

Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Poshard
Combest	Hyde	Quinn
Cooley	Inglis	Quinn
Costello	Istook	Radanovich
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Crane	Jones	Regula
Crapo	Kanjorski	Riggs
Creameans	Kasich	Roberts
Cubin	Kildee	Roemer
Cunningham	Kim	Rogers
Danner	King	Rohrabacher
Davis	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	Klink	Roth
Deal	Knollenberg	Royce
DeLay	LaFalce	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Sanford
Dickey	Largent	Scarborough
Doolittle	Latham	Schaefer
Dornan	LaTourette	Schiff
Doyle	Laughlin	Seastrand
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Ehlers	Lightfoot	Shuster
Emerson	Linder	Skeen
English	Lipinski	Skelton
Ensign	Livingston	Smith (MI)
Everett	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Fields (TX)	Manton	Smith (TX)
Flanagan	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Forbes	Mascara	Solomon
Frisa	McCollum	Souder
Funderburk	McCrery	Spence
Gallegly	McDade	Stearns
Gekas	McHugh	Stenholm
Geren	McInnis	Stockman
Gillmor	McIntosh	Stump
Goodlatte	McKeon	Stupak
Goodling	Mica	Talent
Goss	Miller (FL)	Tate
Graham	Mollohan	Tauzin
Gutknecht	Montgomery	Taylor (MS)
Hall (OH)	Moorhead	Taylor (NC)
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Tejeda
Hamilton	Myrick	Thornberry
Hancock	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
Hansen	Neumann	Volkmer
Hastert	Ney	Vucanovich
Hastings (FL)	Norwood	Waldholtz
Hastings (WA)	Nussle	Walker
Hayworth	Oberstar	Walsh
Hefley	Ortiz	Wamp
Heineman	Orton	Watts (OK)
Herger	Oxley	Weldon (FL)
Hilleary	Packard	Weldon (PA)
Hobson	Parker	Weller
Hoekstra	Paxon	Whitfield
Hoke	Peterson (MN)	Wicker
Holden	Petri	Wolf
Hostettler	Pombo	Young (AK)
Hunter	Portman	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bryant (TX)	Ewing	Johnson (SD)
Chapman	Ford	Myers
Clay	Green	Stokes
Collins (MI)	Hayes	

□ 1538

Mr. COOLEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. THORNTON, MOAKLEY, CRAMER, and LONGLEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, on Rollcall No. 51, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LINDER] assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWN PAYMENT ACT, II

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 104-1474.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISTOOK

Mr. ISTOOK. 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. ISTOOK: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), add the following new title:

TITLE V—DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL GRANTEES

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL GRANTEES

SEC. 5001. (a) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 31 of each year, each organization receiving a Federal grant shall provide (via either electronic or paper medium) to each Federal entity that awarded or administered its grant an annual report for the previous Federal fiscal year, certified by the organization's chief executive officer or equivalent person of authority, setting forth—

(1) the organization's name and grantee identification number;

(2) the amount or value of each grant (including all administrative and overhead costs awarded), and the description of each such grant and the name of the Federal agency awarding such grant; and

(3) a good faith estimate of the organization's actual expenses on lobbying activities in the most recent taxable year.

(b) EXEMPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to an individual or a State, local, or Indian tribal government.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) FEDERAL GRANT.—The term "Federal grant" means money or real property that is paid or provided by the Federal Government to any organization. Such term does not include (A) any assistance described in section 6302(2) of title 31, United States Code; (B) any amount paid under a procurement contract described in section 6303(1) of such title; or (C) and payment or assistance described in clause (ii), (iii), (iv), or (vii) of section 6501(4)(C) of such title.

(2) LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—The term "lobbying activity" means any activity that is either (A) a lobbying activity within the meaning of section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; or (B) an activity influencing legislation within the meaning of section 4911 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Such term shall also include advocating the election or defeat of any candidate for public office, or the passage or non-passage of any ballot proposition.

(D) PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY.—

(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE FORMS.—Each Federal entity awarding a Federal grant shall make publicly available the grant application, and any annual report provided under subsection (a) by the organization receiving the grant.

(2) ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC.—The public's access to the documents identified in paragraph (1) shall be facilitated by the Federal entity by—

(A) placement of such documents in the Federal entity's public document reading room;

(B) expediting any requests under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (the Freedom of Information Act), ahead of any requests for other information pending at such Federal entity; and

(C) submitting to the Bureau of the Census a report (standardized by the Office of Management and Budget) setting forth the information provided in such documents, which the Bureau of the Census shall make available to the public through the Internet.

