTE's that occurred between fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1995.

Over a 4-year period, legislative branch entities covered in this bill will have downsized personnel by over 15 percent.

So, I welcome the new majority's continuing efforts to spend our resources wisely and let the taxpayers know that this is a lean and cost-effective Congress.

There are some good initiatives in this bill:

Scrutinizing the number of copies of congressional publications we need, for example, copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, copies of committee reports, eliminating the free U.S. Code or Annotated Code provided to freshmen. MC's can still get the code from their official expenses account.

Creating incentives to convert to electronic formats and to convert to electronic document distributions where it is feasible.

Funding for the National Digital Library project at the Library of Congress.

Many of the reductions in this bill are really a consequence of cost-shifting.

Shifting the Botanic Garden to the Department of Agriculture.

Cutting in half the appropriations for the Superintendent of Documents and Federal Depository Libraries and asking agencies to assume these costs.

Changes that will dramatically affect the operation of Members' personal offices from day to day—the committee estimates that the average office will have to absorb \$12,000 in additional costs due to cuts in the Clerk's and CAO's budget coupled with changes approved by the Committee on House Oversight to eliminate our in-house printing facilities, close the folding room, and increase the costs of the recording studio and the photography office.

These shifts have been somewhat offset by an increase in Members accounts.

However, there is an amendment to decrease these funds, and even with the proposed increase in Members accounts, there is no provision for a COLA for our staffs.

I'm also particularly concerned about the effect of these cuts on the important House support organizations we depend upon.

GAO is embarking on a 2-year reduction of 25 percent—15 percent of which is included in this bill. Since 1992, that's a 35-percent cut.

Congressional Research Service is being asked to absorb their pay cut costs with only a \$1,000 increase.

CBO's budget is being held level at a time we have given them significant additional responsibilities with unfunded mandates—glad that an amendment will give us the chance to add additional resources.

Perhaps the least defensible elimination in this bill is the Office of Technology Assessment.

The Speaker talks of the cyber-Congress but the first chance the Republican majority gets, it proposes eliminating the one agency that helps us sort out the fact from fiction over increasingly technical and complex policy questions.

OTA studies have saved us billions by performing independent analyses concerning high technology issues like synthetic fuels, computers at the Social Security Administration, technologies to counter terrorism in our airlines, and medical prevention technologies in Medicare.

Important to retain an independent analytical function as Congress takes up important but technical policy questions regarding risk assessment and telecommunications.

We need a counter to the executive—shouldn't have to depend on agency self-analysis.

OTA has always functioned with a unique bipartisan House-Senate board that directs their research mission; they use more than 5,000 outside-the-beltway specialists each year to assist in their studies and review their work.

We're closing them down with no thought to preserving their mission or even providing close-down funds to complete the studies they have underway.

Certainly, OTA should not be immune to the cuts we are imposing on other support agencies. Simply placing it in a Federal building, such as House Annex 2, would immediately save \$2 million a year—10 percent of their annual budget—in lease costs.

I'm glad we have two amendments to consider ways to restore OTA—the Fazio amendment and the Houghton amendment.

I would prefer to simply restore OTA, and my amendment reflects that—our bill is \$26 million under our 602b allocation so there is certainly plenty of room for OTA.

Mr. HOUGHTON is also offering a very thoughtful amendment that permits us to abolish the agency yet retain its mission and the core of its personnel while getting it out of leased space and into a Federal building—maybe Annex II, maybe the Adams Building.

Also concerned about a provision having to do with the Joint Tax Committee, and I am prepared to offer a corrective amendment.

Under current law, the Joint Committee on Taxation is required to review all proposed tax refunds in excess of \$1 million before the refund can be paid by the IRS to the affected taxpayer.

In 9 percent of cases, the Joint Committee staff finds an error or issue.

In 1994, for example, joint tax reviews resulted in \$16 million in reduced refunds, \$64 million in reduced minimum

tax net operating loss carry-forwards, and \$255 million in reduced minimum tax foreign tax credit carry-forwards.

In the first 5 months of 1995, Joint Tax reviews have resulted in \$5 million in reduced tax refunds.

Joint Tax and CBO estimate that eliminating this review of large tax refunds will reduce Federal budget receipts by at least \$50 million over the 1996-2000 period.

Our colleague, BILL ARCHER, in testimony before our subcommittee, said:

... I think it is very, very important that whatever arm does this investigation be accountable to us so that we can make whatever changes need to be made.

... constitutionally, the founders of this country were very, very concerned about the power to tax, and that it be closely held within not just the Senate, but within the House of Representatives, and we all know that the Senate cannot initiate any tax legislation. And so the Congress felt many, many years ago, long before I ever came here, that it was very, very important that the Congress keep as much of that power as was reasonably justified. . . . But doing my own return, I must tell you that there are big problems. But the fact that the review has found that there was \$16 million that was unjustified, more than justifies the cost of the committee review.

Classic example of a solution trying to find a problem.

No evidence that anything is wrong—serves as an important legislative check on this process.

So, the minority has a number of problems with this bill—some of them can be addressed with the amendments we will consider.

Beginning of a long process, including Senate consideration and conference committee.

Look forward to working with Chairman PACKARD in the weeks ahead.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me respond briefly to the gentleman. I certainly will stipulate that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is correct. The downsizing of the legislative branch of Government started long before this year and before I became chairman. The report reflects that. I wanted to make that apology to his efforts as chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure to stand here and support this appropriation bill. This is the beginning of the downsizing of Government. It is great that we are starting with ourselves. That is the second appropriation bill, and it is important to show to the American people and to the other agencies of the Federal Government that we are starting with ourselves.

We are actually cutting \$154.9 million from last year's budget. This is not slowing the growth in spending, as we

are in so many other very important programs. This is an actual cut from last year's spending, not a cut from the baseline, but a cut from the 1995 spending. When we add the cuts that the Senate will probably come forward with, we are talking about \$200 million savings on approximately a \$2 billion budget. Therefore, we are moving in the right direction, and we are sending the right message.

Mr. Chairman, we are accomplishing this by basically privatizing, streamlining, and computerizing the legislative branch operations. In the privatization, Mr. Chairman, we are just taking functions that are important that we provide. For example, the calendars that the historical society provides, they are going to continue to be available. We are just going to be charged for them on our individual budgets. If we can afford it, fine. If not, they will be bought through the historical society and made available that way.

The same way with the flag operation. It costs over \$300,000 just to raise and lower the flags, not counting the costs of the franking, where it takes basically two letters to go through the process of arranging for the flags, the cost of sending the flag itself, and the cost of the labor of everybody in all 40 offices preparing all the flag purchases.

The flags are going to continue to be available. They will continue to fly over the Capitol. It is just that the person buying the flag will pay the cost, the actual cost of flying that flag. This can be true of a number of other issues we are going to have within the Federal Government, as here in the Congress.

We are eliminating a number of programs. The United States Code, as we go to computerization, why do we need to buy these expensive sets of books? If Members want to buy them, they can put it in their budget. If not, they can just charge it. What is exciting is the fact we are computerizing so many things in the Government now, especially in our offices, so we can be reached by E-mail by our constituents.

We are providing money to digitalize a lot of the Library of Congress, and we are looking into digitalizing the congressional information to make it available to more people all over the United States without the bulk of the paperwork that now is so costly. I am proud to be able to support this bill, and urge my colleagues to support this appropriation bill.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is not just because it takes away much of our oversight, particularly in areas in science and technical matters, where I find that I rely a great deal on OTA analyses. The Office of Technology Assessment has done a great job over the years in supplying us

with the information we need to make difficult decisions. The review that is made by the Joint Tax Committee staff of audits, they have uncovered hundreds of thousands of dollars of money that people were trying to avoid paying, that legally they were responsible for.

I do not rise so much in opposition to the fact that we are not going to be providing the information that we have traditionally provided to our constituents, whether it be through depository libraries or the General Accounting Office's capacity to print the kind of information our constituents need; all those things I oppose, but what troubles me the most about this bill is what it does to the unsung heroes in this institution, people who have devoted their lives in a professional manner to making this the very special place it is, people that take such great pride in their work.

Since the two speakers before me mentioned the Flag Office, to emphasize what we are doing in terms of saving money in the Flag Office, let me focus on that, the fact that we will say to these people that "We no longer need your services, we have found a way to privatize;" to say to somebody like Chris Benza, who has worked in the Flag Office for 35 years, in a windowless office in the bowels of the Capitol, surrounded by piles of flags, doing her job, and as her colleagues, just a few people down there do their job day in and day out for 435 Members and 100 Senators who expect immediate service.

When I wanted to provide flags to Captain O'Grady's family, on the day that Captain O'Grady returned to the United States, after his family had assumed that he was lost, dead in Bosnia, that was an important occasion. The people in this Flag Office went in to work over the weekend to prepare the flags flown over the Capitol on June 8, the day of Captain O'Grady's rescue, to ensure that they were ready for presentation for the O'Grady family.

While we concentrate on the cost of doing that, which is a few dollars, really, they do not bill us anything more for working on the weekends or late at night, we think nothing of the value of a service like that, of people like that.

If you were to go into a PX on a military base, you would pay twice as much money as we charge our constituents for these flags that are flown over the Capitol. Those flags have not flown over the Capitol. All we would have to do is to add \$2 to the cost of each of these flags. We would bill our constituents. That would actually enable us to generate a profit. However, that would not be privatization, would it?

□ 1145

Mr. PACKARD. We have tried to be very sensitive as we have dealt with employees, and certainly the Flag Office is one. In our discussions with Clarence Brown, a former Member of

Congress who is Director of the Capitol Historical Society, we discussed the employees of the Flag Office. He cannot, of course, give us assurance that they would be pulled into his organization and continued service but he certainly will give every effort to do so. We are sensitive to the gentleman's concerns.

Mr. MORAN. I appreciate what my friend, the chairman says, but the point is that these employees have no assurance and the assumption is that they will lose their jobs. After 35 years of dedicated service to us and all the people that have preceded us, this is how we say thanks for a job well done: "Sorry, you're no longer needed. You're expendable. It's more important to us to privatize this office with new people," in a way that we cannot assure that he service will be provided as efficiently as it is to our constituents.

I see no reason why this was necessary to be done, and in fact why we could not have accepted an alternative that would have generated money and still provided this service at less cost than they could get anyplace else, and still reward public servants who deserve to be rewarded.

That is one of the very strong reasons I oppose this bill.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of this particular piece of legislation, notwithstanding the fact that it does involve a degree of change. As a matter of fact, life involves a degree of change.

My concern is the direction of the change. Change will occur. It is whether the change is understood and directed and for the better, or whether the change controls you and it is not for the better.

I happen to believe that the combined efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the hard-working members of that subcommittee have offered us change which is on the whole for the better. I congratulate them for their work product. I do need to point out, I guess in part because of a degree of pride, that of the \$155 million reduction, \$40 million plus of it is on the basis of the committee changes that originated in the Committee on House Oversight.

I want to underscore the comment of both of the gentlemen from California that this is a work in progress. It certainly started before the 104th Congress. It also cannot be denied that it has been rapidly accelerated in the 104th Congress and that we are in fact making changes that are long, long overdue.

There are a number of amendments that will be offered shortly and there will be a very brief time in which to

discuss these amendments. I would like to take some time now to kind of do a preview of those amendments I have a particular interest in, and will indicate my support or opposition and the reason why. If I do not discuss a particular amendment, it is because I basically do not feel that my input would be useful to the Members in arriving at their particular decision as to whether to support or oppose that particular amendment.

At this time, I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], if he would engage me in a colloquy in a subject matter which is focused on by amendment No. 4, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. If his amendment is offered on the Joint Committee on Taxation language removal, I would support that amendment.

I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy to clarify a provision in the bill, if it remains in the bill, that states that no funds of the Joint Committee on Taxation can be used to determine specific refunds or credits under sections 6405 and 8023.

As the chairman knows, in the Internal Revenue Code, the IRS is required to report to the Joint Committee on Taxation any proposed refunds, credits or tentative adjustments of certain Federal taxes in excess of \$1 million. As the chairman is also aware, the Joint Committee on Taxation does not receive a copy of the tax return but rather reviews the adjustments and determinations made by the IRS in connection with the tax return, and that under the Internal Revenue Code only the IRS may either adjust the amount to be refunded or make the refund as proposed.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman will yield, yes, that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the provision in the bill neither prevents the Joint Committee from reviewing proposed refunds or credits in excess of \$1 million as is required by Internal Revenue Code section 6405 nor does it limit the Joint Committee's ability to secure data from the IRS under section 8023.

Is the sole purpose of the provision in the bill to make it crystal clear that the Joint Committee does not have the power to actually decide the amount of refund or credits in a taxpayer's Federal tax return?

Mr. PACKARD. That is the sole purpose and the only purpose of the provision.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the chairman for that clarification.

Mr. Chairman, I would in the brief time I have indicate to my colleagues that I also will oppose amendment No. 1 or 2, which is the reduction in the Members' allowances, not that I am opposed to reductions in Members' allowances. I have encouraged, supported, and in fact brought about more than a one-third reduction in the franking account. I will continue to monitor and

urge us to make adjustments as appropriate in the Members' accounts, just as we have in the committee accounts.

My concerns with amendments 1 and 2 are, frankly, the timing. As I said, the changes in the House are a work in progress. We are going to make adjustments, a portion of them created financially in this bill by consolidating the three funds available to Members into one. We will do that through the committee in the next calendar year. We are assigning a number of specific increases to Members' allowances which ordinarily would have been paid for by the general funds of the House.

My concern is that as we make these adjustments on costs that were borne by the House on the whole, moving \$10,000 to \$15,000 to the Members' individual accounts, that this is not the right time to make the adjustment, perhaps compounding the problem of budgeting for some Members. That adjustment should be made after we actually combine accounts and we absorb the individual costs that will be placed upon the Members through H.R. 1854.

It is not that I am opposed to the concept of further reductions, it is frankly timing, and the timing is wrong. I would ask my colleagues to oppose amendments 1 and 2.

Conversely, I would indicate that I would vote in favor of amendment No. 3 by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] which would extend the cutoff period for unsolicited mass mailings from 60 days to 90 days before an election.

Finally, I would strongly oppose amendment No. 8 by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON]. All this does is keep alive hard copy transfer at a time when we are trying to create electronic transfers. In no way should we provide funds, regardless of where they come from, to maintain the old way of doing business. If amendment No. 8 by the gentleman from Utah passes, it will only delay and make more expensive the transition into the new electronic world. I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing amendment No. 8.

As I indicated at the beginning, I think this is an excellent work product. It is a very difficult thing to do, that is, change, especially when it involves personnel and dollar amounts. Change is new and unfamiliar. On the whole, I believe H.R. 1854 is as good as could be expected and perhaps even better in making this institution more accountable to our shareholders, the American people. I applaud both of the gentlemen from California on their work product.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Office of Technology Assessment.

Since its inception in 1972, OTA has served as the scientific arm of Congress. In the effort to spend the dollars more wisely, it seems to me that OTA

is more critical today than ever before. OTA helps Congress determine what projects should be undertaken, streamlined and made more effective.

It is often said that knowledge is power. Having the right information, the right knowledge, will allow us to better be able to make the right decisions. In this case, OTA provides us with the knowledge, gives us the power.

Opponents of OTA say that because OTA's reports take too long to prepare and are too detailed, they are out of sync with the legislative flow or speed with which Congress now operates. To the opponents of OTA, I ask you, what do you want? Do you want it fast, or do you want it right? When did speed become the hallmark of quality legislation?

If we lose OTA, we effectively eliminate the lens by which Congress assesses the quality of its technology-based assessments.

Mr. Chairman, in my district in Rhode Island, the fourth most elderly district in the Nation, OTA has been critical in advancing preventative medicines and cures that have helped reduce the cost of Medicare, which has helped save our taxpayers dollars. It saved over \$368 million in a Social Security Administration computer system. It has helped us move to find out which technologies are more effective, and in my State that has a lot to do with the military. We have the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, and OTA has done reports on that.

Mr. Chairman, I think the OTA gives us the information that we need, and in this environment we need the right information. I would ask my colleagues to support the Houghton amendment and others that help maintain the function of OTA.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

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

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate both the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. This is not a new idea. Others have expressed this. I think they have done a wonderful job over the years. I think particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has been sensitive to the overall issues we are dealing with today.

I just want to make one plea, and I want to follow up and thank the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] for what he has said.

Budgeting is not an across-the-board process. It is never done well that way. We have never done it that way. Therefore, it is a selective, it is not a meat cleaver approach, it is a surgical approach.

One of the things I worry about here is that the committee bill zeros out the Office of Technology Assessment. Why do I worry about it? It is not a political

issue. It is not something which affects many of us back in our districts, but long-term it affects this country.

We should not go blind into the 21st century thinking about a whole variety of things, not understanding science. There are only 3 scientists in this body. Most people do not consider the scientific implications here. They are critically important.

I have been involved as a businessman, before I came here, in cutting, cutting, cutting all my life. That is the nature of what business does. Never once did we cut the research, because it not only affects the cost but particularly it affects the revenues.

If we are going to go into this next century and our major war will be economic rather than military, we must know what our legislative body can do and what other people are going to do in the world around us. Therefore, I plead either to support the Fazio amendment or my particular amendment in terms of preserving an element of scientific understanding without which I think we are going to be in terrible trouble.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose this bill as is. What really annoys me about it is the attitude that the other side of the aisle seems to have, that government is bad and somehow we all ought to apologize for what we do here; that we need to engage in self-flagellation all the time to eliminate things because we are supposedly living high off the hog here. The fact of the matter is that 99 percent of the Members that I know on both sides of the aisle work very, very hard here and use the resources that we are given.

□ 1200

If we do not begin to have respect for ourselves or respect for this institution, frankly no one is going to have respect for us at all. And for good cause.

Yes, let us cut waste. Let us cut the things that do not work. But let us not throw the baby out with the bath water. Eliminating OTA? Give me a break. That is one of the things that has worked. It is one of the things that has been good.

We have 581,000 people in my district. New York has 581,000 people in all the districts. We need to communicate with our constituents. I do not see why eliminating the folding room or cutting printing helps anybody. I do not see where it makes government more efficient, just so we can go back to our constituents and say look at what we have done, we have cut all of these wonderful things.