(3) WITHHOLDING PROHIBITED.—Records described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to withholding, except under the exemption set forth in subsection (b)(7)(A) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) FEES PROHIBITED.—No fees for searching for or copying such documents shall be charged to the public.

(e) CONSTRUCTION.—No provision of this section may be construed to affect whether any organization is exempt from, or subject to, tax under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue any regulations necessary to carry out this section.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall take effect January 1, 1996, and apply thereafter.

(2) PRIOR ACTIVITIES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—In applying this section, only expenditures made after December 31, 1995, in taxable years ending after such date shall be taken into account.

(3) ANNUALIZATION FOR PARTIAL TAXABLE YEARS.—In the case of a taxable year that ends after December 31, 1995, and begins before January 1, 1996, each of the dollar amounts applicable under this section shall be proportionally reduced to reflect the portion of such taxable year after December 31, 1995.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] is recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], is recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is at the desk is a very simple disclosure amendment. It specifies that recipients of grants from the taxpayers, groups that have asked for and received taxpayers' money in the form of grants, should simply make an annual disclosure of the total amount that they have spent in that year on lobbying. It is not a detailed disclosure, it is not a restriction of any sort on how their money is spent, it is not a restriction of any sort on eligibility. It simply says that once a year they shall disclose the total amount they have spent on lobbying.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not even know what the

gentleman's lapel button reads, but there is a House rule against speaking while wearing a button other than a Member's button.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] is responding by taking his button off, and the Chair thanks the gentleman from Mississippi for raising the point of order.

□ 1545

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, we have had debate previously in this Chamber about the activity of different groups that receive Federal taxpayer's money, sometimes in hundreds of millions or tens of millions of dollars, and their lobbying activity. Previously this body voted, on two different occasions, passing legislation that would put some commonsense limitations on the scope of lobbying by groups dependent upon the taxpayer's money. The Senate also had a similar vote, adopting that in principle as well.

This amendment, however, Mr. Chairman, does not go that far. It simply says that groups that are recipients of taxpayers' money will make a disclosure of the total amount once a year that they have spent on lobbying. That will certainly help both sides in that debate, Mr. Chairman. Some have said oh, they are not doing big time lobbying. Others have said, yes, they are. But the problem is we have never required them to report that, along with the other information grant recipients report. This will give us the information so that both sides may consider this issue based upon the facts. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2¼ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will stipulate at the outset this particular rendition of this redtape-filled, burdensome, bureaucratic reporting requirement on America's charities is less bad than the last time we had this debate, but it does not make it good. To the contrary, this will impose a scheme that will force charities and nonprofit and many businesses, small businesses included, to keep a whole new set of records about the activities of their employees and volunteers and their expenditures in order to file a whole new set of annual reports to the Federal Government, to Washington, letting us know what they may be doing to try to influence legislation by their city councils, by their county commissions, by their State legislatures, if they happen to get some Federal money by way of a grant.

What in the world are we doing, Mr. Chairman? What is the evil here? Who are the bad guys? What is the problem? It is already illegal to use Federal grant moneys to lobby. That law works very well. There have been no demonstrated problems. What is this amendment about? What will the impacts be? Let me just give a couple of examples.

The Red Cross of America, trying to get the county that it may be operat-

ing in to develop an emergency preparedness plan, will have to keep track of the activities involved with that, so it can be part of this report. The YMCA in your local community that gets a child care grant, that is trying to get a citizen council to pass an ordinance about child care, will have to keep track of its activities in order to be accounted for in the reports required under this amendment.

The State chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, trying to toughen DUI laws, will have to keep track of all of that so as to be able to report under this amendment. Even, if Members can believe it, the local electrical contractor getting an SBA technical grant will have to keep track of its donations in connection with a referendum about a local recreation district in order to be able to report under the requirements imposed under this amendment.

What in the world are we doing? The current law works just fine. We have a hard time figuring out why the folks that want to bring us less burdensome regulation from Washington, less paperwork, would indulge in this kind of activity.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just want to echo the gentleman's comments and associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I would say, For heaven's sakes, I thought we had a bipartisan agreement, led by my Republican Party, that said the era of big government was over. Here we have not a simple disclosure; it is a Big Brother regulatory morass, and it does not even pass the commonsense test.

This puts mindless bureaucracy in a position to demand reports from the YMCA, your local church, the Red Cross, the charity groups helping provide meals for senior citizens.

This is also completely contradictory to our stated and loudly proclaimed purpose of encouraging the private sector and the charities to shoulder a great share of welfare costs.