Let us cut where it makes sense, but not just to cut to throw the baby out with the bath water. The flag program, my constituents like that program and

if we are subsidizing it at \$300,000 a year, let us just raise the price of the flags. Why do we have to eliminate it or transfer it to another agency?

Transferring or shifting things to other departments is a phony savings. It is a phony cost savings. We are not saving money; we are just shifting the costs and claiming that we are saving money.

Privatization, I do not think privatization as an end in itself is something that is so terrific. If it makes sense, let us do it. But if there are functions here that we do in terms of legislative offices like printing and like folding, to me it makes sense to do it in-house.

And firing employees, well, let us fire where we need to fire. But just to throw people out on the street and pretend that we are doing all of these great things, I do not see it at all.

This rule blocks most of the amendments filed at the Committee on Rules, including the gift-ban amendment, amendments to abolish two joint committees, and the lockbox amendment.

The bill eliminates funding for the Office of Technology Assessment for the first time since 1972. The bill prohibits the Joint Committee on Taxation from reviewing tax refunds of a million dollars or more to determine if they are in compliance with tax laws.

Give me a break. Let us cut where cutting is necessary, but let us not do this thing with a meat cleaver and pretend that we are somehow doing wonderful things for the American people.

I make no excuses for government. I think government is necessary to help people. I do not want to eliminate it. Downsize it, yes. But downsize it where it is important, not just so we can go home and say how wonderful we are.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to applaud the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking member, for doing a fantastic job in an extremely difficult situation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to one issue during the brief time that I have here today, and that is the issue of the elimination of the Office of Technology Assessment.

As a senior member of the Committee on Science and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on National Security, it is extremely important that we not take this short-sighted approach to eliminate what amounts to approximately a \$22 million item in our legislative branch appropriations bill.

The Office of Technology Assessment touches the acts of this Congress in ways that none of us really are aware of or understand. In the area of defense, the subcommittee that I chair

oversees approximately \$35 billion of expenditures. That is more than five Cabinet-level agencies.

Much of the research that we do is dependent upon the long-term work that has been done by the Office of Technology Assessment. Just last week we marked up the 1996 authorization bill for the military and we plussed up the national missile defense accounts and theater missile defense accounts by \$800 million.

Much of the documentation and the arguments to justify that plus-up came from reports and studies done by the Office of Technology Assessment; their study on missile proliferation around the world, their work on the development of arms and the need for arms control and the needs of defending the American people. All of that factual investigative work that took in some cases months and years was done by OTA.

It would be extremely short-sighted for us to eliminate this agency. And, in fact, we and the taxpayers would be the losers in the end. And there is no other agency that can do that work.

I know there are going to be amendments offered by our colleagues. And I would say to our colleagues here, support those amendments, whether it is by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] or by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], who I am here to help today.

Even if you are not satisfied with where the money will come from, we can send a message to the conference committee that we want OTA to be saved. It is important for this Congress and it is important to the issues that we deal with.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to what this bill does to the Government Printing Office. It virtually begins the dismantlement of that office with a 50-percent cut from 1995. No thought is given to access by the public, which will now have to go through the individual agencies instead of to a single service to get documents. I fear for the public. Government is hard enough to find your way through.

This massive cut assumes that the agencies are going to pay. Of course, we are cutting the agencies too, so we are simply moving the cost. GPO, ironically, is the leading agency in contracting out. Yet the underlying assumption of this bill is that what we ought to do with this agency is contract out.

They contract out 75 percent of their work. We ought to send the other agencies to the GPO to find out how they do it. We need a referee, however, when we are talking printing and printing technology, to decide what should be contracted out and what should not.

I cannot imagine each individual agency going through the process of deciding that. And particularly, I cannot

imagine that given what a recent GAO report has found; that agencies contract out work that can be done more cost efficiently in-house, more cheaply in-house.

Mr. Chairman, I have a bill, cosponsored by the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], that would require executive agencies to make a specific determination, before contracting out occurs, that it is going to indeed cost less. Nothing, of course, requires that to happen within this body.

We need, with this body, procurement with some controls on it from a central, knowledgeable source. For most of our history that source has been the GPO.

Finally, let me say the Government Printing Office is one of the few manufacturing facilities still left in the District of Columbia. It is the largest minority employer in the manufacturing facility. Congress has ultimate responsibility for the District of Columbia, which is on its financial knees. This is not the time to cripple one of its major employers.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1854. We hear from our colleagues that.

Government is bad, and none of us have made that statement here as Republicans. We are not saying that Government is bad, but we are trying to evaluate the need for the expansiveness of this Government.

No father likes to tell his children that we cannot go on vacation this year. No parent wants to tell their child they cannot go to college because we cannot afford it.

But in Government we seem to print money and make excuses that everything is essential. Everything that we do in this body is essential. The American businessman has to make decisions that are critical to the salvation of his or her company, and they make those decisions based on the need for productivity.

I want to particularly single out something that this committee has done regarding the code books that I have discussed on this floor in past sessions. And I want to thank you for including language in the bill prohibiting Members' personal subscriptions to the United States Code book to be paid for by the Clerk's budget.

Many may recall I brought this issue to light earlier this year following a salesman's visit to my office peddling the \$2,500 set of gold-embossed books as being free. But as anybody who has spent any time in Washington knows, there is no such thing as free in Congress.

As I have advocated, this bill states that for Members who require an office copy, the code can be purchased from the Members' official expense allowance. Alternatively, the code is avail-

able in the House library, at the Library of Congress, on line, and on CD-ROM.

By eliminating this entitlement to newly elected Members of Congress, we can bring some accountability to this system and eliminate some of the waste and abuse associated with the current system. No longer will newly elected Members be able to simply sign away 2,500 hard-earned taxpayer dollars, but they will be accountable for this purchase in their office accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his attention to this issue and bring closure to the issue of free sets of the United States Code to Members of Congress. But, I want to urge both sides to participate in meaningful debate of making certain that what government is doing today is what is important for the taxpayers, not for those that reside in Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out, as I said earlier, there is still \$26 million under the 602(b) figure that has been allocated to this subcommittee, and I would hope that we could at some point, perhaps in conference, use those additional funds to augment CBO.

I would like to reiterate that I do not think we need to help that beleaguered agency by cutting back on the Folk Life Center. I understand the Library of Congress has been contacting Members concerned about the Houghton amendment which would take some funds from the only agency in this bill that has had an increase to perpetuate the existence of a scaled-down OTA under the aegis of the Library.

Certainly, if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] were adopted or if mine were to be adopted, I would hope that we could compensate the Library at a higher level in order to make up for any costs that might be incurred by them as we divert funds to another agency in this bill.

These things can be worked out, and I do not believe the Library need worry that they are coming under attack here today. In fact, I would hope that they would understand the importance of keeping OTA alive.

But I wanted to mention another piece of legislation which has already been referred to in a colloquy between the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and that is the language that refers to the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Currently, the Joint Committee is required to review all proposed tax refunds in excess of \$1 million before the refund can be paid by the IRS to the affected taxpayer. Ninety-two percent of these returns are corporate returns. There are very, very few individual returns in this category.

When we heard from our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], who is the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and this



year the chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation, in testimony before our legislative-branch subcommittee, he said, I think it is very, very important that whatever arm does this investigation be a accountable to us, meaning the legislative branch, so that we can make whatever changes need to be made.

There is no question that the Internal Revenue Service sees no need for this amendment. They are satisfied that the relationship that we currently have between these two branches of Government is working well.

It is important to understand that this committee has historically saved the taxpayers of this country a great deal of money. In fact in 1994, they saved in the neighborhood of \$270 million. That is far in excess of the amount we are cutting from the legislative branch in this bill today.

In 1 year, by simply doing a more accurate job of auditing the returns, mostly of corporate taxpayers, they have saved the taxpayers far more than we are saving them today in all of the legislative branch reductions that are included in this bill.

In 9 percent of the cases the joint committee staff finds an error or an issue. These are the cases where filings are over \$1 million.

Let me break down for you how we got to that figure, the total savings that they made in 1994. In reviewing the various returns, they found savings of \$16 million in reduced refunds, \$64 million in reduced minimum tax operating loss carry-forwards, and \$255 million in reduced minimum tax foreign tax credit carry-forwards.

In the first 5 months of 1995, joint tax reviews have resulted in \$5 million in reduced tax refunds. The Joint Tax and CBO together estimate that eliminating this review of large tax refunds would reduce Federal budget receipts by at least \$50 million over the 1996 to 2000 year period, in that 4-year period. So I think the argument that we need to be involved in this area is simply lacking. In my view we have a solution trying to find a problem.

I do think that we should not in any way interfere with the relationship between the Congress and the executive, between Treasury and IRS, the Joint Committee on Taxation and the two tax writing committees in the Senate and the House. There is no evidence that anything is wrong. I think this serves as an important legislative check. It is the kind of oversight that we need to be doing.

So, I am hopeful that my amendment will be adopted and that we create no confusion about what our intent is in this area. I think we should support the decision that has been made I believe by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and in effect take no action on any language that may have been made in order by the Committee on Rules that would affect the prerogatives of that committee.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, to respond briefly to the comments of the gentleman from California, we simply do not eliminate the opportunity for the Joint Committee on Taxation to review the reports from the Internal Revenue Service on tax returns of those that are requesting a refund of \$1 million or more.

□ 1215

We simply are saying, in bill language, none of these funds shall be used to determine specific refunds. That is the job of IRS.

If IRS is not doing that job, then we need to have better oversight and work with them to accomplish that goal. It does not preclude the Joint Committee on Taxation to review these returns. They can continue to do that as they have done in the past.

I thought the colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] made that very clear, and thus, in my judgment, it makes the amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is referring to unnecessary, because exactly what he is asking for is what we have agreed is the case in the colloquy but also in bill language.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I just wanted to read into the RECORD a brief paragraph that I received from Margaret Milner Richardson, who is the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service. She says,

I appreciate the opportunity to clarify that refund reviews performed by the Joint Committee on Taxation serve a legislative purpose and are not merely duplicative of executive branch functions. These refund reviews are one form of legislative oversight for the Internal Revenue Service but are also an invaluable resource of information useful to a better understanding of areas ripe for legislative change.

I believe she's saying there seems to be no confusion about the two roles of the executive and the legislative branch and really believes there is no particular purpose for this language.

Mr. PACKARD. Reclaiming my time, I can put my signature at the bottom of her letter because I agree, we do not infringe upon the ability of the Joint Committee on Taxation to continue to do refund reviews of those tax returns. We simply do not want the Joint Committee on Taxation to do the auditing, to determine the return that goes to the taxpayer. That is all we are doing.

And so again I think we really are together on it, and maybe we are struggling over the language itself. But nevertheless I think our objective is simply to prevent the Joint Committee on Taxation from doing the returns. Let IRS do that. Let the review be done as they have been doing in the past by the committee.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If the gentleman would yield further, is there a problem that the gentleman is going

after? Is there some substance where the joint committee was alleged to have done the audit which technically could only be performed by IRS? I mean, I did not hear in the testimony in the subcommittee or have not been presented with any cause for us to take action. I have not been made aware there was a problem by either entity, either IRS or the Joint Committee. I wondered if the gentleman could cite for me what the reason is for offering the language.

Mr. PACKARD. We did not wish to have anything in current law that would give the Joint Committee on Taxation the feeling that they had a prerogative to determine the tax return.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I have gone back and looked at the votes that I have cast in previous years for the legislative appropriations bill. My votes have always been "no." This is the first time, in fact, that I expect to vote "yes."

The reason is this: In each of those years, spending under this subcommittee has gone up. This year it is different; spending goes down. In fact, spending goes down about 8 percent. I think that is a pretty good figure, particularly as we look at years and years ahead of us of multi-\$100-billion deficits.

In fact, if we had an 8-percent cut in each of the appropriation bills, we would save the taxpayers about \$130 billion just in fiscal year 1996. That is not bad. In fact, that is exactly the direction that we need to be headed.

Mr. Chairman, in this year of massive budget cuts, it is only fair that this subcommittee, the legislative branch, takes its fair share of cuts, and I applaud the committee for doing this.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1854.

This bill's treatment of employees, the lowest paid employees, in the folding room, the recording studio, and the photographic studio, is an outrage. Just as this House's employees were to come under private sector laws, 270 of them will be let go in the most capricious way.

For the rest of the country, we have a Job Training Partnership Act, JTPA, as it is known, and that law has a specific title, title III, for dislocated workers. This is a program that assists in communities, States and local governments, and private sector employees who lose their jobs. Many businesses have their own training and placement programs in addition to those run by the government, and in the case of some industries, such as aerospace, there are additional JTPA programs designed to meet the specific job training needs of the dislocated population.

Yet this bill makes no serious attempt to assist our own employees who

are slated for termination. Let me be clear about who we are talking about. Folding room employees, for example, are among the lowest paid workers in the House. Many of them have 15 and 20 years of service. They have never been promoted to anything. After all of these years, many of them have never received a salary increase, maybe one salary increase, and this under both Republicans and Democrats.

We are talking about people who have endured the most difficult working conditions of any House employees. If you have ever been down in the folding room, you know what I mean. I think it has been a health hazard. I think not only have they been working in unsafe conditions, I think there have been problems of discrimination, on and on and on, and I really think they should pursue a lawsuit.

Let us defeat this bill and do it right. We need to do something about our employees.

I was attempting to describe a situation that we should all be embarrassed about. We have low-entry-level employees working in these various places, and the folding room is a prime example of where they have been working for years, many of them 20-25 years, that have received no upper mobility opportunities, very little in pay increases, working in unsafe conditions, and we are literally kicking them out. And do not tell me that the measly amount of money that was put in in the Committee on Appropriations is designed to do anything real.

These people need an opportunity to be retrained. They need job training. If we can do it for the private sector and others, if we have money in the Federal Government, why are we treating our own employees this way?

I am sorry that I and others who care so much about this issue have not had an opportunity, because we do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations, but you are about to do the same thing, I understand, with our elevator operators and with others. They deserve better than the way that they are being treated.

I believe that this business to rush to privatization, to give out contracts, I am told, that do not even go up to bid without making any requirements that these people be hired by the people that we are giving these contracts to is absolutely unconscionable.

I would urge this body to show that it cares about the least of these, to show that we are not just concerned about ourselves and our generous salaries and our perks, whatever they may be, but that we care about little people.

Do you know that many of these people may never work again? Many of them have little children. It is tough out there, with no job training. We can do better than this.

Let us send this bill back. Let us do it right. This is enough for Democrats and Republicans alike to come together on. It is not too much to ask.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude the remarks on this side by saying, and I will try to be brief, I want to work with my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], in opposition to one amendment which was just mentioned by the gentlewoman from California. My understanding is that the CAO is looking at this question of the need for elevator operators.

It is a longstanding amendment which we have seen on many occasions. I certainly hope the two of us can ask our colleagues together to withhold on support of the Christensen amendment, and I also want to go on record in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] which is flawed in its concept.

In the days when we had Democratic Speakers, we used to hear about Speakers' slush funds. In fact, no such slush fund is available or could be drawn down upon. In fact, this bill for the first time, under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will let each Member know just how much they have spent of what is authorized and available to them, so that Members can help gauge their spending and, therefore, leave money in the Treasury that otherwise might have been drawn down.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] is well-intentioned, but flawed in concept. I look forward to joining the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] in opposition to both of those amendments.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that the Legislation Branch Subcommittee is not against the Federal Government. We honestly believe that Government has a very important function for the American people. We simply believe that the American people are not satisfied that Government is functioning in a most efficient and effective way.

This bill, we think, goes a long way toward fulfilling that desire in the American people. It does cut back on the legislative branch of Government. There is not question that it does, and it has not been an easy process of trying to determine where those cuts ought to be made, but we have tried to be sensitive to the employees of the Government. We have tried to be sensitive to the needs of the Members of Congress and their ability to communicate with their constituents.

We think we have done a good job.

The amendment process we will now enter into will help us refine that even further.

I urge the Members of the House to vote for the legislative branch bill.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1854 is a historic achievement. For the

first time, Members of Congress are finally putting their money where their mouths are.

I'd like to commend Chairman RON PACKARD for reporting out of his subcommittee a bill that is consistent with the reforms Members have promised their constituents they supported, but have never been willing to act upon. Year after year, we've heard Members tell their constituents that they agree this institution needs reform. Yet year after year, opportunities for reform have been wasted and we've seen no genuine effort to review legislative branch expenditures in terms of the best interests of the taxpayer. This Congress is different. This bill cuts funding by \$155 million over the fiscal year 1995 level.

As a member of House Oversight, the committee that authorizes programs funded through Mr. PACKARD's subcommittee, I am pleased to see the appropriation for the operation of the House of Representatives reflects the same intent of House Oversight, such that:

Committee staff funding is cut by one-third. Many functions of the House provided more cheaply by the private sector will be privatized. Offices and functions not critical to the ability of Members to serve their constituents will be abolished.

It's crystal clear that Republicans are running this show differently, and are willing to challenge the status quo if it means savings to the taxpayer and a more efficiently run Congress. The Republican-led Congress is not afraid to absorb cuts where we'll feel the cuts most—our own House, the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to rise in support of this bill, because it says to the American people that while Congress is making the difficult policy decisions necessary to achieve a balanced budget, Congress is starting with itself. We are willing to reduce our budget and cut back on noncritical functions. Not only is it symbolically important that we be willing to set the example for fiscal conservatism in today's economic climate, it is further proof that we are keeping our promises to the American people.

Thank you, and I yield back any time that remains.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 1854 and is pleased that this measure includes a reduction of \$56 million for the General Accounting Office [GAO] below the fiscal year 1995 funding level.

Mr. Chairman, during the first days of the 104th Congress, this Member wrote to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Budget Committee, to express this Member's strong support for reduced funding levels for GAO. This Member is pleased with the action taken in H.R. 1854 which confers with this Member's request for reducing funding for GAO.

For some time, this Member supported a reduction in funding for GAO. In fact, during consideration of the fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations bill, this Member offered an amendment to cut funding for GAO by 5 percent below the fiscal year 1994 level. Unfortunately, this amendment failed by a close vote.