Again lets get back to reality and vote "no" on this senseless bureaucratic, big government intrusion.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly invite anyone that has been misled that somehow this is some sort of regulatory scheme, frankly, to read the bill. The only thing it requires is a listing of a good faith estimate of the total amount they spent on lobbying that year. I think it is kind of silly if somebody is thinking that this is a regulatory scheme. It is very plain and simple disclosure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

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

First of all, I want to respond to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS]. He has said that the law that we have today is working fine. As far as we know, Mr. Chairman, there has never been enforcement under this law. As a matter of fact, in testimony before our subcommittee, we heard of examples of groups receiving as much as 96 percent of their money from the Federal Government in various grants. And what do they do with most of that money? They turn right around, come back here, and lobby for more.

This is pernicious, Mr. Chairman. It needs to stop. As a matter of fact, our estimates are, it could be as little as \$200 million. It could be into the billions of dollars.

All this little amendment does is require disclosure. This is a sunshine amendment. Members have probably heard this said before, that the single most important antiseptic sometimes is just a little sunshine. Only those who have something to hide fear sunshine. This is a good amendment. It ought to have unanimous support. We ought to find out exactly how much taxpayer money is flowing through some of these special interest groups and being used to lobby for more taxpayer money. It is a good amendment. We ought to have unanimous support.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed a very consistent lack of consistency on the Republican side. This bill carries it out. We are worried that people will get Federal money and use it to lobby us, so we have to ask them to report it, except we exempt the vast majority of recipients. Contractors are exempted from this.

Members will remember that the U.S. Senate, in a rare demonstration of an ability to pass legislation, made a mistake last year, because they passed a version of this and they included contractors, and Blue Cross went into cardiac arrest. Fortunately, they waived their own rules so they could be treated. But they then got into the CR, in a very inappropriate legislative way, an amendment to that bill, and contractors are not covered, and they are not covered here.

If people want to lobby us to build a B-2 and get more money, this bill does not touch them. If people want to lobby us to build the space station or to raise provider payments or do anything like that, this bill does not touch them. Apparently, the new Republican view is if you are engaged in charity, you are suspect.

We hear a lot on that side about how the private, voluntary sector should do more, but they are treated as suspects, because if you are in the private, voluntary sector and you get Federal funds lawfully to carry out a program,

we are going to check up on you. But if you are a contractor and you are going to get money and then lobby for more, if you are a housing developer, if you are an aircraft contractor, if you are a medical provider, if you are an HMO, you will get money and not be reporting. What is the difference? The difference is that the people who do not report get an enormously greater amount of money than the people who do report.

This looks at the gnats and ignores the camels. By the way, the tobacco companies are probably also included in the exemption, while we are at it. So you penalize the voluntary sector, who you otherwise like. When it comes to shifting important jobs from the Federal Government, you are all for the voluntary sector. But here you discriminate against them, because if this were not a problem, you would not have given it to Blue Cross when they came for an exemption and you would not continue to exempt the private contractors.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is a great debater, but he is greatly wrong on one point. That is that on Federal contractors, the rules governing Federal contractors are about a foot thick. So they exist under their own special rules.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in strong support of the Istook amendment. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is a simple disclosure requirement. In a free society, the people have the right to know that their tax dollars may be going to organizations that then lobby the Federal Government. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would go a long way in extending that basic right. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Istook amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, if the purpose for this amendment today is to find out how much Federal money is being used to lobby by nonprofit groups, I can give the answer right now. Zero. It has been against the law here for years. The IRS has never had a single complaint. We brought this up at committee meeting after committee meeting, because we debate this thing once a week, almost.

The truth of the matter is that the only thing anybody could ever come up with even a hint of a notion that somebody had misused money, was that the beer wholesalers were mad at the Mother Against Drunk Driving. This amendment tries to demonize the Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, Catholic charities, and all other groups out there who are doing work for the Federal Government. It is absolutely nonsense that we waste our time on this.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to what may have been represented to the gentlewoman from New York, many nonprofit groups are major lobbyists. They are required to make a disclosure of that through an IRS regulation, which is adopted here. Many of their disclosures reveal that they spend substantial funds. But this is talking about Federal grantees, what they spend on lobbying.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRlich].

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting to hear the spin on this one. We hear so much spin on this one, Mr. Chairman. When you are acting in your capacity as a Federal grantee, you are covered under this amendment. When you are not, regardless of your profit or nonprofit status, everybody knows that. We have debated that on the floor many times.

Mr. Chairman, this is full disclosure. Full disclosure is good government. It is very interesting to hear arguments against full disclosure and good government coming from the other side. This just makes common sense. It is the first step in the right direction. I rise in enthusiastic support for the Istook amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute 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 would like to talk against this amendment. I have been in the foundation field all my life. I frankly feel this is a smokescreen to curtail their activities. There is not a single shred of evidence from the GAO, the Inspector General, any of the accounting offices, or the IRS to say that any Federal money has been used for lobbying, period.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. J.D. HAYWORTH.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. It is interesting, as my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, noted, the juxtaposition that has gone on here. In previous days when we have debated this issue, statements from the other side have been that this was an effort to restrict free speech.