The \$393 million fiscal year 1996 funding level for GAO included in H.R. 1854 represents a decrease of \$56 million below the fiscal year 1995 level. During last year's deliberation of the legislative branch appropriations

bill, the House approved a funding level of \$439.5 billion, an increase of \$9.4 million. In addition, the conference report then included \$449 million for GAO, \$10 million more than the House bill. This Member commends his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for reversing this outrageous trend in funding for GAO.

This Member strongly believes that GAO is an agency where growth has been out of control, and that it is an agency which has not been responsive to individual Members, especially to the requests of Republican Members during our long tenure in the minority. This Member also believes that the quality of work produced by the GAO is increasingly shoddy. While the quality of the work varies dramatically, all products are given the same kind of credibility simply because they are GAO products. The level of resources provided to produce these products has been excessive and has grown disproportionately when compared with other congressional support agencies. In addition, GAO resources have also been used for consultants, training and other unnecessary expenses. Concern has also been expressed that GAO is more interested in getting headlines than in supporting the Congress with the required information. This Member has also been concerned by the funds that have been spent to lavishly renovate GAO's offices. This renovated space includes plush conference and meeting rooms which seem excessive for the scope of work performed at GAO. The leadership and staff of the GAO ought to visit the staff here on Capitol Hill to understand something about crowded staff office conditions and about the absence of required conference rooms for meetings with constituents.

Now let's examine the GAO workload. From 1985 to 1993, GAO investigations doubled from 457 per year to 915. In addition, GAO's budget jumped from \$46.9 million in 1965 to our current spending level of \$449 million, a nearly 1,000 percent increase in unadjusted dollars.

While the number of full-time equivalent positions at GAO has been reduced additional cuts are still needed to account for the past growth at this agency, which this Member will outline. In 1980, funding for GAO staff cost \$204 million. By 1985 that had grown to \$299 million. In 1988 it was \$330 million, and in 1989, \$346 million. The average increase between 1980 and 1990 was 8 percent per year. Then, in 1991, GAO was increased by 14 percent, to a total of \$409 million. In 1992, GAO received another 8 percent increase to \$443 million.

According to a Democratic Study Group [DSG] Special Report issued on May 24, 1994, January 1994 personnel totals for GAO were 4,597. This level was nearly as large as the staffing level of 4,617 for the entire Library of Congress—the largest library in the world—which also includes the staff of the Congressional Research Service.

According to this same study, in 1994, GAO's staffing level was nearly 2½ times as large as the 1,849 House committee staff members, during the 103d Congress, and more than one-half as large as the 7,340 individuals employed by Members of the House. The DSG study also compared funding levels for the legislative branch from 1979 to 1994, in inflation-adjusted dollars. According to the DSG, the General Accounting Office received

one of the largest increases in funding for the entire legislative branch at an inflation-adjusted 13.5 percent during this time period.

Funding for other areas of the legislative branch have actually declined since 1979, according to this study. For example, the Library of Congress received a 17.6-percent reduction, CBO was reduced by 3.8 percent, and Members' staff was reduced by 6.4 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars since 1979.

Again, this Member would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for their good judgment in facing the long-term reality of GAO and reducing funding for that agency. This Member urges his colleagues to support this funding level included in H.R. 1854.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the bill before us, and I urge my colleagues to take a hard look at its contents, as well as its long-term effects, prior to voting.

One of the primary reasons for my opposition is the heartless, and indeed cruel, manner in which this bill treats the current employees of the House folding room, the House printers, and the various other programs that are being privatized, downsized, and eliminated. This bill tells them that while we have used, and many of us have appreciated, their services since coming to Congress, we are now casting them off, with really very little concern for their futures or their families.

While I can appreciate the move to save the taxpayers' money—and I agree, wholeheartedly, that we need to begin to reduce the deficit by reviewing spending on ourselves—I have concerns that this is a short-term fix that in the long run may not produce any fiscal savings.

As long as Members send out districtwide constituent communications, such as newsletters, we will need the services currently provided by the folding room. While I recognize that the House Oversight Committee has estimated that closing the folding room will save money, I am skeptical, to say the least, that the amount estimated will ever be realized. Representatives of Washington-area companies that provide mail processing services have said that they can " \* \* \* undercut the upper end of the estimate of the folding room costs."

Would it not make sense, then, to also look at how we can keep the folding room costs down to the lower end of the current estimates, and perhaps save the taxpayers money by keeping the job in-house? To my knowledge no such study, on how to improve the current operations, has been performed.

Finally, I am also curious as to why we are rushing into this matter. As many of us know, the Congressional Accountability Act, which would provide the employees of the folding room with the rights which are afforded to people in the private sector who are facing layoffs, will not be in place until the end of this year. It is my understanding that many of the folding room employees will not even be able to apply for retraining under the JTPA for Dislocated Workers program. This is a shame.

In short, I have concerns that this legislation is wreaking havoc with people's lives for the sake of a quick, and perhaps ultimately expensive, political hit. I hope that the Members will take the time to review their actions before voting. The actions of this House have already ruined the reputations of many fine people. Passage of this bill may, very well, ruin their lives.

I urge my colleagues to review the costs of this bill in light of the questionable savings.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I particularly appreciate the opportunity to speak before the House today as this is a critical time for OTA. At a time when budget cuts are a priority, some have questioned whether Congress needs a support agency whose primary mission is to assess technology and its implications for society. I hope you will answer that question with an emphatic yes because I believe today we need OTA more than ever before.

I have been involved with OTA from the very beginning and have watched its development from my vantage point on the OTA Board since 1975. Congress established OTA because there was a great need to have our own independent and objective source of information on complicated scientific and technological issues.

I am convinced that this need is stronger than ever because science and technology permeate so many of the issues that we consider, such as space, energy, environment, and health.

When OTA was created, no one knew exactly how it was going to work. There were times during the early years when we were not quite sure it would work at all. I think few of us would have predicted what a vital role OTA would play in the legislative processes over the years, and how valuable its work would be to so many different committees and to Members from both sides of the aisle.

I recall in particular that back in 1988, concerns about aviation safety led Representatives TOM LEWIS, then ranking Republican member of the Transportation, Aviation and Materials Subcommittee of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, to introduce legislation to strengthen FAA research efforts. OTA had prepared a report, "Safe Skies for Tomorrow," that addressed many of the research issues in the legislation.

The study found that the FAA was not adequately addressing human factors in its research program, even though these factors contributed to more than two-thirds of aviation accidents. OTA testified before and worked closely with the Science Committee. Important parts of the Aviation Safety Research Act of 1988 are based directly on OTA's work. In fact, Representatives WALKER, VALENTINE, LEWIS, and I noted in a letter requesting a subsequent OTA report that "Safe Skies for Tomorrow [had] led to passage of Public Law 100-591."

In space technology, OTA has a history of studies extending over a decade. Some of these are extensive landmark studies of a broad sweep that produced several reports. The space transportation study of 1988-1990 and the recently completed study of earth observation produced six studies each. These studies helped shape the debate on major elements of the U.S. space program, and also provided focused insights into specific program elements. Smaller space studies with a specific focus were also very useful in our deliberations.

I could give you many more examples, but the point I want to make is that OTA contributed to legislation on science and technology issues for many years, and that it continues to do so here and now.

Consider one of OTA's recent studies which reviews the Department of Energy's Fusion

Energy Program and was released at a hearing of the House Science Committee earlier this month. That study highlighted critical strategic and budgetary shortcomings of the fusion programs that have gone largely unacknowledged despite hundreds of millions of dollars in annual spending. I fully expect that OTA's work will help lead to more rational fusion program decisions.

In coming months, Congress will try to delineate the appropriate role of government and industry in science and technology. OTA can help us sort through the claims of parties interested in particular programs so that we can focus on the matters that are more important to the entire Nation.

Also in the coming months, large science projects will come under scrutiny and have to face the realities of fiscal restraints. Many believe that international cooperation may provide a way to share the costs of such projects.

OTA is now looking at the opportunities and challenges of such cooperation and will be able to help us understand what arrangements may or may not work in the future. As Congress and the administration move to revise national R&D strategies and reduce some R&D funding, OTA can give us realistic appraisals of options being considered.

OTA can help us understand how to utilize research more cost effectively. In response to a bipartisan request from the Science Committee for example, OTA has been examining a problem that has been much in the news since the tragic Kobe earthquake: how to mitigate damages from such natural disasters. OTA's study will help us understand how we can use research and innovate technologies most effectively to reduce earthquake damage.

I strongly believe OTA's work is going to be increasingly valuable in the months and years to come. OTA can continue to serve the needs of Congress in technology areas where the committees do not have in-depth expertise and do not wish to rely solely on the information provided to us by interested parties.

OTA gets advice from outside the beltway. Their studies draw on a network of nearly 5,000 experts each year from industry, academia, and other institutions. These advisors ensure that OTA has access to the best technical advice available from all areas of enterprise. Their knowledge and expertise, in conjunction with the quality and experience of the OTA staff, create a model organization ideally suited to conduct the necessary analyses designed for the specific needs of Congress.

OTA has perfected a process that brings in and distills all relevant points of view through panels, workshops, and broad review. Moreover, the OTA Board ensures that the studies are relevant to the priority needs of both parties, and that they are objective and well founded.

It would take many years to recreate this unique institution. I urge you not to deprive Congress of this valuable resource at a time when we need it most.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the Government Printing Office—the GPO—is the Federal agency responsible for fulfilling the printing needs of the Federal Government and providing the American people with copies of Government documents. It is through legislative branch appropriations that the GPO receives its funding.

I rise in support of both the funding allocation provided by the subcommittee to GPO and the allocation not provided to the Joint Committee on Printing, which has oversight over the agency.

The provisions in this bill are consistent with comprehensive legislation I sponsored to reform title 44, the portion of the United States Code that governs Government printing.

Both Mr. PACKARD and I are attempting to force agencies to budget for their printing needs the same way they budget for other activities. Both Mr. PACKARD and I are attempting to cut back on the amount of unnecessary and duplicative printing for Congress, while protecting the public's access to Government documents through the Depository Library Program. It is critically important that we maintain the historical record of the activities of our Government—a vital function of GPO's Superintendent of Documents. Without a complete and accurate record, we do a disservice to the generations of Americans who will come after us—all of whom have a right to Government information, documents, reports, and statistics. When agencies bypass the Superintendent of Documents, we very well may lose a piece of American history. This is what is referred to by depository librarians as the fugitive document problem.

By creating incentives for Federal agencies to use the GPO for their printing, not only do we help eliminate the fugitive document problem, but we keep costs to the taxpayer to an absolute minimum since GPO's competitive procurement system can generally secure work for about half of what it costs agencies to print in-house. The bill before us today also asks the agencies, rather than the institution of Congress, to reimburse the cost of printing and distributing documents to the public through the Depository Library Program. Congress will still pay for the printing and distribution of its own documents, but for the first time, the costs of printing will be where they belong: In the budgets of the individual agencies.

The bill has not provided funding for the Joint Committee on Printing, except to the extent that the JCP will exist through the rest of the fiscal year. This is among the first crucial steps toward reforming the way our Government purchases printing. It sends a message to our more reluctant colleagues that change is, indeed on the way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I commend Chairman PACKARD for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bill and would like to thank Chairman PACKARD and the members of his committee for the effort they put forth in order to bring this bill to the floor and for allowing me to speak on its behalf.

I am, however, disappointed that the Rules Committee did not choose to make my own amendment in order.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would have stopped the automatic pay raises for Members of Congress until the Federal Government is once again running under a balanced budget. While passage of this bill will demonstrate to the American people that we are willing to reform our own house, until we make the necessary step to change the law regarding our own salaries, the people we represent will continue to see a Congress that cuts funding for the programs they care about while it continues to raise its own pay.

We must return, Mr. Chairman, to the ideals set forth in the 27th amendment to our own Constitution which prohibits pay raises from going into effect until an election has passed. The American people recognize that if your salary went up, you got a raise. They also know that by trying to avoid direct votes on these raises, some Members are trying to hide them and to avoid the spirit of the 27th amendment if not the letter of the law. While we currently vote on our salaries, we have to vote not to raise them in a special bill. With my amendment we would no longer need to take special action to stop raises from going into effect. If the budget was not balanced, Members would get no such raise.

We can still take the necessary step. Join me in supporting H.R. 1133 which I have sponsored and which will put this freeze in place. Help us to restore the bonds of trust between our constituents and their elected representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of Chairman SOLOMON and the Rules Committee as well as the work of Chairman PACKARD and the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and compliment them on their fine work. And I understand that congressional salaries are not a line item in this bill and that my amendment was therefore difficult to include. Yet without my amendment, it will prove difficult to restore the faith of the American people in their elected officials.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and hope that it will take us a step closer to reforming this great institution in which it has been my honor to serve.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of today's bill, H.R. 1854. As a member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, we have worked long and hard to bring real cuts to the legislative branch appropriations. Three years ago, as a new member of the subcommittee in a much different Congress, I proposed a plan which would have achieved a 25-percent cut in the money Congress spends on itself.

Today's bill, with almost 10 percent is a significant move toward that goal. We eliminate the Office of Technology Assessment, we cut the General Accounting Office by 15 percent this year and 10 percent next year, and we have reduced committee staff by some 800 positions, and the entire legislative branch by some 2,400 positions. Imagine, this bill actually spends less money on fewer people than did last year's—\$154,000,000—a feat impossible before the 104th Congress.

My proposal for a real and achievable 25-percent cut in the legislative branch budget can result in a total savings of over \$2 billion of taxpayers' money over the next 4 years.

Major American corporations—from IBM to General Motors to Sears & Roebuck—have responded to changes in the marketplace by cutting expenses and becoming more efficient. So must the Federal Government, especially the Congress.

Until this bill, Congress has acted as though the solution to any management difficulty is to merely increase taxes or spending. I advocate we make the same kind of tough decisions that private sector companies must make when they cannot increase revenue—to cut their spending. Under my plan and this bill, we begin that process in earnest.

Because each individual Member can best determine for himself how to spend their office

funds, we combined all three office accounts into a single, unified account; making the Member responsible for how he or she spends the taxpayer's money in representing those same taxpayers.

My plan of 3 years ago proposed that we consolidate the activities of the Congressional Budget Office, the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Joint Economic Committee, and House and Senate Budget Committee with a shared staff. Today's bill cuts the Joint Economic Committee by a third and makes it clear the joint committee will be zeroed out next year. And, we will make further progress in moving toward a consolidated staff structure.

We still have a long way to go in the consolidation of Congress' legal staff. Congress and its support agencies currently employ literally hundreds of highly paid lawyers, many with duties and functions that are either duplicative or which are unrelated to the legislative duties of the Congress.

We have, to name just a few, the Office of Legal Counsel, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of the Law Revision Counsel, the Office of Legislative Counsel, the Library of Congress' American Law Division, and the hundreds of lawyers employed by dozens of congressional committees and subcommittees.

To eliminate the waste and duplication of effort and staff caused by these offices, I propose consolidating all of these offices into one legal pool. We could get a lot of high-paid lawyers off the public payroll and save the taxpayers millions of dollars. At least \$5 million would be saved from the legislative counsels, most of the \$11 million cut in the Congressional Research Service could be achieved from this consolidation, and millions more would be saved from within the committee and subcommittee budgets.

In addition to these consolidations, my plan eliminates a number of activities that we simply can no longer afford in this era of \$300 billion budget deficits. Under my plan, we would eliminate:

All expenses related to former speakers—\$201,000 in official expenses and \$410,000 in salaries for a total 1-year savings and \$611,000 and a savings of \$2,444,000 over 4 years.

The compilation of precedents of the House, saving \$587,000.

The office and research assistant provided to the former Librarian of Congress.

I would also make the Office of the Attending Physician operate on a self-sustaining basis, based on the contributions of Members, for a 1-year savings of \$1,305,000 and \$5.2 million over 4 years.

Unbelievably, congressional travel is included in the legislative branch budget. I support developing a procedure to reduce foreign travel, and make this bill reflect the actual costs of congressional travel instead of hiding it elsewhere in the Federal budget.

Today's bill is a very good start indeed at reforming this institution and gaining creditabil-

ity with the American people. I look forward to working with Chairman PACKARD and the other members of the subcommittee to move further next year into the next phase of our streamlining of the legislative branch.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of H.R. 1854 is as follows:

H.R. 1854

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$671,561,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$11,271,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$1,478,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,470,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$1,480,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$928,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$918,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, \$376,000; Republican Steering Committee, \$664,000; Republican Conference, \$1,083,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, \$1,181,000; Democratic Caucus, \$566,000; and nine minority employees, \$1,127,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$360,503,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$78,629,000.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$16,945,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$83,733,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not to exceed \$1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$13,807,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not to exceed \$750 for official representation and reception expenses, \$3,410,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, \$53,556,000, including salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Systems, \$27,500,000, of which \$16,000,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That House Information Systems is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$3,954,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, \$858,000; Office of the Chaplain, \$126,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$1,180,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$1,700,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$4,524,000; and other authorized employees, \$618,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$120,480,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$1,213,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$1,000,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursements, \$68,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement funds, Social Security fund, Medicare fund, health benefits fund, and worker's and unemployment compensation, \$117,541,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$658,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, in the case of mail from outside sources presented to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives (other than mail through the Postal Service and mail with postage otherwise paid) for internal delivery

in the House of Representatives, the Chief Administrative Officer is authorized to collect fees equal to the applicable postage. Amounts received by the Chief Administrative Officer as fees under the preceding sentence shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 102. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, amounts received by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives from the Administrator of General Services for rebates under the Government Travel Charge Card Program shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 103. The provisions of section 223(b) of House Resolution 6, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, establishing the Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities; House Resolution 7, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing for the designation of certain minority employees; House Resolution 9, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing amounts for the Republican Steering Committee and the Democratic Policy Committee; House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing for the transfer of two employee positions; and House Resolution 113, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to March 10, 1995, providing for the transfer of certain employee positions shall each be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) The five statutory positions specified in subsection (b), subsection (c), and subsection (d) are transferred from the House Republican Conference to the Republican Steering Committee.

(b) The first two of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3); and

(2) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by section 102(a)(4) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990;

both of which positions were transferred to the majority leader by House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of this Act, and both of which positions were further transferred to the House Republican Conference by House Resolution 113, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to March 10, 1995, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of this Act.

(c) The second two of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) are the two positions established by section 103(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1986.

(d) The fifth of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) is the position for the House Republican Conference established by House Resolution 625, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to October 22, 1965, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1967.

(e) The transfers under this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any rule, regulation, or other authority, travel for studies and examinations under section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(b)) shall be governed by applicable laws or regulations of the House of Representatives or as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to travel performed on or after that date.

SEC. 106. (a) Notwithstanding the paragraph under the heading "GENERAL PROVISION" in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 102a) or any other provision of law, effective on the date of the enactment of this section, unexpended balances in accounts described in subsection (b) are withdrawn, with unpaid obligations to be liquidated in the manner provided in the second sentence of that paragraph.

(b) The accounts referred to in subsection (a) are the House of Representatives legislative service organization revolving accounts under section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 96a).

SEC. 107. (a) Each fund and account specified in subsection (b) shall be available only to the extent provided in appropriation Acts.

(b) The funds and accounts referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the revolving fund for the House Barber Shops, established by the paragraph under the heading "HOUSE BARBER SHOPS REVOLVING FUND" in the matter relating to the House of Representatives in chapter III of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-554; 88 Stat. 1776);

(2) the revolving fund for the House Beauty Shop, established by the matter under the heading "HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP" in the matter relating to administrative provisions for the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970 (Public Law 91-145; 83 Stat. 347);

(3) the special deposit account established for the House of Representatives Restaurant by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (40 U.S.C. 174k note); and

(4) the revolving fund established for the House Recording Studio by section 105(g) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 123b(g)).

(c) This section shall take effect on October 1, 1995, and shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 107A. For fiscal year 1996, subject to the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives, of the total amount deposited in the account referred to in section 107(b)(3) of this Act from vending operations of the House of Representatives Restaurant System, the cost of goods sold shall be available to pay the cost of inventory for such operations.

SEC. 108. The House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291, et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(1), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General";

(2) in the first sentence of section 4(b), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General";

(3) in section 5(b)(1), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster" and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General"; and

(4) in the first sentence of section 5(c), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General".

SEC. 109. (a) Upon the approval of the appropriate employing authority, an employee of the House of Representatives who is separated from employment, may be paid a lump sum for the accrued annual leave of the employee. The lump sum—

(1) shall be paid in an amount not more than the lesser of—

(A) the amount of the monthly pay of the employee, as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; or

(B) the amount equal to the monthly pay of the employee, as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, divided by 30, and multiplied by the number of days of the accrued annual leave of the employee;

(2) shall be paid—

(A) for clerk hire employees, from the clerk hire allowance of the Member;

(B) for committee employees, from amounts appropriated for committees; and

(C) for other employees, from amounts appropriated to the employing authority; and

(3) shall be based on the rate of pay in effect with respect to the employee on the last day of employment of the employee.

(b) The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) As used in this section, the term "employee of the House of Representatives" means an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, as applicable, except that such term does not include a uniformed or civilian support employee under the Capitol Police Board.

(d) Payments under this section may be made with respect to separations from employment taking place after June 30, 1995.

SEC. 110. (a)(1) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the allowances for office personnel and equipment for certain Members of the House of Representatives, as adjusted through the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, are further adjusted as specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The further adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The allowance for the majority leader is increased by \$167,532.

(B) The allowance for the majority whip is decreased by \$167,532.

(b)(1) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the House of Representatives allowances referred to in paragraph (2), as adjusted through the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, are further adjusted, or are established, as the case may be, as specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The further adjustments and the establishment referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The allowance for the Republican Conference is increased by \$134,491.

(B) The allowance for the Republican Steering Committee is established at \$66,995.

(C) The allowance for the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee is increased by \$201,430.

(D) The allowance for the Democratic Caucus is increased by \$56.

#### JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

##### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$3,000,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

###### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For duties formerly carried out by the Joint Committee on Printing, \$750,000, to be divided into equal amounts and transferred to the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. For the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Joint Committee on Printing for the remainder of the One Hundred Fourth Congress only, the rules and structure of the committee will apply.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$6,019,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to determine specific refunds or credits under section 6405 and section 8023 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

For other joint items, as follows:

##### OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month to one assistant and \$400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) \$852,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,260,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

##### CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

###### CAPITOL POLICE

###### SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than \$600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds, as authorized by law, of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, \$70,132,000, of which \$34,213,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, and \$35,919,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms

and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

##### GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$2,560,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1996 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 111. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1996 for the Capitol Police Board under the heading "CAPITOL POLICE" may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES", upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

##### CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, \$1,991,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than forty individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

##### STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, \$30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 112. (a) Section 441 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (40 U.S.C. 851) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) In addition to any other function under this section, the Capitol Guide Service shall provide special services to Members of Congress, and to officers, employees, and guests of Congress."

(b) Section 310 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (2 U.S.C. 130e) is repealed.

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) and the repeal made by subsection (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1995.

##### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not to exceed \$2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$23,188,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of 219 fulltime equivalent positions: *Provided further*, That any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease of such property, supplies, or services to the Congress subject to section 903 of Public Law 98-63: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by inter-agency transfer, donation, or discarding.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 113. Section 8402(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office may exclude from the operation of this chapter an employee under the Congressional Budget Office whose employment is temporary or intermittent."

##### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

###### OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

###### SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law, \$8,569,000.

###### TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$20,000.

##### CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, \$100,000.

##### CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

###### CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$22,832,000, of which \$3,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

###### CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$5,143,000, of which \$25,000 shall remain available until expended.

###### HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office

buildings, \$33,001,000, of which \$5,261,000 shall remain available until expended.

#### CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$32,578,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1996.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$60,083,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

##### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

##### CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semi-monthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$88,281,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Senators, Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1996".

#### TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

##### BOTANIC GARDEN

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic

Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$3,053,000.

##### CONSERVATORY RENOVATION

For renovation of the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden, \$7,000,000, to be available to the Architect of the Capitol without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated for such renovation for this fiscal year and later fiscal years may not exceed \$21,000,000.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 201 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993 (40 U.S.C. 216c note) is amended by striking out "\$6,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

(b) Section 307E(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (40 U.S.C. 216c(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "plans" and inserting in lieu thereof "plants".

##### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress, not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$211,664,000, of which not more than \$7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1996 under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,869,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,458,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

##### COPYRIGHT OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$30,818,000, of which not more than \$16,840,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1996 under 17 U.S.C. 708(c), and not more than \$2,990,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1996 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$19,830,000: *Provided further*, That up to \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,250 may be expended on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection

with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

##### BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$44,951,000, of which \$11,694,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$4,882,000, of which \$943,000 shall be available until expended only for the purchase and supply of furniture, shelving, furnishings, and related costs necessary for the renovation and restoration of the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Library buildings.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$194,290, of which \$58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 203. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 205. Not to exceed \$5,000 of any funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Library of Congress incentive awards program.

SEC. 206. Not to exceed \$12,000 of funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 207. Under the heading "Library of Congress" obligational authority shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$86,912,000 for reimbursable and revolving fund activities, and \$5,667,000 for non-expenditure transfer activities in support of parliamentary development during the current fiscal year.



SEC. 208. Notwithstanding this or any other Act, obligatory authority under the heading "Library of Congress" for activities in support of parliamentary development is prohibited, except for Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Slovakia, and Romania, for other than incidental purposes.

SEC. 209. (a) Section 206 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 132a-1) is amended by striking out "Effective" and all that follows through "provided", and inserting in lieu thereof "Obligations for reimbursable activities and revolving fund activities performed by the Library of Congress and obligations exceeding \$100,000 for a fiscal year for any single gift fund activity or trust fund activity performed by the Library of Congress are limited to the amounts provided for such purposes".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1996, and shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL  
LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS  
STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$12,428,000, of which \$3,710,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$16,312,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$130,000: *Provided further*, That funds, not to exceed \$2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional Serial Sets and other related Congressional/non-Congressional publications for 1994 and 1995 to depository and other designated libraries.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 210. The last paragraph of section 1903 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The cost of production and distribution for publications distributed to depository libraries—

"(1) in paper or microfiche formats, whether or not such publications are requisitioned from or through the Government Printing Office, shall be borne by the components of the Government responsible for their issuance; and

"(2) in other than paper or microfiche formats—

"(A) if such publications are requisitioned from or through the Government Printing Office, shall be charged to appropriations provided to the Superintendent of Documents for that purpose; and

"(B) if such publications are obtained elsewhere than from the Government Printing Office, shall be borne by the components of the Government responsible for their issuance."

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING  
FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal

year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of passenger motor vehicles, not to exceed a fleet of twelve: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316): *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS" and "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,900 workyears: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not to exceed \$7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315); hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits comparable with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to AID projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—or his designee—under the authority of section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(b)); \$392,864,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$400,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than \$8,000,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement

Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 211. (a) Effective June 30, 1996, the functions of the Comptroller General identified in subsection (b) are transferred to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, contingent upon the additional transfer to the Office of Management and Budget of such personnel, budget authority, records, and property of the General Accounting Office relating to such functions as the Comptroller General and the Director jointly determine to be necessary. The Director may delegate any such function, in whole or in part, to any other agency or agencies if the Director determines that such delegation would be cost-effective or otherwise in the public interest, and may transfer to such agency or agencies any personnel, budget authority, records, and property received by the Director pursuant to the preceding sentence that relate to the delegated functions. Personnel transferred pursuant to this provision shall not be separated or reduced in classification or compensation for one year after any such transfer, except for cause.

(b) The following provisions of the United States Code contain the functions to be transferred pursuant to subsection (a): sections 5564 and 5583 of title 5; sections 2312, 2575, 2733, 2734, 2771, 4712, and 9712 of title 10; sections 1626 and 4195 of title 22; section 420 of title 24; sections 2414 and 2517 of title 28; sections 1304, 3702, 3726, and 3728 of title 31; sections 714 and 715 of title 32; section 554 of title 37; section 5122 of title 38; and section 256a of title 41.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Oversight and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 306. (a) Upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in accordance with conditions determined by the Committee on House Oversight, positions in connection with House parking activities and related funding shall be transferred from the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Capitol buildings and grounds, House office buildings" to the appropriation "House of Representatives, salaries, officers and employees, Office of the Sergeant at Arms": *Provided*, That the position of Superintendent of Garages shall be subject to authorization in annual appropriation Acts.

(b) For purposes of section 8339(m) of title 5, United States Code, the days of unused sick leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) shall be included in the total service of such employee in connection with the computation of any annuity under subsections (a) through (e) and (o) of such section.

(c) In the case of days of annual leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make a lump sum payment to each such employee for that annual leave. No such payment shall be considered a payment or compensation within the meaning of any law relating to dual compensation.

SEC. 307. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the relocation of the office of any Member of the House of Representatives within the House office buildings.

SEC. 308. (a)(1) Effective October 1, 1995, the unexpended balances of appropriations specified in paragraph (2) are transferred to the appropriation for general expenses of the Capitol Police, to be used for design and installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

(2) The unexpended balances referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the unexpended balance of appropriations for security installations, as referred

to in the paragraph under the heading "CAPITOL BUILDINGS", under the general headings "JOINT ITEMS", "ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL", and "CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS" in title I of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995 (108 Stat. 1434), including any unexpended balance from a prior fiscal year and any unexpended balance under such headings in this Act; and

(B) the unexpended balance of the appropriation for an improved security plan, as transferred to the Architect of the Capitol by section 102 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (102 Stat. 2165).

(b) Effective October 1, 1995, the responsibility for design and installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds is transferred from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police Board. Such design and installation shall be carried out under the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5). On and after October 1, 1995, any alteration to a structural, mechanical, or architectural feature of the Capitol buildings and grounds that is required for a security system under the preceding sentence may be carried out only with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

(c)(1) Effective October 1, 1995, all positions specified in paragraph (2) and each individual holding any such position (on a permanent basis) immediately before that date, as identified by the Architect of the Capitol, shall be transferred to the Capitol Police.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1995, are—

(A) under the Architect of the Capitol;

(B) within the Electronics Engineering Division of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; and

(C) related to the design or installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

(3) All annual leave and sick leave standing to the credit of an individual immediately before such individual is transferred under paragraph (1) shall be credited to such individual, without adjustment, in the new position of the individual.

SEC. 309. (a) Section 230(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371(a)) is amended by striking out "Administrative Conference of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board".

(b) Section 230(d)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Administrative Conference of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board"; and

(2) by striking out "and shall submit the study and recommendations to the Board".

SEC. 310. Section 122(d) of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (Public Law 103-110; 2 U.S.C. 141 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The Provost Marshal (U.S. Army Military Police), Fort George G. Meade, is authorized to police the real property, including improvements thereon, transferred under subsection (a), and to make arrests on the said real property and within any improvements situated thereon for any violation of any law of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any State, or of any regulation promulgated pursuant thereto, and such authority shall be construed as authorizing the Provost Marshal, with the consent or upon the request of the Librarian of Congress or his assistants, to enter any improvements situated on the said real property that are under the jurisdiction of the

Library of Congress to make arrests or to patrol such structures."

SEC. 311. (a)(1) Effective as prescribed by paragraph (2), the administrative jurisdiction over the property described in subsection (b), known as the Botanic Garden, is transferred, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of Agriculture. After such transfer, the Botanic Garden shall continue as a scientific display garden to inform and educate visitors and the public as to the value of plants to the well-being of humankind and the natural environment.

(2) The transfer referred to in paragraph (1) shall take effect—

(A) on October 1, 1996, with respect to the property described in subsection (b)(1)(A); and

(B) on the later of October 31, 1996, or the date of the conveyance described in subsection (b)(1)(B), with respect to the property described in that subsection.

(b)(1) The property referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the property consisting of—

(A) Square 576 in the District of Columbia (bounded by Maryland Avenue on the north, First Street on the east, Independence Avenue on the south, and Third Street on the west) and Square 578 in the District of Columbia (bounded by Independence Avenue on the north, First Street on the east, and Washington Avenue on the southwest), other than the property included in the Capitol Grounds by paragraph (20) of the first section of Public Law 96-432 (40 U.S.C. 193a note);

(B) the site known as the Botanic Garden Nursery at D.C. Village, consisting of 25 acres located at 4701 Shepherd Parkway, S.W., Washington, D.C. (formerly part of a tract of land known as Parcel 253/26), which site is to be conveyed by the District of Columbia to the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to Public Law 98-340 (40 U.S.C. 215 note);

(C) all buildings, structures, and other improvements located on the property described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(D) all equipment and other personal property that, immediately before the transfer under this section, is located on the property described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and is under the control of the Architect of the Capitol, acting under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

(c) Not later than the date of the conveyance to the Architect of the Capitol of the property described in subsection (b)(1)(B), the Architect of the Capitol and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into an agreement to permit the retention by the Architect of the Capitol of a portion of that property for legislative branch storage and support facilities and expansion of such facilities, and facilities to be developed for use by the Capitol Police.

(d)(1) Effective October 1, 1996, all employee positions specified in paragraph (2) and each individual holding any such position (on a permanent basis) immediately before the transfer, as identified by the Architect of the Capitol, shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

(2) The employee positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1996, are under the Architect of the Capitol and are primarily related to the functions of the Botanic Garden.

(3) All annual leave and sick leave standing to the credit of an individual immediately before such individual is transferred under paragraph (1) shall be credited to such individual, without adjustment, in the new position of the individual.

(e)(1) Notwithstanding the transfer under this section, and without regard to the laws specified in paragraph (2), the Architect of

the Capitol shall retain full authority for completing, under plans approved by the Architect, the National Garden authorized by section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (40 U.S.C. 216c), including the renovation of the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden under section 209(b) of Public Law 102-229 (40 U.S.C. 216c note). In carrying out the preceding sentence, the Architect—

(A) shall have full responsibility for design, construction management and supervision, and acceptance of gifts;

(B) shall inform the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time of the progress of the work involved; and

(C) shall notify the Secretary of Agriculture when, as determined by the Architect, the National Garden, including the renovation of the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden, is complete.

(2) The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924 (40 U.S.C. 71a), and the first section of the Act entitled "An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U.S.C. 104).

(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), effective October 1, 1996, the unexpended balances of appropriations for the Botanic Garden are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) Any unexpended balances of appropriations for completion of the National Garden, including the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden, under subsection (e) shall remain under the Architect of the Capitol.

(g) After the transfer under this section—

(1) under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may impose, including a requirement for payment of fees for the benefit of the Botanic Garden, the National Garden and the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden shall be available for receptions sponsored by Members of Congress; and

(2) the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Botanic Garden, shall continue, with reimbursement, to propagate and provide such plant materials as the Architect may require for the United States Capitol Grounds, and such indoor plant materials and cut flowers as are authorized by policies of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 104-146. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a member designated in the report, shall be considered as having been read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by the rule.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without in-

tervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NEUMANN: Page 3, line 6, strike "\$360,503,000" and insert "\$351,217,000".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that Congress should shrink its own budget as well as the rest of the budget for the U.S. Government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] to handle the debate on this amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss both what he was doing and an amendment which will come to his amendment shortly after this particular debate is concluded. There will be other speakers on this.

The issue of the franking privilege in the Congress of the United States is one we have all wrestled with at one time or another. I have been working with some like-minded people to try to reduce the cost of the taxpayers of the United States of America in the area of franking.

Now, let me just say, because I believe there will be some opposition to our amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], that the individuals who are working on this, on the Republican side, I think have done a remarkable job. Both the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations, I think, have done an outstanding job of trying to deal with this particular problem.

□ 1230

However, I feel that we should go even faster. I have here before us a couple of charts, if I may, Mr. Chairman, and the first of these charts shows the expenditures in an election year, and I think it is self-explanatory. I have always stated that, as far as the franking privilege is concerned, it is a tremendous boost to the incumbent because the incumbent can spend much more money on mail, either for town meetings, or questionnaires, or newsletters, or just mail in general during the course of an election year, and, as we

cycle this, it shows completely that this can take place, and that is what the chart demonstrates, and I think that is a significant number to keep in mind.