Mr. Chairman, free speech is not free when you and I are paying for it, when the taxpayers of this country repeatedly are called upon to let folks come up here and lobby, and take that money and lobby for more and more money. The fact is, this is a very simple requirement, simply calling for disclosure; not itemization not red tape nothing of the sort.

The fact is we know this lobbying has gone on. We know taxpayers' dollars have gone for this, and this must stop, or at the very least, as this amendment

says, it should be accounted for and simply disclosed. My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, said it eloquently. Sunshine is the best disinfectant. Let us let the sunshine in and have disclosure of these funds.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield ½ minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. As I have told my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], this amendment discriminates against charities. It puts the reporting burden on charities getting Federal grants, but it does not put the same burden on businesses getting Federal grants. From that, you can make your decision on that.

Why should one group, the charities, which help so many people, be hurt by this amendment, and the other people who are getting Federal contracts are not? It is not fair. Vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment discriminates against charities. It puts a reporting burden on charities getting Federal grants but does not put the same burden on businesses getting Federal contracts.

In his "Dear Colleague," Mr. ISTOOK says we should support his amendment because, "there is no data kept that covers all federal grantees' lobbying." I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether there are data on lobbying by those who receive Federal contracts?

He knows the answer is "no." If he is really interested in sunshine, why not have it fall on everyone.

Stop picking on our charities.

□ 1600

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] has 4¼ minutes remaining.

The Chair informs the Members that the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. STAGGS, representing the committee's position, is entitled to close debate.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say again, you cannot now use Federal dollars to lobby the Federal Government. That is existing law. All the Istook proposition says is that to the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the Farmers' Union, Alzheimer's Association, Girl Scouts, the Epilepsy Foundation, churches and charities, you have got to go through this paperwork joke. It says to the giant contractors who spend billions of dollars in contracts with the Federal Government, no Washington ink is exempt. You do not have to worry about it, big boys.

Mr. Chairman, I think the selectivity of this amendment is pernicious and it

is cynical. It just seems to me that the best way to deal with this is to keep an even playing field, turn down this amendment. I think every Member of this House is a big enough boy or a big enough girl to handle a tough lobbying job from the Boy Scouts without having this kind of wasteful proposition intervene.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, there are always people that do not want to reveal to the public how Washington works or how much people spend on trying to lobby in Washington or anyplace else, especially groups that are dependent upon the taxpayers for their money.

Contrary to what several speakers have claimed, there is no distinction made in this simple disclosure legislation between a business and a charity, none whatsoever. It says any organization that receives a Federal grant will make the disclosure. The only exceptions are for individuals and for entities of State, local and tribal government.

There is no exemption for big business. There is no exemption for big charity. There is no exemption for big anybody except for government itself. Any group whatsoever, what are they afraid of? What is it they are trying to conceal when they come to us and say, We want the taxpayers' money but we just do not want to tell you how much we spent on lobbying?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just would inquire of the sponsor of this amendment, what business is it of the Federal Government whether Regis College in Denver, CO spends some of its funds lobbying Denver city council over a land-use matter? Why should they have to report to Washington that kind of activity?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, if a group does not ask for taxpayers' money, this legislation does not mean beans to them. It is only groups that ask to get in the taxpayers' pocket.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, why should a local college have to report to Washington their local activities with their city council?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is wrong. The gentleman indicates we do not want people to know how Washington works. I quite disagree. I think the gentleman is a perfect example, and so is his amendment, of exactly how Washington works: Protect the big boys and go after the little people.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to praise the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing forth this disclosure amendment. In fact, the amendment does not provide additional requirements for information to be disclosed, but consolidates a lot of disclosure requirements that are already there for these grant recipients in various current legislation. The more important issue in this debate, I think, is what direction do we want to go in?

Are we going to continue to have the taxpayers subsidizing large lobbying outfits here in Washington, or are we going to build a record and continue the progress that we started last fall in protecting the taxpayer interest, in saying if you want to be a lobbying organization, you can lobby, that is your right, but do it with your own dime and on your own time.

This amendment moves in that direction. There are many other things that should be done to strengthen that, to say lobbying groups cannot use loopholes in the lobbying bill to allow affiliates to take the money and then come in and lobby on their own. These matters are not covered here today in this amendment. Those we will have to do in future legislative activity.

This amendment today begins that process of saying let us fully disclose so that the American taxpayer knows groups who are receiving taxpayer money, how much lobbying they do, when they do it, what they do with that money, so that the taxpayer can hold them accountable.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It is straightforward. It is plain vanilla. It affects one group of organizations and only one: groups that have made up their mind that they want financing from the taxpayers. If they do not want taxpayers' money, this amendment does not affect anyone. If they want taxpayers' money, it simply says give us the bottom line. The details are not even covered here. Just give us the bottom line once a year, how much did you spend on lobbying?

Mr. Chairman, they are already required to keep records of this. If they were, for example, a 501(c)(3), they are already required by the IRS to keep records of it. They are already subject to auditing. They do not want people to know. There are groups that receive tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars from the taxpayers, that are some of the major lobbying groups in Washington, and they try to claim we are letting the big boys off.

If the group is a big boy, it does not matter if it is a charity or business. This amendment treats it the same. It says, If you want taxpayers' money, tell us one simple thing: How much are you spending on lobbying?

Then if the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] thinks the results show

that it is not a problem, he can use that as his evidence. If it shows more things with problems, that too can be evidence. Let us get simple and to the facts.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is no trivial matter. Contrary to the representations made by the proponents of this, it will require all affected organizations, large and small, charitable and for-profit, to set up a new system of recordkeeping in order to be able to make that good faith estimate, because without accounting for the time and money spent by both paid and volunteer staff, things that now are not covered by any Federal requirement, they will not be able to make that report, however simply it may be.

I again ask my colleagues, why in the world is it the business of the U.S. Government to require a private university getting an NSF grant to report to us, to Washington, about their efforts to work with the local country commissioners over a matter involving transportation in their area? Why is it of concern to Washington if a veterans' group that happens to be getting a job training grant wants to lobby their State legislature for a veterans' cemetery? Why should we require them to keep track of those activities and report to us?

This amendment would create a paperwork burden, tons of redtape in addition to filing the report that would be required, again, because these organizations would have to account for the time spent by their employees and volunteers beyond what is now required under the Internal Revenue Code. It will bring tens of thousands of businesses, charities, and schools under new reporting requirements. Forty-seven thousand grants go to businesses, 43,000 grants to private colleges and universities. Again, what business is it of ours what they do at the State and local level?

This is just the first step, as the gentleman from Maryland's comments suggested, in the ongoing assault that the advocates of this amendment wish to make on the free-speech rights of many Americans and their organizations. The original amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma has been divided into parts, and this happens to be the first part. But we should say no to this part lest we have to deal with the others.

This proposal comes to us from the folk who promised to lighten the regulatory burdens, imposed from Washington, to reduce Federal paperwork. This amendment comes to us from the people who expect private charity to try to pick up the slack as the Federal Government does less.

Mr. Chairman, give me a break. More importantly, give them a break and vote "no."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the Istook amendment to H.R. 3019. This amendment is

designed to send a chilling effect to groups who are attempting to express their opinions on the important issues confronting our Nation. While some proponents of this amendment argue that it is just a disclosure requirement. Many of us know the real motivation of this amendment.

The amendment requires organizations to list each Federal grant that they receive, a description of each grant, the name of the agency awarding the grant, and an estimate of lobbying expenses. Why is this information necessary? Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and stand up for the true meaning of our democratic principles which encourages free speech, encourages citizens to participate in government, and the right to impact public policy.

This amendment is a bad amendment. It is also mean spirited. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 209, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—211

Allard	Dornan	Jones
Archer	Dreier	Kasich
Army	Duncan	Kelly
Bachus	Dunn	Kim
Baker (CA)	Ehrlich	King
Baker (LA)	Emerson	Kingston
Ballenger	English	Knollenberg
Barr	Ensign	Kolbe
Barrett (NE)	Everett	Largent
Bartlett	Ewing	Latham
Barton	Fawell	LaTourette
Bass	Fields (TX)	Laughlin
Bateman	Flanagan	Lazio
Bereuter	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lightfoot
Bliley	Fowler	Linder
Boehner	Franks (CT)	Livingston
Bonilla	Frisa	Longley
Bono	Funderburk	Lucas
Brewster	Galleghy	Manzullo
Brownback	Ganske	Martini
Bryant (TN)	Gekas	McCollum
Bunning	Geren	McCrery
Burr	Gillmor	McDade
Burton	Gingrich	McHugh
Buyer	Goodlatte	McInnis
Callahan	Goodling	McIntosh
Calvert	Goss	McKeon
Camp	Graham	Metcalf
Chabot	Gunderson	Mica
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Chenoweth	Hall (TX)	Molinari
Christensen	Hancock	Montgomery
Chrysler	Hansen	Moorhead
Coble	Hastert	Myrick
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt
Collins (GA)	Hayworth	Neumann
Combest	Hefley	Ney
Condit	Heineman	Norwood
Cooley	Herger	Nussle
Cox	Hilleary	Oxley
Crane	Hobson	Packard
Crapo	Hoekstra	Parker
Cremeans	Hoke	Paxon
Cubin	Hostettler	Petri
Cunningham	Hunter	Pombo
Davis	Hutchinson	Porter
Deal	Hyde	Portman
DeLay	Inglis	Pryce
Diaz-Balart	Istook	Quillen
Dickey	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Doolittle	Johnson, Sam	Regula

Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunn
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons

Bevill
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
Clay

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt

NOES—209

Gilchrist
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler

NOT VOTING—12

Collins (MI)
de la Garza
Durbin
Green

Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Lowey
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

□ 1629

Mr. LoBIONDO and Mr. LIPINSKY; changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. PORTER, LONGLEY, and EVERETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 104-474.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAPO

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAPO: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new title:

TITLE V—DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Deficit Reduction Lock-box Act of 1996".

SEC. 502. DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX LEDGER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEDGER.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX LEDGER

"SEC. 314. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEDGER.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Director") shall maintain a ledger to be known as the "Deficit Reduction Lock-box Ledger". The Ledger shall be divided into entries corresponding to the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations. Each entry shall consist of three parts: the 'House Lock-box Balance'; the 'Senate Lock-box Balance'; and the 'Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance'.

"(b) COMPONENTS OF LEDGER.—Each component in an entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (c). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

"(c) CREDIT OF AMOUNTS TO LEDGER.—(1) The Director shall, upon the engrossment of any appropriation bill by the House of Representatives and upon the engrossment of that bill by the Senate, credit to the applicable entry balance of that House amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by that House to that bill.

"(2) The Director shall, upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill, credit to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance the amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to—

"(A) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of new budget authority in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of new budget authority in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that bill; and

"(B) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of outlays in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of outlays in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that bill.

"(3) CALCULATION OF LOCK-BOX SAVINGS IN SENATE.—For purposes of calculating under this section the net amounts of reductions in

new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by the Senate on an appropriation bill, the amendments reported to the Senate by its Committee on Appropriations shall be considered to be part of the original text of the bill.

“(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ‘appropriation bill’ means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 313 the following new item:

“Sec. 314. Deficit reduction lock-box ledger.”

SEC. 503. TALLY DURING HOUSE CONSIDERATION.

There shall be available to Members in the House of Representatives during consideration of any appropriations bill by the House a running tally of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill as reported.

SEC. 504. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF 602(a) ALLOCATIONS AND SECTION 602(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.

(a) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) Upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill (as defined in section 314(d)) for a fiscal year, the amounts allocated under paragraph (1) or (2) to the Committee on Appropriations of each House upon the adoption of the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year shall be adjusted downward by the amounts credited to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance under section 314(c)(2). The revised levels of budget authority and outlays shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.”

(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.—Section 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Whenever an adjustment is made under subsection (a)(5) to an allocation under that subsection, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall make downward adjustments in the most recent suballocations of new budget authority and outlays under subparagraph (A) to the appropriate subcommittees of that committee in the total amounts of those adjustments under section 314(c)(2). The revised suballocations shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.”

SEC. 505. PERIODIC REPORTING OF LEDGER STATEMENTS.

Section 308(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such reports shall also include an up-to-date tabulation of the amounts contained in the ledger and each entry established by section 314(a).”

SEC. 506. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The discretionary spending limits for new budget authority and outlays for any fiscal year set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be reduced by the amounts set forth in the final regular appropriation bill for that fiscal year or joint reso-

lution making continuing appropriations through the end of that fiscal year. Those amounts shall be the sums of the Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balances for that fiscal year, as calculated under section 602(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. That bill or joint resolution shall contain the following statement of law: “As required by section 6 of the Deficit Reduction Lock-box Act of 1995, for fiscal year [insert appropriate fiscal year] and each out-year, the adjusted discretionary spending limit for new budget authority shall be reduced by \$ [insert appropriate amount of reduction] and the adjusted discretionary limit for outlays shall be reduced by \$ [insert appropriate amount of reduction] for the budget year and each out-year.” Notwithstanding section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 306 of that Act as it applies to this statement shall be waived. This adjustment shall be reflected in reports under sections 254(g) and 254(h) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 507. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This title shall apply to all appropriation bills making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 or any subsequent fiscal year.

(b) FY96 APPLICATION.—In the case of any appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996 engrossed by the House of Representatives after August 4, 1995 and before the date of enactment of this bill, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall, within 10 calendar days after that date of enactment of this Act, carry out the duties required by this title and amendments made by it that occur after the date this Act was engrossed by the House of Representatives.