What we are trying to do here is to reduce the overall Members' representation allowance which has now been lumped together, and I think that is a good idea, too, with other office expenses, by \$4.6 million, and essentially it reduces it to where it was last year, at a sum of some \$41 million.

Now, as the Member who spent less than anybody else in this Congress last year on the franked mail, I can tell my colleagues that for sure we can answer all of our mail for this amount of money, and I say to my colleagues, if you want to give notices of town meetings, you can probably do that. You can probably have a statewide mailing in addition to that. But you are going to reduce some of these costs, as far as the margins are concerned, and that is essentially what we are attempting to do.

So we have indeed put together this effort. We believe it is reasonable, we believe that it does not overreach in terms of the reductions which are in order, and even though there is some added costs to the Members' office because the folding room will no longer be a part of this and some other costs, I think it leaves a great deal of latitude to handle whatever mail is necessary to be handled in the Congress of the United States and indeed to allow the various Members to communicate fully with their constituents.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACKARD. Are we now debating the Castle amendment or the Neumann amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the gentleman from California, the Castle amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. PACKARD. So we are now talking about the Neumann amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. Chairman, we have already cut severely the Members' allowance to pay for clerk hire for their staff as well as other office expenses in this bill. We have also, in order to absorb the cost of the reforms that the Committee on House Oversight has approved, we will be absorbing somewhere between \$11 and \$12,000 per office of existing office expense accounts, and each Member is asked to absorb those costs.

We have also in this bill underfunded by the amount of \$28 million the current allowances of Members for staff salaries, and an office and mail expenses. The House Finance Office estimates that the amount funded in the

bill will be necessary for the salary expenses of the staff in Members office. There is no room for additional reductions.

Simply said, the House budget has already been cut by \$57 million, Members' allowances are underfunded by \$28 million, and there is reason to believe that another almost \$5 million will have to be absorbed because of administrative reforms. If we simply add additional reductions of \$4.6, or \$9 million in the Neumann amendment case, it is just going to put such a burden on Members' budgets that I think they will suffer dearly and would have to actually not pay their staff or release their staff. I strongly urge the Members to protect their own offices and their own staffs from a further cut and vote against this amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, all the work he has done, and he is absolutely doing the right thing, and anything I say to rebuttal to this, or anything anyone else might say, is in no way critical of that because they really are going in the right direction.

But I must state, "If you look at the second chart I have here, which shows our outgoing mail versus our ingoing mail, it is just absolutely evident to anyone who has ever examined these accounts that quite frankly there is a great deal of room to reduce the costs that we have, and it is correct that this particular Congress has taken very strong and good measures and intends to take more, which I know about, in order to address this problem, but the bottom line is that we are dealing with a relatively small reduction, a relatively small number, that hardly cuts into the outgoing mail."

Mr. Chairman, if I had my druthers, we would go much further than we are at this particular time. I would have clearly supported the first amendment before us right now, the Neumann amendment, and clearly the amendment which I will offer as an amendment to that, the Castle amendment which reduces it even more. I think it is one which should be supported, so I am in support of that.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will say briefly, You can look at the franked mail charts over there, but this does not apply to franked mail. Part of the problem around here is that we have some people who were very earnest in the changes they want to make. You need to know that this is an appropriation bill. It goes into effect October 1. The combined representational account, which the gentleman from Delaware wants to cut, the gentleman from California, has already cut by more than one-third since the last year. We cannot make the changes to make it a single fund until the cal-

endar year, and that's why the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is right.

This money could very well go to deny already agreed-upon salaries to employees and purchasing of equipment. I want to underscore the fact I am not opposed to continuing to reduce Members' funds. There is a way; there is an orderliness to it. We are trying to move forward in an orderly fashion. The appropriation goes first, then the Committee on House Oversight will take those already agreed-upon changes and put them into effect.

I say to my colleagues, when you introduce changes like this in midstream, that throws out the coordination of the leadership, the majority and the minorities' agreed-upon changes and it just makes it more difficult. I'm not opposed to cuts. I'm opposed to cuts at this time in this manner. Let's get this representational account combined. Let's then examine it.

Frankly I am anxious to cut more than the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] is looking at, but I want to do it from a realistic, honest base where the Members have not already made commitments that they are now going to be forced to renege upon in the zealotness to get credit for some kind of a reduction.

I would urge the Members to vote "no," reluctantly, on this amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from California with whom I have discussed it, and by the way I cannot congratulate him enough on taking this issue and trying to run with it because I think he is doing absolutely the right thing, and I have no disagreement with that, but I do not think this is midstream. I believe that the franking privilege has lurked around this Congress at numbers well beyond anything that the public comprehends and certainly would be willing to live with it if they understood what those numbers are, and I think any time we can diminish those numbers we should. Quite frankly I wish I had an amendment accepted that would have cut it even more than ultimately what my amendment will be, the \$4.6 million. We are going to a representational allowance, and I agree with the chairman. It is wonderful that he has done that, but still that provides for some extra costs too, \$9.3 million, and this is merely a taking away of a very small part of that.

So for all of these reasons I feel very strongly that what we are doing here today should happen today. It in no way deters the steps which the gentleman from California has taken or that those who advocate his position would want to do, and, as a matter of fact, I stand behind that and would encourage our pursuing that in every way we possibly can.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWMAN

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASTLE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. NEUMANN: Page 3, line 6, strike "\$360,503,000" and insert "\$355,903,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and a member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Chairman, today is a day for leadership by example. At a time when we are making very difficult decisions affecting Medicare, student loans, military base closures and low income heating assistance, this is not a time when we can afford to take ourselves off the firing line. I am very pleased to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], in support of this bipartisan reform effort.

Let me first of all define the content of the amendment so that we are clear as to what we are talking about.

The Castle-McHale-Smith amendment simply freezes the amount of money available for the frank at last year's level. The Castle-McHale-Smith amendment cuts \$4.6 million from Members' representational allowances signifying a 13 percent reduction in franking funds from the committee recommended amendment for fiscal year 1996. The amendment that we now offer is supported by the National Taxpayers Union and by Common Cause.

Let us be candid in defining the problem. Last year Congress sent out over six times more mail than it received. Two hundred sixty-seven million pieces of mail were sent out by Congress during that period. According to the National Taxpayers Union Foundation, in July and August of 1994 alone Members spent 84 percent more on the frank than during the same months in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, we are making tough choices in balancing the budget. We have a moral and political responsibility to share in carrying that burden. This is a reasonable amendment. It is fiscally responsible, and it demonstrates, as we unfortunately rarely do, leadership by example.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, I assume inadvertently, he is wrong. This chart is wrong. It does not apply

to franking, it applies to the salaries of the Members, to the Members' staff and what they have committed to. It applies to the computers that they may have already obligated themselves to in terms of purchasing. That is why we ought to go about these changes in an orderly fashion.

I say to my colleagues, I believe you think you're cutting the frank. The way in which the amendment is written, means that this reduction goes to the salary of the staff that you've hired, to the computers that you have already obligated yourself and/or mail.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, Please, let me repeat once more, that this is not a reduction in the frank, you are misrepresenting this amendment. It is not. We cut franking by one-third already in this session, one-third, 33⅓ percent. This is not an amendment to cut franking.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Chairman, I just simply say that because of the representative aspects of the way this is done we can only cut the office budgets as a whole, but clearly every office can take this money as a portion. Over 435 Members is \$4.6 million out of the money they would use for franking; it is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues' support for the Castle-McHale-Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment cuts \$4.6 million from the Members' representational allowances, and my intent is to reduce Members' franking.

I want to tell my colleagues a little bit about what happened in the last campaign. My opponent had a flurry of franked mail that came in the last few weeks. Many, many, 499 piece mailings. If they had that much money, they simply did not need it.

I say to my colleagues "We have to step up, folks, and start being a part of the budget problem," and what we are doing here is saying, "Take a small, not a significant, but at least small step in good faith to do that."

My colleagues will say, "Well, we are going to go further later."

Well, this says we will because we are not going to put the money in right now. Good words for later just do not cut it, and I understand the intent here is good and strong for those that are working the congressional issues and the budget. But this should fit in real well to any planning to downsize Congress.

□ 1245

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to reinforce what the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] said earlier, and that is this amendment does not target the

mail account. This amendment applies to all three accounts that Members have. That is very important to know, that you are cutting back on office expense and Clerk hire. Frankly, we have given at the office in this bill. It is not necessary for us to cut to the point where we simply cannot do our job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded that it is very difficult to out reform a reformer, but we are a reform Congress. That is the whole point. That is the point of the November elections. We are reforming.

Now, how much do we have to bleed on the floor to show, to demonstrate, that we are reforming? If you don't watch out, you start making cuts for the sake of cuts to the point that the reform becomes counterproductive. The reform, in essence, then becomes an obstacle to clean, efficient Government. Now, I thought the purpose of this entire effort over the last year, during which the House of Representatives and the Senate changed hands from one party to another, was in fact to pare down Government, to streamline it, and make it more efficient.

Well, it seems to me that the primary amendment here, albeit well-intentioned, from the gentleman from Wisconsin, as well as the amendment to the amendment, the Castle substitute, frankly leaves us in the position that we are not going to be able to reform. We are just going to be able to stand around and show how frugal we should be without really displaying any great deal of sense or wisdom.

The fact is that the gentleman from California has shown that we are cutting the funding for this Congress, and we are paring down on all of our accounts. We are consolidating, we are merging, and we are doing it with a great deal of thought and effort. I commend the gentleman from California and his Committee on Oversight, and I especially commend my other friend from California, Mr. PACKARD, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, for their efforts. They are conscientious and diligent in trying to bring some common sense to Government. They are eliminating agencies. They are downsizing the legislative branch and the Government in general.

But to cut more just to say that we can cut more money is a counterproductive amendment, and it should be defeated. Frankly, it astounds me. If the gentleman is sincere about giving back money to the Treasury and saving money, let him give his own office account back. And I would say that to him and the other gentleman that they can turn their own money back. Any

Member in this House can turn back to the Treasury any amount of money you want to get rid of. But do not impede the progress of the House of Representatives by shortsighted cuts that do not make sense.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Castle-McHale-Smith amendment. While I feel, as I am sure Mr. CASTLE does as well, that we need to go further to address the issue of franking, this amendment is an excellent start.

For too long, Members of Congress have used taxpayer financed mail as an extension of their reelection campaigns at the expense of the challengers as well as free and fair elections.

This is not a wild accusation. The piles of newsletters in the House basement just before election cutoffs are a testament to their political nature. Furthermore, in the past decade franking expenditures have risen by as much as 50 percent in election years.

I know my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware, who represents an entire State, agrees that we do not need to send our reams of newsletters to keep our constituents informed. In my first 2 years of service I spent less than \$25,000 out of a budget of more than \$300,000.

This year it may be even more dangerous because of the unified budget. No longer will Members be constrained strictly by their franking budgets.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Castle substitute and go even further by calling for comprehensive franking reform along the lines of H.R. 798 which I introduced, or H.R. 923 introduced by my distinguished colleague from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, in this debate of about 20 minutes these charts have never been answered. We are sending out more mail in election years than at any time, and we are sending out a lot more mail from our offices than we are receiving. The cut we are talking about, which is \$4.6 million, is a very small amount.

To the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am proud to say, I spent \$10,000 out of \$400,000 over 2 years. I did my part to return it to the taxpayers.

This bill is endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union as a key vote, it is endorsed by Common Cause, it applies to all of the accounts of Congress. But if you want to, you can make sure it comes out of your franking portion of your account. There are no questions about that.

Basically it still leaves \$4.5 million after we reduce it by \$4.6 million in order to accommodate any extra costs which are added in with respect to

some of the other aspects of the House which are being closed down.

This is a very simple amendment. It is not a large sum of money. It will not deter in any way the progress we want to make on making deeper cuts. But I believe we should band together to make absolutely sure we are ending or at least reducing this practice, which has been very objectionable. I encourage Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would simply like to say we have underfunded. This bill underfunds the mail account by \$13.3 million below the allowance of the Committee on House Oversight. They just lowered that allowance a few months ago, and we are well below that level. We have cut this allowance to a point where severe restraint is going to be necessary for the Members. For them to have to cut further is beyond restraint, it is fiscal imprudence.

We have an amendment coming up that will further restrain the mail account to where they cannot mail out 90 days before an election, so we are putting more and more constraints on the mail account. We again feel that we have already given at the office in this bill. Let us not devastate each Member's office. I urge the Members to vote against the substitute amendment of Mr. CASTLE. We certainly agree that we need to cut. We think alike. It is just that we feel we have gone far enough in our bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, on the Neumann amendment, if there is no intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 215, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]  
AYES—213

Allard	Browder	Coble
Andrews	Brown (OH)	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Brownback	Condit
Baldacci	Bryant (TN)	Costello
Barcia	Burr	Cox
Barrett (WI)	Camp	Cramer
Barton	Canady	Crane
Bass	Cardin	Crapo
Becerra	Castle	Creameans
Bentsen	Chabot	Cunningham
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Danner
Blute	Chapman	Davis
Boehner	Chenoweth	Deal
Bonilla	Christensen	DeLauro
Brewster	Chrysler	Deutsch

Dickey	Kingston
Dooley	Kleczka
Dornan	Klug
Doyle	LaFalce
Dreier	LaHood
Duncan	Largent
Dunn	LaTourette
Durbin	Laughlin
Edwards	Lazio
English	Leach
Ensign	Levin
Eshoo	Lincoln
Fawell	LoBiondo
Flanagan	Lofgren
Foley	Longley
Forbes	Luther
Ford	Maloney
Fowler	Manzullo
Fox	Martini
Franks (CT)	Mascara
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy
Funderburk	McCrery
Furse	McHale
Gallegly	McHugh
Geren	McInnis
Gilchrist	McNulty
Gordon	Meehan
Goss	Metcalfe
Graham	Meyers
Green	Mfume
Greenwood	Mica
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)
Hall (TX)	Minge
Hamilton	Montgomery
Harman	Moorhead
Hastings (WA)	Morella
Hayes	Neal
Hayworth	Nethercutt
Hefley	Neumann
Hefner	Norwood
Hilleary	Olver
Hinchee	Orton
Hobson	Pallone
Hoekstra	Parker
Holden	Pastor
Horn	Paxon
Houghton	Payne (VA)
Hutchinson	Peterson (FL)
Inglis	Peterson (MN)
Johnson (SD)	Petri
Jones	Pickett
Kasich	Pomeroy
Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Kennelly	Poshard
Kildee	Pryce
Kim	Quinn

NOES—215

Abercrombie	Collins (MI)
Ackerman	Combest
Archer	Conyers
Armey	Cooley
Baessler	Coyne
Baker (CA)	Cubin
Baker (LA)	de la Garza
Ballenger	DeFazio
Barr	DeLay
Barrett (NE)	Dellums
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart
Bateman	Dicks
Beilenson	Dingell
Bereuter	Dixon
Berman	Doggett
Bevill	Doolittle
Bilbray	Ehlers
Bishop	Ehrlich
Bliley	Emerson
Boehkert	Engel
Bonior	Evans
Bono	Everett
Borski	Ewing
Boucher	Farr
Brown (CA)	Fattah
Brown (FL)	Fazio
Bryant (TX)	Fields (LA)
Bunn	Fields (TX)
Bunning	Filner
Burton	Flake
Buyer	Foglietta
Callahan	Frank (MA)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen
Clay	Frisa
Clayton	Frost
Clement	Ganske
Clinger	Gejdenson
Clyburn	Gekas
Coburn	Gephardt
Coleman	Gibbons
Collins (IL)	Gillmor

Radanovich	Livingston
Rahall	Lowey
Ramstad	Lucas
Reed	Manton
Rivers	Markey
Roberts	Martinez
Rohrabacher	Matsui
Ros-Lehtinen	McCollum
Roukema	McDade
Royce	McDermott
Sanford	McIntosh
Scarborough	McKeon
Schaefer	McKinney
Schroeder	Meek
Seastrand	Menendez
Shadegg	Miller (FL)
Shaw	Mineta
Shays	Mink
Sisisky	Molinari
Skaggs	Mollohan
Smith (MI)	Moran
Smith (NJ)	Murtha
Smith (TX)	Myers
Smith (WA)	Myrick
Solomon	Nadler
Souder	Ney
Spratt	Nussle
Stearns	Oberstar
Stenholm	Obey
Stockman	Ortiz
Talent	Owens
Tanner	
Tate	
Tauzin	
Taylor (MS)	
Thornberry	
Thornton	
Thurman	
Tiahrt	
Upton	
Volkmer	
Waldholtz	
Walker	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Ward	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
White	
Woolsey	
Wyden	
Young (FL)	
Zeliff	
Zimmer	

Oxley	Spence
Packard	Stark
Payne (NJ)	Stokes
Pelosi	Studds
Pombo	Stump
Porter	Stupak
Quillen	Taylor (NC)
Rangel	Tejeda
Regula	Thomas
Reynolds	Thompson
Richardson	Torkildsen
Riggs	Torricelli
Roemer	Towns
Rogers	Traficant
Rose	Tucker
Roth	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Vento
Rush	Visclosky
Sabo	Vucanovich
Salmon	Waters
Sanders	Watt (NC)
Sawyer	Waxman
Saxton	Whitfield
Schiff	Wicker
Scott	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Wise
Serrano	Wolf
Shuster	Wynn
Skeen	Yates
Skelton	Young (AK)
Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—6

Gunderson	Moakley	Torres
Kaptur	Schumer	Wilson

□ 1313

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Gunderson for, with Mr. Moakley against

Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ZELIFF, Ms. FURSE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. CREMEANS, SMITH of Texas, LAFALCE, LAZIO of New York, PAXON, and STOCKMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN]. The amendment was rejected.

□ 1315

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTIERREZ: Page 3, line 6, insert before the period the following: "Provided, That no such funds shall be used for the purposes of sending unsolicited mass mailings within 90 days before an election in which the Member is a candidate."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] and a Member in opposition will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment,

and I seek to control the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit mass mailings within 90 days of an election. As all Members are well aware, a prohibition currently exists barring such activities from occurring 60 days before an election.

In its simplest form, this amendment is an extension of that limit.

But, it is more than that.

It is a sign to an American public hungry for change that we are ready to implement reform.

It is a sign that we are more interested in doing the people's business rather than our own political business.

This additional 30 days makes sense. Common sense.

We have all been through campaigns. As candidates. And as voters.

So, we know what happens when it's 65 or 70 or 75 days before election day. In some ways, it's not so different from what happens right before election day.

That is the point.

Here is an example. Most years, Labor Day falls in that block of time that is currently unrestricted by franking prohibitions.

Now, for a lot of people, Labor Day's a holiday. But, for any candidate hoping to keep his office, that's a day to labor—it is the heart of campaign season.

And, most years, we are on the stump even earlier than that. The "dog days of August" are often the red hot days of a tough campaign.

Unfortunately, under current guidelines, it is entirely possible that your district-wide newsletter, sent at the taxpayers expense, hits the mailbox at the same time as a challenger's direct-mail campaign piece.

That is not fair.

It is not fair to voters who deserve a campaign based on the power of ideas, rather than the power of incumbency.

And, you know what? As long as these double standards exist, it is not fair to us. It's not fair that Congress is perceived as inactive on reform.

But today is our change to erase part of that perception.

I offer this amendment in the greatest spirit of bipartisanship.

I want to thank members of both parties on the Rules Committee who made this amendment in order. I know that many Republicans have introduced reforms of this nature—including my friend, JACK QUINN of New York.

And, at the same time, this amendment is in keeping with the franking reforms initiated by the Democratic leadership—by Mr. FAZIO and others—that have led to great savings.

Since 1991, when some crucial reforms in franking were first put in place, a considerable sum of taxpayer

funds has been saved—to the tune of over \$190 million.

I believe it is accurate that the trend I have just mentioned would continue and even accelerate with new reforms like this one.

Regardless of those trends, let us just try to estimate cost savings this way.

In 1994, an election year, House mail costs were \$42 million.

Let us ask: Did mass mailings—especially those sent in the heat of an election in late summer or early fall—account for half of that money?

A quarter? A tenth?

If they even accounted for just under 5 percent of such funds, then that equals \$2 million.

Two million bucks of the taxpayers money. That is a conservative estimate—and I am not usually a conservative.

And, if you are looking for a couple of outside authorities on this matter, I think it's worth noting that the National Taxpayers Union—a group committed to cost savings—has pledged their support of this amendment.

And, Public Citizen, a group well-known for its work on reform, also supports my amendment, because they see it as an important step—a first step—toward better government.

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time being yielded by my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to support the amendment offered by Congressman GUTIERREZ to prohibit congressional unsolicited mass mailings within 90 days of an election.

Last year, I successfully offered an amendment to this bill, along with my colleague, Mr. POMEROY, to cut congressional franking allowances by \$4 million. The franking allowance, therefore, was reduced from \$35 million to \$31 million for House Members.

There is quite a bit of talk in Washington about reducing the cost of Government. If Congress is ever going to be successful in getting Government spending under control, it first must reduce its own expenses.

I consider the ability to communicate with my constituents to be very important. Nevertheless, when I first ran for Congress in 1992, I pledged not to send mass mailing within 6 months of an election. I have kept that promise throughout my tenure in Congress and it has worked very well.

This amendment only prevents Members from sending mass mailings within 3 months of an election. By restricting myself from mailing within 6 months, twice the amount of time involved in this amendment, I have shown that this approach not only works, but is not overly restrictive.

I invite my colleagues to support this amendment. I also encourage all of you to join me in an effort to restore credibility to this body by voluntarily withholding mass mailings within 6 months of an election.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying it was a number of years ago that we moved from 30 days to 60 days, and then under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] who, by the way, should have jurisdiction of this issue within his committee, the Committee on House Oversight, we made sure people were not allowed to mail simply by delivering their printing to the Post Office and having it go out after the 60-day deadline was thought to be in place. In other words, if it is not postmarked before 60 days before the election, it cannot go.

Mr. Chairman, we have occasionally had problems where people did mail after that date, but the effect of the Thomas amendment, I think, has gone a long way to cleaning up the problem that some of our colleagues continue to be concerned about.

Mr. Chairman, let me just simply say that now, as we move to a contracting out concept with the folding room, Members will be dealing with literally hundreds of printers here and, I suppose, in their districts, so there will be no overruns of the 60-day period, which has occurred because of the heavy load of printing going through simply 2 printers, one for the minority and one for the majority.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, if we move to 90 days, it would mean that Members with late primaries would be completely unable to send even community meeting bulletins, even notices of town hall meetings, for as long as 6 months at a time.

Perhaps this is acceptable to some Members, but it seems to me that in the 6 months prior to our ability to go before the voters in November, there ought to be some opportunity for Members to communicate directly and personally with their constituents. I think we would end up, frankly, if we had a 90-day period, with a much more expensive mailing scheme even from normal purposes, even for those communications that go out to inform constituents of what the Congress has indeed accomplished.

As we all know, much of what we do will not be known until the last few months before we leave here in the second year of the congressional session. Much of the reason for this saw-tooth effect that Members saw earlier on the chart is that while certainly elections are a factor in Members' thinking, just as important is the desire on the part of each Member to communicate the accomplishments or the failings of Congress, whatever they may have done on the issues that they said to their constituents they were to focus

on in the second year of a Congress, when much of the work that we are engaged in comes to a close.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that this amendment, pushing us out 30 more days, is much more than is appropriate. I would urge that it be defeated.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to add to what the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] said. Those who have late primaries, in September, would not be able to send anything out for a long period of time during a general election out for a long period of time during a general election and a primary election campaign. Also, Mr. Chairman, an early primary would force Members to do their mailing during the holiday season. That is not a good time to communicate with your constituents. Therefore, I think there are some reasons for Members to be very concerned about this provision of extending it an additional 30 days.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I would ask how much time remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ], has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 75 percent of that time, 45 seconds, to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], and I will keep 15.

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

Mr. THOMAS. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for voting with us on the last amendment. It creates an orderly process in making change, and I want to thank them.

I was the author of the 60-day postmark cutoff, because I thought that was what the law was supposed to be. I will tell Members that I am rising in support of this particular amendment because it does not create disorder. Since we are getting rid of the folding room at the end of August, the decision to go to 90 days from 60 days is basically a philosophical one. I would ask the Members to ask themselves whether they think it is appropriate or not.

I would say that a September primary now, because of the 60-day cutoff, does not allow Members to mail between September and November, anyway. That is not an argument for this amendment. Members can send notice through newspapers and other means for town hall meetings. It does not have to be unsolicited mass mail. Therefore, this would not be disruptive, and I would support it.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

No. 1, I think we can organize our mailings. People are watching us right now as we speak. I just want to say that I offer this amendment because I think it is important for the House to

reform itself before the people reform us and demand these reforms. I think that is what a lot of the elections, at least the last two election cycles, have been about. I encourage everybody to support this amendment.

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

I will just conclude, Mr. Chairman, with the comment that I think all of us who attempted to get people together at a townhall meeting relying on the good offices of local newspapers have found that to be a wanting approach. We do need to let people know when we are available for constituent consultation or for just the give and take on the issues. It seems to me to have 90 days before a primary and 90 days before a general election makes it almost impossible for Members to adequately communicate during the second year of a congressional session.

□ 1330

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman that the Committee on House Oversight is working on the possibility of creating public service announcement-type purchases on the radio and other media, as a point of information, beyond mail, for the townhall meetings.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate that comment. I certainly think we should take a look at doing something to mitigate for this before we act on it, in the absence of any alternative. Therefore, I would urge that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

The amendment was agreed to. The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO of California: Page 15, line 8, strike the colon and all that follows through "1986" on line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I think this issue has been debated probably more extensively in the

general debate than the 10 minutes we have to debate it now would permit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying, "If it ain't busted, don't fix it." The Joint Committee that does the auditing work, looks over the work of the IRS, is not busted. I have been associated with it for about 30 years now. I have never heard one single complaint about their work.

Let me repeat that. In the 30 years I have followed the work of the Joint Committee on Taxation, overseeing the IRS on refunds, I have never heard of one single complaint from either a taxpayer or from anybody involved in the tax-gathering business. It is highly professional. It is nonpartisan. It is something that needs to be done. The Congress set it up that way a number of years ago.

It has worked well. We should not destroy what works well. This is a very controversial area of the law. I think anybody who is connected with the Code realizes that the IRS Code is very complicated and requires some very technical information. These are the people who know it and they do it well. Don't fix it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree at all with the previous speaker, and I do not believe that it really is broke. I believe that we did treat the Joint Committee on Taxation very favorably in this bill. We did not change anything.

According to the colloquy and my understanding of the language in the bill, it simply confirms something that is important in terms of its function. We simply do not want the Joint Committee on Taxation to determine tax returns and refunds. We think that that is addressed in the bill. The colloquy I think addressed that.

Frankly, I do not know that this amendment will do anything differently than what is already done. In the interest of time, I would simply ask the gentleman from California to withdraw his amendment and let it ride the way that the colloquy followed, but I will leave that to his judgment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do continue to offer the amendment, not because I at the moment am convinced that the plans of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] are pernicious or would in any way be intentionally undermining the role of the Joint Committee, but I have yet to hear a rationale for the language that has been offered.

I say that because in the earlier colloquy there was no problem cited, no indication that we had a lack of clarity about the powers of the executive or the legislative branch, no problem that had been presented in terms of the role



the Joint Committee on Taxation has performed in this area.

There is no question that they have performed admirably. They have, I think, saved the taxpayers countless millions of dollars, and will in the future. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means testified that he felt the process was working well and that this language in effect when it was discussed, not at that time offered, was perhaps going to be somewhat confusing.

I do not really think that the Packard amendment, as it is currently worded and currently interpreted by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] in the earlier colloquy, does anything at all.

What I would suggest is we simply leave the language out. If the intent was not to interfere with the processing of audits at the Joint Committee on Taxation, then I think we should be silent on this issue. This is an opportunity for the Members, I think, to register support for the work of the Joint Committee in this regard and for the oversight function that Congress must provide over the Internal Revenue Service.

As the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has said, this is not simply an oversight function but one that helps the two entities educate themselves about new approaches that have been taken by countless attorneys and accountants to in many ways short the American taxpayers on a proper filing of their corporate returns. Ninety-two percent of these returns are corporate.

I am urging my colleagues to vote down this amendment. I think it would be the most effective way to say we support the status quo. If at some point I am presented with some facts that show we are in disarray or disagreement between the two branches, if the Joint Committee has gone too far, if IRS thinks there is somehow some confusion about their role to actually be the final say on any given return, then I think we could revisit this in a future Congress.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time, but reaffirm my desire for this amendment to be defeated. I would hope perhaps that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] could withdraw it, because if he does not believe that this will do anything, I do not know that we need to present the amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, if I have done anything, I have confused the gentleman from California. It is his amendment, not mine, and I think he wants a "yes" vote, not a "no" vote.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am opposed to the language as placed in the bill. And the gentleman does correct me.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for an "aye" vote on my

amendment to remove the language that I would hope the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] would voluntarily withdraw, should he succeed in this vote.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 104-146.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO of California: Page 19, after line 13, insert the following:

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-484), including official reception and representation expenses, expenses incurred in administering an employee incentive awards program, and rental of space in the District of Columbia, \$18,620,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in this instance in strong opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of, obviously, an amendment that I think is important to restore the Office of Technology Assessment to that group of agencies that have shown an outstanding ability to assist this Congress in its workload.

There is no question in my mind that this is an organization that, if eliminated, would be seriously missed by this institution and I think by the people who elect us and send us to Washington to serve every 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very complex world we are part of. Many of us are trained in the social sciences and humanities. We are not physicists, chemists. There are very few of us that have scientific degrees. Yet we as a Congress, in almost every committee of jurisdiction, are assigned a responsibility of very frequently, particularly in the appropriations process, making fundamental judgments about questions relating to science and technology that are beyond our ability to understand without the assistance of people who are expert.

What have we done? Instead of going out and hiring a group of people who

are standing by to advise us, we have created a small entity with a core staff that works with thousands of people, from the academic world, from the private sector, from national laboratories, from any number of places where scientists are employed in this country, to help us solve the problems that come to us on a regular basis. We have had this agency, which has a \$22 million budget, pay for itself hundreds of times over by giving this Congress the kind of advice it needs to prevent mistakes from being made.

Some are, anyway. We have not always used OTA to the extent we should. But my suggestion is, rather than eliminate it, let's let the new majority, if they are so inclined, to change it, to reform it, to mold it, to make it more useful. I think this meat ax approach should be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], a member of the board of OTA.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been associated with the OTA since the hearings which led to its creation back in the 1960's, and I have been on the board for some time.

Mr. Chairman, I would concur in everything that the distinguished gentleman from California has said about the merits of the OTA. It is today a better organization than it has ever been. It is headed by one of the finest, most capable Members of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], who is, and I have said this publicly, the finest chairman the board has had in my experience, and I hope he will have an opportunity to continue.

The value of the work that is done I have illustrated here. I have brought with me some of the reports; the most recent, National Space Transportation Policy, dealing with critical issues in the Space Program which will require expenditures of billions of dollars, and on which most Members of this House will not be able to make informed decisions without the kind of advice and assistance that these reports represent.

I think it would be tragic to eliminate the agency at this time. I very strongly urge support for the amendment of the gentleman from California to restore the funding.

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

Mr. Chairman, in our efforts in this bill we have genuinely tried to find where there is duplication in the legislative branch of Government. This is one area where we found duplication, serious duplication. We have several agencies that are doing very much the same thing in terms of studies and reports.

I served on the Subcommittee on Science of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for many, many years in this institution, and I am

aware of the invaluable service of OTA, but there are other agencies that do the same thing. The CRS has a science division of their agency. GAO has a science capability in their agency. They can do the same thing as OTA.

We evaluated how to best consolidate, and it was our conclusion as a committee that to eliminate OTA and absorb the essential functions into some of these other agencies that are going to continue was the best way to go.

If the Members of Congress really feel that duplication and additional bureaucracies with additional personnel and office space and cost are the way to go and status quo is the way to go, then they would want to vote for this amendment, but I do not believe the committee nor the House feels that that is the way to go. We ought to eliminate those agencies where duplication exists. This is one of those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I admit OTA has done a good job. They have good, solid professionals, but those professionals can work with other agencies that will do those same functions, if they are essential. We also have the CRS, GAO, and other agencies, such as the National Academy of Sciences. There are many alternatives, or this work can even be privatized and contracted out for the services. But we do not need this agency that has now outgrown its usefulness, has now outgrown its usefulness, has now increased its mission to other areas beyond science. I feel that the committee has done the right thing, and would strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

□ 1345

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important issue and I urge the members to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. So much of the work of this place now goes on really in a second language, the language of science and technology, whether it is space issues or research issues or environmental issues.

Without OTA, essentially, to do simultaneous translation of the language that is very inaccessible to most of us who have not been trained in technical fields, we will essentially be engaging in an act of unilateral disarmament on very, very key national issues.

Far from being a luxury that we could do without, this is a necessity that we would be foolish to try to do without. The idea that there is play or leeway in the budgets of any of the other support agencies, GAO or CRS, is simply not true. Those budgets are being held static. There is no place else to put these functions. We need to keep them alive and well at the OTA.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that this is over \$18 million that would

be added back into the budget. If we are serious about deficit reduction and balancing the budget, then it really needs to start with Congress itself, and this is an agency of the Congress itself.

We believe that the American people would be very pleased to see Congress eliminate, certainly, the duplication and the bloat of the bureaucracy that we have created for ourselves over the years. Surely we can do without agencies that duplicate the same service.

It is not a question of whether the science reviews and studies will be done or the reports will be done. It is a question of whether we want two or three or four agencies doing essentially the same work. So I urge my colleagues to save this \$18 million, and not add it back as this amendment would do.

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

I want to make it very clear, I am going to be supporting my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], who will be offering a substitute in just a few seconds. That amendment, I think, is a compromise which does allow CRS to absorb OTA for purposes of getting us to conference.

I will be honest, I do not want to draw down the Library of Congress' budget for this purpose, and I would request that none of my colleagues vote against this amendment out of any concern for the library. We still have \$26 million allocated by the full committee that has not been used. That will be enough to absorb what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] expects to spend in the library.

There is no question that OTA is accountable and should be reformed if Members of the majority feel it should. But I think the amendment that my colleague from New York is offering allows OTA to go through that process of reform under his stewardship and will put us in a position to continue to benefit from the expertise that we have repositied at OTA over the last decade plus.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOUGHTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. HOUGHTON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO of California: Page 23, line 18, strike "\$60,083,000" and insert "\$75,083,000".

Page 26, line 19, strike "\$211,664,000" and insert "\$195,076,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], and a Member in opposition, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will speak briefly because other Members want to express themselves.

I have spoken earlier on the floor regarding the OTA. I believe it is critically important for this Nation to know what is going on in the business of technology and science into the 21st century. This is the only unit we have to advise this Congress, to work hand in hand with the scientists of this country and know what is there, and if we eliminate it, we go blindfolded, and I think that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], who also is a member of the OTA Board, who would like to express himself.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Houghton amendment. I have had a great experience working on the Board at OTA. I have learned a lot. And what I have learned is this, that the information that we get as Members of Congress making policy is getting more and more technical and more and more difficult. And OTA has done yeoman's work in providing that kind of information.

One example, we had a bill last year, if you will recall, dealing with wiretapping. We worked with the FBI, we worked with the telephone companies, to craft a bill that would allow the FBI and other law enforcement agencies to deal with the very real problem of using legal wiretaps on the new technology.

We asked OTA to determine how that technology will result in either excessive or not excessive costs in implementing that program. It was a very important study. We just got the interim report back. We would expect the final report back relatively quickly. That will give us an idea about how that new technology will work and the ability of law enforcement to protect us from the kind of situation that occurred in Oklahoma City.

I think it is important that OTA be made part of this proposal. I support the Houghton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to restore funding for the Office of Technology Assessment.

While I am a relative newcomer to OTA's operations, I have been impressed with what I have observed. In addition to being on OTA's governing board, I am also one of its clients as a member of two subcommittees of the House Commerce Committee. In September I asked the OTA to take on a complicated job for the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance—namely, to figure out the costs to the telecommunications industry of meeting law enforcement needs under the requirements of the Communications for Law Enforcement Act.