(c) FY96 ALLOCATIONS.—The duties of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Committees on the Budget and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives pursuant to this title and the amendments made by it regarding appropriation bills for fiscal year 1996 shall be based upon the revised section 602(a) allocations in effect on August 4, 1995.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term “appropriation bill” means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] is recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, before we begin the debate, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third time that we will have had the lockbox provision before us. It is one of the most critical reform issues with regard to the budget that will face in this Congress. It makes sure that when we make cuts on the floor of this House to the discretionary budget, that those

cuts are real and that they are not then shifted into other spending programs.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated this many times. I suspect that we will continue debating it until it becomes law. I encourage Members to stay the course on the lockbox. We are going to have a lot of people here in support of it today, but the point that must be recognized is we will stick with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member opposed to the amendment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. On the face of it, the lockbox proposal is an appealing idea. As proponents describe it, it is a way to ensure that the savings produced in spending cut amendments to appropriations bills are used to reduce the deficit, not to increase spending for other purposes.

But what the procedure actually does is to reduce the amount of funds available to the Committee on Appropriations by the amount saved by spending cut amendments adopted on the House and Senate floor. Thus, it is a tool to force total discretionary spending below the level that Congress has already decided through its budget resolution and through statutory caps as the appropriate level for the coming fiscal year.

So the question we should be considering is do we need to adopt an additional budget procedure to force deeper cuts in discretionary spending than we are already on the path toward achieving?

For those of us who think that we are already making more than enough cuts in discretionary spending, for those of us who oppose the substantial cuts in education and environmental protection that would result from this bill, and for those of us who are worried about future cuts in those areas, as well as cuts in transportation, housing, science and health research, national parks, crime control and many of the other programs that comprise the discretionary spending category that will be imposed if we eventually agree to a plan to balance the budget, it makes little sense to endorse a procedure that will likely lead to even deeper cuts and fewer opportunities to restore funds to these very programs.

Even Members who do wish to cut discretionary spending further cannot dispute the fact we already have an extremely effective process in place for

controlling that kind of spending. Those controls have enabled Congress to restrain the growth of discretionary spending to such an extent that its share of GDP has declined from 10.5 percent in 1980, to 8.2 percent in 1994, and if the Congress complies with the current discretionary spending caps that are in the budget resolution that was adopted last year, that spending will decline to just 6.8 percent in 1998. Domestic discretionary spending will decline from 5.1 percent of GDP in 1980, down to 3.1 percent in 1998.

Last, Mr. Chairman, if our goal is to establish procedures that will help us to reduce the deficit, this measure obviously aims at the wrong target. Like other procedures Congress has considered in recent years to apply further controls to discretionary spending, such as expedited rescission, line-item veto, separation of emergency and non-emergency appropriations, the lockbox proposal addresses the one part of the budget that is already the most strictly controlled.

If our budget process is inadequate in any way, it is that it provides comparatively little control for the mandatory spending, the entitlement programs, that are driving the growth of the Federal budget deficit.

If we are ever to succeed in eliminating deficit spending, Congress has got to change its focus with respect to budget process matters. Rather than devoting our time and effort to devising ways to apply more controls to the part of the budget that is already strictly controlled, we should devote that same kind of effort to addressing other parts of the budget that are under less effective control.

In addition, the Appropriations Committee will have to operate under a significantly more complicated process for figuring out how much funding they have to work with. And, this new procedure is likely to generate more conflict between the Senate and the House, and between Congress and the President, toward the end of each year's appropriations season when new, reduced allocations of spending are parcelled out to the appropriations subcommittees to accommodate whatever lockbox savings are finally achieved.

Popular as the lockbox proposal is, I urge my colleagues to consider carefully whether Congress needs a new procedure that increases the complexity of the budget process, and the difficulty of reaching final agreement on appropriations bills, and that focuses our deficit-reduction efforts on an area of the budget that is already contributing more than its fair share to the cause.

Mr. Chairman, I urge members to vote "no" on the Crapo amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who has been so gracious to be a strong supporter of this measure and bring the amendment forward.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, in spite of my great admiration and respect and friendship for the greatest chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that this body has ever known, I rise in the strongest possible support for this legislation.

Do my colleagues know why? I have been here for 18 years, not quite as long as the gentleman who is the chairman. In those 18 years, except for perhaps the retiring gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], I guess I have offered more amendments on this floor successfully passed than any other Member. Most of them were cutting amendments, even cutting sacrosanct things like foreign aid, which was unheard of. And lo and behold, over the 18-year career, all of the money was reprogrammed and respent.