The problem we had during the debate over the act, was that the telephone industry and

the FBI had widely different ideas on costs. To understand these costs and whose numbers might be best, we quickly figured out that we needed to know a lot more about the technology than we did. And neither we nor our staffs has the time to do the necessary digging. So we turned to the OTA.

What I discovered was a wealth of knowledge and insight related to the whole field of telecommunications. OTA, I found, has already completed numerous studies upon which we could draw and there was knowledgeable staff to quickly take on our task. I already have their preliminary results in hand and I expect the final report next month.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials, I will be using OTA's expertise again. OTA's analysis of the Superfund Programs will be important as efforts begin in the Congress to completely revamp this program. Just last week, OTA provided important testimony before my subcommittee, and is continuing to produce analysis to help in rewriting Superfund legislation.

I know that these limited experiences of mine are not unique. Countless other subcommittees and committees are continually tapping into OTA's knowledge base and expertise. At this time, when we are contemplating massive changes in the way this country is run, I think we need the best information and analysis available. With this in mind, I hope that my colleagues will carefully consider the OTA's irreplaceable expertise to Congress and support this amendment.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to make some observations. The one area that services the Congress and the country perhaps best of all in the legislative branch of Government is the Library of Congress.

There is not any Member of Congress that I know of that has any desire to limit or to cut back the Library of Congress. In fact, it is the one agency in our bill that we have struggled to remain whole and to provide for them even a modest increase.

It is the most valuable resource I think the Members of Congress and the country have relative to the providing and preservation of information.

This cut to the Library of Congress, a cut of over \$16 million, over \$16.5 million, would cut 306 full-time employees, it would be an 8.1-percent cut in this particular area. And it would also limit or cut back on the time that the reading rooms would be open for the public, according to the Librarian.

It would also reduce their cataloging facilities by 25 percent and if they cannot catalog, then other libraries throughout the country cannot use or access the bibliographic records. It would cut back on the preservation of collections by 15 percent to 20 percent. That is 40,000 to 50,000 items that would not be preserved and would be lost because of paper or binding deterioration. And it would cut back on the law library services of the Library of Congress which is arguably the most important collection of legal materials in the world. The processing of library materials would be cut back.

I received two phone calls from the Librarian, Dr. Billington, within the last 24 hours and he strongly urges a "no" vote on this amendment. And I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I wish Dr. Billington had called me. He did not, obviously, as the author of this amendment. The Library is not going to suffer if we deal with their needs in conference. There is no other way in a revenue-neutral sense that we could begin to help OTA unless we went to the one agency that was plussed up in this bill, the Library. Dr. Billington needs to understand the context in which this bill is being offered.

Mr. PACKARD. I think it is clear that this substitute amendment unquestionably will penalize the Library of Congress by over \$16.5 million. I think that it is unconscionable to transfer these funds out of the Library. I would much prefer to see the OTA be absorbed into the Library of Congress, as this amendment does, but let the CRS absorb that workload and eliminate the costs at OTA.

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

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

I would just like to respond a minute. This is a rather new argument, and it comes about because of the absorption of the costs. I, myself, have also talked to Dr. Billington. I explained our situation. I think he understood. I cannot speak for him, but I thought he did.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly supportive of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the work that his subcommittee has done, but I must say in this situation I do wholeheartedly support the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

It cuts 50 of 190 jobs. It cuts the budget by 32 percent, from \$22 million down to \$15 million. And it folds its functions into the Congressional Research Service. So we cut down on the money, we cut down on the personnel, we downsize to the bone, but we do not lose the function.

It just seems to me in this era of fiber optics and lasers and space stations, we need access to an objective, scholarly source of information that can save us millions and billions. We should not eviscerate everything that makes us a more effective Congress. So, I support the Houghton amendment.

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

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

The largest science project that has come before this Congress and before the country was the superconducting super collider project. OTA refused to do a study and a review and a report on that project.

Subsequently, and I cannot fault the lack of a report and a study, but subsequently, there has been billions of dollars lost on that project because it did not go to fruition in the State of Texas.

There are reports that have come late after the report was of no value. So there are some flaws in the process. It is not an agency without its problems. But I do not believe that we have to retain an agency if we retain the essential functions of the agency. And that is what we are proposing to do.

It is not that the functions will not be done that have to be done. But if the Members of Congress are serious about downsizing Government, if they are serious about cutting costs, they ought to start with themselves, and the committee has, in their judgment, felt that this is a place to start.

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

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in a time when we are talking about risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, getting the Congress the best possible information we can get is a very important undertaking. And having OTA to provide that kind of assistance to the Congress is absolutely indispensable.

OTA, because of the fine technical work and because of the careful research which it has done on advanced questions involving technology and advanced information systems, has saved the Congress literally hundreds of millions of dollars over the time of its existence.

To cut it back at a time when other nations are beginning to recognize the importance of this kind of advice to a legislative body would be a great shame, and would indeed cost us vastly more than any piddling savings that could be made by eliminating that agency. I would urge my colleagues to recognize this is a cost-benefit, efficient, and desirable step in continuing the existence of OTA.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment to preserve the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA] I fail to see precisely what problem the elimination of OTA is supposed to solve.

Is the problem that we suffer from a surfeit of clear, objective, analysis on the complex technical issues confronting the Nation? Is the problem that we expect that the questions facing the Congress are likely to become simpler and less related to technology? Is the problem that as individual Members we have more time, energy, and staff to delve into perplexing scientific and technical materials?

Obviously, the answer to all these questions is a resounding no. And for that reason, the response to the proposal to eliminate OTA should also be a resounding no.

OTA is the Agency that gives Congress half a chance at making sense of the growing welter of complex, technical issues we must consider. Without OTA, we will be ever more at the mercy of special interests, who appear at our doors with their particular take on the issues, their own tailored explanations, their specifically crafted data.

Now of course I know why some Members want to eliminate OTA—to save a little money. But as I have said before, the public has asked us to do more with less—not to do more knowing less. There are other items we should examine before limiting our access to the most precious commodity in Washington—reliable information.

The writer Kurt Vonnegut once defined the "information revolution" as the ability of human beings to actually know what they are talking about, if they really want to. OTA has given us the ability to participate in that revolution. It is a revolution we should embrace, not reverse. Support this amendment, and support the ability of Congress to know what it is talking about.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in strong support of the Houghton amendment.

I think it really does not make a whole lot of sense as we move into a more technologically driven era to be taking away the tool that really give us in Congress the opportunity to assess the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of various technologies. I know as the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that we rely, in doing that oversight as to the effectiveness of programs, OTA provides us with invaluable information.

□ 1400

So, you know, we seem to be going in the wrong direction when we really are going to have a much more scientifically, technically driven society, to be taking away the resource that enables us to make rational decisions as to what we should be investing in.

I think it would be a terrible mistake to do away with OTA entirely.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear to the Members of the House this vote

is a vote to determine whether there is a serious commitment to downsizing our own agencies and starting downsizing Government right here within our own legislative branch.

On the Houghton amendment, the real choice is whether you want to downsize in the Library of Congress or whether you want to downsize OTA. The committee has studied this very carefully, and we have come to the conclusion that to eliminate an agency where the services could be rendered and done in another agency is a good move.

We think we have made the right choice. We hope the Members of Congress will recognize that we are not eliminating the review process and the study process and the reporting process for science issues. It is simply a question of whether it is done in one agency or another.

We think the Library of Congress can do it under the CRS. We think other agencies could do it. We do not think we need to preserve every agency that is current.

There is no question in my mind that the status quo is not always the best. In this instance we think it is time for a change.

We strongly urge that the Members of Congress vote to eliminate OTA, and to allow other agencies to do those functions that must be preserved and protected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by my good friend AMO HOUGHTON to transfer \$15 million in funding to the Congressional Research Service for the transfers of functions and personnel from the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA]. Efforts to eliminate funding for this program are a short-sighted move that Congress will regret as the OTA is an invaluable resource in determining the budgetary impact of new scientific developments.

The OTA is a bipartisan agency that relies on technical and scientific expertise from a broad cross-section of industry, academia, and other well-respected institutions. The reports that OTA submit to congressional committees are thorough, top-notch documents that provide expert guidance in advising how Congress should adapt to emerging technologies.

Furthermore, OTA is an efficient, unbiased organization that has made recommendations which have saved the U.S. Government millions of dollars. For example, the OTA's study of a Social Security Administration plan to purchase computers helped save the Government \$368 million. Other OTA recommendations have been influential in public policy decisions. OTA's reports on preventative Medicare services validated the benefits of mammography screening in the elderly. Another study demonstrated how cost prohibitive it would be to institute cholesterol screening in the elderly.

The point I am trying to make is that OTA is a proven organization that provides tangible benefits, expertise, and savings to Congress. Efforts to eliminate all of the functions and personnel of the OTA are misguided and I urge my colleagues to support the Houghton amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this effort to restore funding for the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA].

As the chair of the Science Subcommittee on Technology, I can attest to the importance of OTA. It provides in-depth analyses of science and technology issues for Congress on a bipartisan basis. Reports are initiated only after OTA's congressional governing board, consisting of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, agrees to proceed.

OTA is a small agency that is able to do its job effectively because of its access to expertise from across the country, calling on industry, academia, and other experts to obtain free assistance. It has voluntarily reduced its management staff by 40 percent since 1993, and it continues to save Federal dollars by relying on temporary experts on staff. OTA's reports have led to important cost-saving innovations for our agencies as well.

OTA's continued existence is critical to our resolution of complicated policy questions through an objective analysis of difficult issues. Currently, OTA is working on reports examining weapons proliferation, the human genome project, air traffic control, nuclear waste cleanup, and advanced telecommunications networks.

The Houghton amendment proposes a 25-percent reduction in operating expenses for OTA, while still retaining its core function. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to retain this valuable resource.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], if there is no intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—228

Abercrombie	Buyer	Dingell
Ackerman	Cardin	Dixon
Baesler	Castle	Doggett
Baldacci	Clay	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Clayton	Durbin
Bass	Clement	Edwards
Becerra	Clinger	Ehlers
Beilenson	Clyburn	Engel
Bentsen	Coleman	English
Bereuter	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Berman	Collins (MI)	Evans
Bevill	Conyers	Farr
Bishop	Costello	Fawell
Boehlert	Coyne	Fazio
Bonior	Cramer	Fields (TX)
Borski	Crane	Filner
Boucher	Danner	Flake
Brewster	Davis	Foglietta
Browder	de la Garza	Ford
Brown (CA)	DeFazio	Frank (MA)
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Franks (NJ)
Brown (OH)	Dellums	Frisa
Bryant (TX)	Deutsch	Frost
Bunn	Dicks	Furse

Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Nussle	Sanford	Stump
Gephardt	Lincoln	Richardson	Packard	Saxton	Stupak
Geren	Lipinski	Rivers	Parker	Scarborough	Talent
Gibbons	Loggren	Roberts	Peterson (MN)	Schaefer	Tate
Gilchrest	Lofrey	Roemer	Petri	Seastrand	Thomas
Gillmor	Maloney	Rose	Pickett	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Gilman	Manton	Roukema	Pombo	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Gonzalez	Markey	Roybal-Allard	Porter	Shaw	Traficant
Goodling	Martinez	Rush	Portman	Shays	Vucanovich
Gordon	Martini	Sabo	Pryce	Shuster	Waldholtz
Graham	Matsui	Sawyer	Quillen	Sisisky	Walker
Green	McCarthy	Schiff	Radanovich	Skeen	Wamp
Greenwood	McCrery	Schroeder	Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Gunderson	McDermott	Scott	Regula	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Gutierrez	Serrano	Scott	Riggs	Smith (TX)	Weller
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Skaggs	Rogers	Smith (WA)	White
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Skelton	Rohrabacher	Solomon	Wicker
Hamilton	Meek	Slaughter	Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Wolf
Hancock	Menendez	Spratt	Roth	Spence	Young (AK)
Harman	Mfume	Stark	Royce	Stearns	Young (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)	Stokes	Salmon	Stenholm	Zeliff
Hayes	Mineta	Studds	Sanders	Stockman	Zimmer
Hefner	Minge	Tanner			
Heineman	Mink	Tauzin			
Hilliard	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)	Fattah	Schumer	Wilson
Hinchee	Montgomery	Taylor (NC)	Moakley	Torres	
Holden	Moran	Tejeda			
Houghton	Morella	Thompson			
Hoyer	Murtha	Thornton			
Hyde	Myers	Thurman			
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Torkildsen			
Jefferson	Neal	Torricelli			
Johnson (CT)	Oberstar	Towns			
Johnson (SD)	Obey	Tucker			
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Upton			
Johnston	Ortiz	Velazquez			
Kanjorski	Orton	Vento			
Kaptur	Owens	Visclosky			
Kelly	Oxley	Volkmer			
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Walsh			
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Ward			
Kennelly	Paxon	Waters			
Kildee	Payne (NJ)	Watt (NC)			
King	Payne (VA)	Waxman			
Klecicka	Pelosi	Weldon (PA)			
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Whitfield			
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Williams			
Lantos	Poshard	Wise			
LaTourette	Quinn	Woolsey			
Lazio	Rahall	Wyden			
Leach	Rangel	Wynn			
Levin	Reed	Yates			

## NOES—201

Allard	Cubin	Hutchinson
Andrews	Cunningham	Inglis
Archer	Deal	Istook
Armey	DeLay	Jacobs
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Baker (CA)	Dickey	Jones
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Kasich
Ballenger	Dornan	Kim
Barcia	Doyle	Kingston
Barr	Dreier	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Knollenberg
Bartlett	Dunn	Kolbe
Barton	Ehrlich	LaHood
Bateman	Emerson	Largent
Bilbray	Ensign	Latham
Billrakis	Everett	Laughlin
Bliley	Ewing	Lewis (CA)
Blute	Fields (LA)	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Flanagan	Lightfoot
Bonilla	Foley	Linder
Bono	Forbes	Livingston
Brownback	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bryant (TN)	Fox	Longley
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Lucas
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Luther
Burton	Funderburk	Manzullo
Callahan	Galleghy	Mascara
Calvert	Ganske	McCollum
Camp	Gekas	McDade
Canady	Goodlatte	McHugh
Chabot	Goss	McInnis
Chambliss	Gutknecht	McIntosh
Chapman	Hansen	McKeon
Chenoweth	Hastert	McKinney
Christensen	Hastings (WA)	Metcalf
Chrysler	Hayworth	Meyers
Coble	Hefley	Mica
Coburn	Herger	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Hilleary	Molinari
Combest	Hobson	Moorhead
Condit	Hoekstra	Myrick
Cooley	Hoke	Nethercutt
Cox	Horn	Neumann
Crapo	Hostettler	Ney
Cremeans	Hunter	Norwood

informed that the members of the Committee on Science were voting, and the Chair waited until he saw them come in, and saw the chairman of the committee on Science come in and vote, and saw the chairman of the Committee on Science come in and vote before he called the end of the vote.

Mr. DOGGETT. A further parliamentary inquiry then:

How are the members of the Committee on Science to be advised of the Chair's awareness and decision to extend the vote beyond the degree provided in our rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was notified by the Democrat Cloakroom that there were people still voting in committee, and held the vote open until he saw them come on the floor.

Ms. RIVERS. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, on the same issue then:

Can we now expect that when committees vote during a rollcall vote here that all of us will have the opportunity to be recorded on the floor when we finish our duties in committee, that will be guaranteed to all Members who are participating in a committee vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would observe that it would hope the committee chairmen would not call votes during the course of a vote here on the floor.

The Chair will also observe that the Chair has been keeping some votes open longer than the 17 minutes we intended to, and very nearly in the future the Chair is going to close votes within 17 minutes whether or not the Members are here.

Ms. RIVERS. The question I am raising though, Mr. Chairman is that is a very flexible policy which is impossible to predict for someone who is not in the chair as you are. How do regular Members know they are going to be protected in an instance?

For example, my concern is that I have been especially diligent and have never missed a vote on the floor, nor in committee. I have been at every committee hearing; I have been at committee activities when they have gone until 11 o'clock at night.

I looked at the clock. I knew how long it took me to get here. There was inadequate time to do both of those things. I had to leave. There was no guarantee. No one came to me as a Committee on Science member, nor did anyone at the committee suggest that we would be accommodated in our need to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has made her comment known to the entire House.

Under rule VIII the House votes take primacy over the committee vote.

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

## NOT VOTING—5

Schumer	Wilson
Torres	

## □ 1422

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, GOODLATTE, ENSIGN, MOORHEAD, ZELIFF, HOBSON, LUTHER, WAMP, and SCHAEFER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GOODLING, DAVIS, and MOLLOHAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, is it within the scope of the rules of this House and the rules of the Committee on Science for the chairman of that committee to call a vote after the bells have gone off, and all the Members on our side of the aisle have left that committee to come to vote, and then to take a recorded vote and have the people miss it? Is that within the rules of the House and the rules of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no rule which precludes such voting in the committee.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, would the chairman please, for the benefit of our Members, let us know what the rules of the Committee on Science are with respect to attendance, with regard to bells going off on this House floor for votes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not aware of a House rule affecting the Committee on Science's rules. The Committee on Science has its own rules, and the Chair assumes the membership knows those rules.

Mr. DOGGETT. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman:

Is there any mechanism available under the House rules that would permit a member of a committee where a vote has been called after a vote has been called here to be recorded in both places after the change in the House rules that abolished proxies?

The CHAIRMAN. There is not a mechanism for that, but the Chair was

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. 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—ayes 166, noes 257, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—166

Abercrombie Frost Olver  
Ackerman Furse Ortiz  
Andrews Gejdenson Orton  
Baldacci Gephardt Owens  
Barcia Geren Pallone  
Becerra Gonzalez Pastor  
Bentsen Gordon Payne (NJ)  
Berman Green Payne (VA)  
Bevill Hall (OH) Pelosi  
Bishop Harman Peterson (FL)  
Bonior Hastings (FL) Pomeroy  
Boucher Hefner Poshard  
Brewster Hilliard Rangel  
Browder Hinchey Reed  
Brown (CA) Holden Reynolds  
Brown (FL) Jackson-Lee Richardson  
Brown (OH) Jefferson Rivers  
Bryant (TX) Johnson (SD) Rose  
Chapman Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard  
Clay Kanjorski Rush  
Clayton Kennedy (MA) Sabo  
Clement Kennedy (RI) Sawyer  
Clyburn Kennelly Schroeder  
Coleman Kildee Scott  
Collins (IL) Klink Serrano  
Collins (MI) Lantos Skelton  
Conyers Levin Slaughter  
Costello Lewis (GA) Spratt  
Coyne Lincoln Stark  
Cramer Lipinski  
Danner Lowey Stenholm  
de la Garza Maloney Stokes  
DeFazio Manton Studts  
DeLauro Markey Stupak  
Dellums Martinez Tanner  
Deutsch Mascara Tejada  
Dicks Matsui Thompson  
Dingell McCarthy Thornton  
Dixon McDermott Thurman  
Doggett McHale Torricelli  
Dooley McKinney Towns  
Doyle McNulty Tucker  
Durbin Meehan Velazquez  
Edwards Meek Vento  
Engel Menendez Visclosky  
Eshoo Mfume Volkmer  
Evans Miller (CA) Ward  
Farr Mineta Waters  
Fattah Mink Watt (NC)  
Fazio Mollohan Waxman  
Fields (LA) Moran Wise  
Filner Murtha Woolsey  
Flake Nadler Wyden  
Foglietta Neal Wynn  
Ford Oberstar Yates  
Frank (MA) Obey

NOES—257

Allard Burr DeLay  
Archer Burton Diaz-Balart  
Army Buyer Dickey  
Bachus Callahan Doolittle  
Baesler Calvert Dorman  
Baker (CA) Camp Dreier  
Baker (LA) Canady Duncan  
Ballenger Cardin  
Barr Castle Ehlers  
Barrett (NE) Chabot Ehrlich  
Barrett (WI) Chambliss Emerson  
Bartlett Chenoweth English  
Barton Christensen Ensign  
Bass Chrysler Everett  
Bateman Clinger Ewing  
Beilenson Coble Fawell  
Bereuter Coburn Fields (TX)  
Billray Collins (GA) Flanagan  
Bilirakis Combest Foley  
Bliley Condit Forbes  
Blute Cooley Fowler  
Boehlert Cox Fox  
Bonilla Crane Franks (CT)  
Bono Crapo Franks (NJ)  
Borski Creameans Frelinghuysen  
Brownback Cubin Frisa  
Bryant (TN) Cunningham Funderburk  
Bunn Davis Gallegly  
Bunning Deal Ganske

Gekas Lewis (CA) Roth  
Gibbons Lewis (KY) Roukema  
Gilchrest Lightfoot Royce  
Gillmor Linder Salmon  
Gillingham Livingston Sanford  
Goodlatte LoBiondo Saxton  
Goodling Lofgren Scarborough  
Goss Longley Schaefer  
Graham Lucas Schiff  
Greenwood Luther Seastrand  
Gunderson Manzullo Sensenbrenner  
Gutknecht Martini Shadegg  
Hall (TX) McCollum Shaw  
Hamilton McCrery Shays  
Hancock McDade Shuster  
Hansen McHugh Sisisky  
Hastert McInnis Skeen  
Hastings (WA) McIntosh Smith (MI)  
Hayes McKeon Smith (NJ)  
Hayworth Metcalf Smith (TX)  
Hefley Meyers Smith (WA)  
Heineman Mica Solomon  
Herger Miller (FL) Souder  
Hilleary Molinari Spence  
Hobson Montgomery Stearns  
Hoekstra Moorhead Stockman  
Hoke Morella Stump  
Horn Myers Talent  
Hostettler Myrick Tate  
Houghton Nethercutt Tauzin  
Hunter Neumann Taylor (MS)  
Hutchinson Ney Taylor (NC)  
Hyde Norwood Thomas  
Inglis Nussle Thornberry  
Istook Oxley Tiahrt  
Jacobs Packard Torkildsen  
Johnson (CT) Parker Traficant  
Johnson, Sam Paxon Upton  
Johnston Peterson (MN) Vucanovich  
Jones Petri Waldholtz  
Kasich Pickett Walker  
Kelly Pomo Walsh  
Kim Porter Wamp  
King Portman Watts (OK)  
Kingston Pryce Weldon (FL)  
Klecicka Quillen Weldon (PA)  
Klug Quinn Weller  
Knollenberg Radanovich White  
Kolbe Rahall Whitfield  
LaFalce Ramstad Wicker  
LaHood Regula Williams  
Largent Riggs Wolf  
Latham Roberts Young (AK)  
LaTourette Roemer Young (FL)  
Laughlin Rogers Zeliff  
Lazio Rohrabacher Zimmer  
Leach Ros-Lehtinen

NOT VOTING—11

Boehner Minge Skaggs  
Gutierrez Moakley Torres  
Hoyer Sanders Wilson  
Kaptur Schumer

□ 1443

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am not understanding the prior statement that was made. As a member of the Committee on Science, I am trying to understand the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentlewoman's inquiry?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is reflecting on the gentleman from Michigan. Did the Chair give a ruling indicating that after the second bell, there was an opportunity to have reconsideration of a vote in a markup rollcall session in committee? Did the Chair give that ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not give any ruling.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. So the Chair did not provide that protection, is the Chair saying?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not the responsibility to provide protection. If this House wants to move to change its rules, it may do so. The Chair may not change the rules of the House or add rules to the House.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Did the Chair make any clarification that at least Members would be notified that votes were being held while the rollcall in committee was going on and a rollcall was going on on the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not inform any Members that the vote would be held. What the Chair did say was under a House rule, No. 8, voting in the House takes priority interest.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, my final question, did the Chair not make a statement in this particular incident that the Chair had informed the Committee on Science chairman that the vote was being held on the floor for those Members?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not make that statement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That was my understanding, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair did say was that the Chair had been notified by the Democratic Cloakroom that some Members would be late because a Committee vote was in progress. The Chair held the House vote open until he saw the chairman on the floor. The Chair has since found out the gentleman was the last one to leave the room.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I was in my prior parliamentary inquiry expressing concern about having to be two places at once. This is a different inquiry under our rules.

My inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is, if a member of the Committee on Science or of any other committee of this House were serving on five or six committees and subcommittees, would that be a violation of the rules of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole cannot give any anticipatory rulings at this point.

Mr. DOGGETT. The Chair is advised that there are at least 30 Members of this House, including a member of the Committee on Science, who are serving on five or six appointments in violation of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. That issue can be addressed in its proper context.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry, what remedy is available for a Member of this House to raise an objection to an open violation of the rules by a member of the Committee on Science or any other committee serving on five or six positions when the rules provide you can

only serve on three? Is there any remedy?

The CHAIRMAN. The rules provide that the House must approve certain subcommittee memberships and committee memberships.

Mr. DOGGETT. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman: Has there been any approval of the 30 Members who are serving on five or six committees? Has there been any waiver granted to them?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole cannot answer that at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 214, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—213

Abercrombie	Fattah	Maloney
Ackerman	Fawell	Manton
Baesler	Fazio	Markey
Baldacci	Filner	Martinez
Barrett (WI)	Flake	Mascara
Becerra	Ford	Matsui
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Bentsen	Franks (NJ)	McDermott
Bereuter	Frost	McHale
Berman	Furse	McKinney
Bevill	Gejdenson	McNulty
Bishop	Gephardt	Meehan
Boehlert	Geren	Meek
Bonior	Gibbons	Menendez
Borski	Gilchrest	Mfume
Boucher	Gilman	Miller (CA)
Browder	Gonzalez	Mineta
Brown (CA)	Gordon	Minge
Brown (FL)	Green	Mink
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	Mollohan
Bryant (TX)	Gunderson	Montgomery
Bunn	Gutierrez	Moran
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Morella
Castle	Hall (TX)	Murtha
Chapman	Hamilton	Nadler
Clay	Harman	Neal
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Clement	Hayes	Obey
Clinger	Hefner	Olver
Clyburn	Heineman	Ortiz
Coleman	Hinchee	Orton
Collins (IL)	Holden	Owens
Collins (MI)	Houghton	Oxley
Condit	Hoyer	Pallone
Conyers	Hyde	Pastor
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Payne (NJ)
Coyne	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (FL)
Danner	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
de la Garza	Johnson	Pomeroy
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Poshard
DeLauro	Kaptur	Quinn
Dellums	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Dicks	Kennelly	Reed
Dingell	Kildee	Reynolds
Dixon	Kleczka	Richardson
Doggett	Klink	Rivers
Dooley	LaFalce	Roemer
Doyle	Lantos	Rose
Durbin	Leach	Roukema
Edwards	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Engel	Lincoln	Sabo
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sanders
Evans	Lofgren	Sawyer
Farr	Lowey	Schiff

Schroeder	Tauzin	Volkmer
Scott	Tejeda	Walsh
Serrano	Thompson	Ward
Skaggs	Thornton	Waters
Skelton	Thurman	Watt (NC)
Slaughter	Torkildsen	Waxman
Spratt	Toricelli	Weldon (PA)
Stark	Towns	Williams
Stenholm	Tucker	Wise
Stokes	Upton	Woolsey
Studds	Velazquez	Wyden
Stupak	Vento	Wynn
Tanner	Visclosky	Yates

NOES—214

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

NOT VOTING—7

Ehrlich	Moakley	Wilson
Foglietta	Schumer	
Hilliard	Torres	

□ 1505

So the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. For what reason does the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] rise?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves that the committee do now rise. There is a motion on the floor. The gentleman from California has been recognized.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAZIO of California. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, did you announce the vote? Mr. Chairman, did you announce the vote?

Mr. BONIOR. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, we had 2 Members in the well with their voting cards out, and the vote was 214 to 213, and the gentleman in the Chair, respectfully I say to him, called the vote while two of our Members were voting. That, Mr. Chairman, is not fair. It is not right. This side of the aisle is not going to stand for it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not correct.

Mr. BONIOR. I would further add, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. That was not a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has a privileged motion before the Committee. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. PACKARD. The motion is to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—233

Allard	Bunning	Deal
Andrews	Burr	DeLay
Archer	Burton	Diaz-Balart
Army	Buyer	Dickey
Bachus	Callahan	Doolittle
Baker (CA)	Calvert	Dornan
Baker (LA)	Camp	Dreier
Ballenger	Canady	Duncan
Barr	Castle	Dunn
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Ehlers
Bartlett	Chambless	Ehrlich
Barton	Chenoweth	Emerson
Bass	Christensen	English
Bateman	Chrysler	Ensign
Bereuter	Clinger	Everett
Bilbray	Coble	Ewing
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Fawell
Bliley	Combest	Fields (TX)
Blute	Cooley	Flanagan
Boehlert	Cox	Foley
Boehner	Crane	Forbes
Bonilla	Crapo	Fowler
Bono	Creameans	Fox
Brownback	Cubin	Franks (CT)
Bryant (TN)	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Bunn	Davis	Frelinghuysen

Frisa Lazio  
 Funderburk Leach  
 Gallegly Lewis (CA)  
 Ganske Lewis (KY)  
 Gekas Lightfoot  
 Gilchrest Linder  
 Gilmor Livingston  
 Gilman LoBiondo  
 Goodlatte Longley  
 Goodling Lucas  
 Goss Manzullo  
 Graham Martini  
 Gunderson McCollum  
 Gutknecht McCrery  
 Hall (OH) McDade  
 Hancock McHugh  
 Hansen McLinnis  
 Hastert McIntosh  
 Hastings (WA) McKeon  
 Hayworth Metcalf  
 Hefley Meyers  
 Heineman Mica  
 Herger Miller (FL)  
 Hilleary Molinari  
 Hobson Moorhead  
 Hoekstra Morella  
 Hoke Myers  
 Horn Myrick  
 Hostettler Nethercutt  
 Houghton Neumann  
 Hunter Ney  
 Hutchinson Norwood  
 Hyde Nussle  
 Inglis Owens  
 Istook Oxley  
 Jacobs Packard  
 Johnson (CT) Paxon  
 Johnson, Sam Petri  
 Jones Pombo  
 Kasich Porter  
 Kelly Portman  
 Kim Pryce  
 King Quillen  
 Kingston Quinn  
 Klug Radanovich  
 Knollenberg Ramstad  
 Kolbe Regula  
 LaHood Riggs  
 Largent Roberts  
 Latham Rogers  
 LaTourette Rohrabacher  
 Laughlin Ros-Lehtinen

NOES—190

Abercrombie Doyle  
 Ackerman Durbin  
 Baesler Edwards  
 Baldacci Engel  
 Barcia Eshoo  
 Barrett (WI) Evans  
 Becerra Farr  
 Beilenson Fattah  
 Bentsen Fazio  
 Berman Fields (LA)  
 Beville Filner  
 Bishop Flake  
 Bonior Foglietta  
 Borski Ford  
 Boucher Frank (MA)  
 Brewster Frost  
 Browder Furse  
 Brown (CA) Gejdenson  
 Brown (FL) Gephardt  
 Brown (OH) Geren  
 Bryant (TX) Gibbons  
 Cardin Gonzalez  
 Chapman Gordon  
 Clay Green  
 Clayton Gutierrez  
 Clement Hall (TX)  
 Clyburn Hamilton  
 Coleman Harman  
 Collins (IL) Hastings (FL)  
 Collins (MI) Hayes  
 Condit Hefner  
 Conyers Hilliard  
 Costello Hinchey  
 Coyne Holden  
 Cramer Hoyer  
 Danner Jackson-Lee  
 DeFazio Jefferson  
 DeLauro Johnson (SD)  
 Dellums Johnson, E. B.  
 Deutsch Johnston  
 Dicks Kanjorski  
 Dingell Kaptur  
 Dixon Kennedy (MA)  
 Doggett Kennedy (RI)  
 Dooley Kennelly

Payne (VA) Sawyer  
 Pelosi Schroeder  
 Peterson (FL) Scott  
 Peterson (MN) Serrano  
 Pickett Sisisky  
 Pomeroy Skaggs  
 Poshard Skelton  
 Rahall Slaughter  
 Rangel Spratt  
 Reed Stark  
 Reynolds Stenholm  
 Richardson Stokes  
 Rivers Studds  
 Roemer Stupak  
 Rose Tanner  
 Roybal-Allard Tauzin  
 Rush Taylor (MS)  
 Sabo Thompson  
 Sanders Thornton

NOT VOTING—11

Coburn Moakley  
 de la Garza Schaefer  
 Greenwood Schumer  
 Martinez Tejada

□ 1528

Messrs. BRYANT of Texas, OLVER, REED, NEAL of Massachusetts, JOHN-SON of South Dakota, FIELDS of Louisiana, BAESLER, MILLER of California, PALLONE, MARKEY, TUCKER, SPRATT, MORAN, and DIXON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GILLMOR, PAXON, BLILEY, KING, HOSTETTLER, SHADEGG, WALSH, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, 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. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 190, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—224

Allard Barton  
 Archer Bass  
 Arney Bereuter  
 Bachus Bilbray  
 Baker (CA) Billirakis  
 Baker (LA) Bliley  
 Ballenger Blute  
 Barr Boehlert  
 Barrett (NE) Boehner  
 Bartlett Bonilla

Thurman  
 Torricelli  
 Towns  
 Tucker  
 Velazquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Volkmer  
 Ward  
 Waters  
 Watt (NC)  
 Williams  
 Wise  
 Woolsey  
 Wyden  
 Wynn  
 Yates

Camp  
 Canady  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Chambliss  
 Chenoweth  
 Christensen  
 Chrysler  
 Clinger  
 Coble  
 Collins (GA)  
 Combust  
 Cooley  
 Cox  
 Crane  
 Crapo  
 Cremeans  
 Cubin  
 Cunningham  
 Davis  
 Deal  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dickey  
 Doolittle  
 Dornan  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 English  
 Ensign  
 Everett  
 Ewing  
 Fawell  
 Fields (TX)  
 Flanagan  
 Foley  
 Fowler  
 Fox  
 Franks (CT)  
 Franks (NJ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frisa  
 Funderburk  
 Gallegly  
 Ganske  
 Gekas  
 Gilchrest  
 Gilmor  
 Gilman  
 Goodlatte  
 Goodling  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Greenwood  
 Gunderson  
 Gutknecht  
 Hancock  
 Hansen  
 Hastert  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Heineman

NOES—190

Abercrombie Costello  
 Ackerman Coyne  
 Andrews Cramer  
 Baesler Danner  
 Baldacci DeFazio  
 Barcia DeLauro  
 Barrett (WI) Dellums  
 Becerra Deutsch  
 Beilenson Dicks  
 Bentsen Dingell  
 Beville Dixon  
 Bishop Doggett  
 Bonior Dooley  
 Borski Doyle  
 Boucher Durbin  
 Brewster Edwards  
 Browder Engel  
 Brown (CA) Eshoo  
 Brown (FL) Evans  
 Brown (OH) Farr  
 Bryant (TX) Fattah  
 Cardin Fazio  
 Chapman Fields (LA)  
 Clay Filner  
 Clayton Flake  
 Clement Foglietta  
 Clyburn Ford  
 Coleman Frank (MA)  
 Collins (IL) Frost  
 Collins (MI) Furse  
 Condit Gejdenson  
 Conyers Gephardt

Pombo  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Pryce  
 Quillen  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Ramstad  
 Regula  
 Riggs  
 Rogers  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roth  
 Roukema  
 Royce  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Saxton  
 Scarborough  
 Schaefer  
 Klug  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Shuster  
 Skeen  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Solomon  
 Souder  
 Spence  
 Stearns  
 Stockman  
 Stump  
 Talent  
 Tate  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Thomas  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Torkildsen  
 Traficant  
 Upton  
 Vucanovich  
 Waldholtz  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Watts (OK)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 White  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Zeliff  
 Zimmer

Geren  
 Gibbons  
 Gonzalez  
 Gordon  
 Green  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (OH)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hamilton  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hayes  
 Hefner  
 Hilliard  
 Hinchey  
 Holden  
 Hoyer  
 Jackson-Lee  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnston  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy (MA)  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 Kennelly  
 Kildee  
 Kleczka  
 Klink  
 LaFalce  
 Lantos