This puts a stop to it today. This means when JERRY SOLOMON, or the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FOLEY, or the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, or any others, offer an amendment, if we do not offset it with other spending, that means that money is going to deficit deduction.

We are going to get this deficit under control one way or another. This is the best possible way to do it. I urge all Members to get over here and vote for this. We will make sure the Senate passes it, and, by golly, we will have some fiscal responsibility around here.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will make the budget process more user friendly for Members who wish to offer spending cut amendments on the floor of the House and Senate. When a spending cut amendment is adopted, savings from that amendment will be credited to deficit reduction.

This amendment is identical to the bill H.R. 1162 which passed the House under an open rule on September 13, 1995 by a bipartisan vote of 364 to 59. A similar amendment was also adopted on August 2, 1995 as an amendment to the Labor, HHS and Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 with 373 Members supporting that amendment. With such vast support for the amendment last year it follows that it should once again be included with these funding bills.

This bill reported by the Rules Committee represents a truly bipartisan effort culminating only after extensive consultation with CBO, OMB, CRS, the Government Reform and Oversight, Appropriations and Budget Committees.

The Crapo amendment contains a process flexible enough for both the Appropriations Committees to set spending priorities and for individual Members to debate substantive policy and spending issues during floor consideration of appropriation measures.

Members will now truly be able to go to the floor and offer spending cut amendments and actually be reducing the deficit.

I strongly urge my colleagues to once again support this bill by passing the Crapo amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia [Ms. HARMAN], who has also been a strong supporter and worked with us from the outset on this matter.

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the mother of lockbox, I rise in strong support of the Crapo lockbox amendment. I hope it will be enacted into law before I become a grandmother.

As we have heard from the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], the lockbox has passed three times by overwhelming margins, and yet it languishes in the other body. During last year's appropriations debates, the House passed floor amendments totaling more than \$350 billion, and those dollars did not go to deficit reduction, they were reprogrammed.

I commend Mr. CRAPO for including in his amendment the language offered by my colleague from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, and myself to the House-passed lockbox bill that captured outyear savings.

Our amendment was supported by the Concord Coalition and the National Taxpayer Union, among others. It ensured that spending cuts in multiyear programs result in a reduction in the outyear discretionary spending caps, as well as the present year spending caps.

Let me explain why such a provision is critical. On average, 95 percent of an agency's personnel funds are outlayed in the first fiscal year. By contrast, only 3.1 percent of funds for constructing military housing are outlayed in the first year. In the case of the Army, 12 percent is outlayed in year 2, 37 percent in year 3, and 24 percent in year 4.

Thus, without an outyear savings provision, cutting \$100 million out of fast-spending program like personnel may translate into a discretionary spending cut of \$95 million. But a successful floor amendment cutting \$100 million from a slow-spending program like Army family housing construction only reduces discretionary spending by \$3.1 million in the first year. The remaining \$96.9 million is not captured and, under our current House procedures, remains available for other spending programs.

Lockbox ensures that a cut is a cut. And, the language identical to the Harman-Stenholm amendment ensures that a cut is a full cut, not a cut based on a program's outlay spending rate for the first fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come. Deficit hawks, please vote for the bipartisan Crapo, Brewster, Foley, Harman, Largent, Schumer, Stenholm, et al, amendment. There is no more time for delay.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], who is one of the strong fighters in the freshman class.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, first congratulations to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], in advance, because this will be successful. For the first time, Congress is going to face the fact that, when we cut spending from programs, it is not going to be siphoned off and sent over to other spending programs. Much like Americans all across our land have Christmas club accounts, vacation accounts, savings accounts,

the lockbox will truly give us a mechanism by which when we cut wasteful spending on the floor or in committee, that wasteful spending will actually go for deficit reduction.

I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This has been a great opportunity for us to work, Republicans and Democrats, for fiscal responsibility. Again I applaud the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] for his leadership on this initiative and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for strong words of encouragement all the way.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], another of the freshmen so strong in support of this matter.

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, let me start by saying that I believe we have a moral imperative to balance the budget for the future of our children, and I believe that every spending reduction we can make is a positive step in that direction.

When Members go to the floor and cast votes for cutting amendments, they believe they are doing just that, cutting spending. In fact, as many of the newer Members of Congress have recently discovered, these cuts do not really go for deficit reduction but are reprogrammed and spent on other projects. This is outrageous. When 200 Members of the House of Representatives vote to cut spending, spending should be cut, not reprogrammed. That is why the lockbox is so important. To lock in the savings that the House passes and ensure that the savings go to deficit reduction, we must enact the lockbox now and not a day later.

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

□ 1645

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I mean many of the reasons have been enumerated, and that is when a cut is made, the cut should go to cutting. I have been against many of the very draconian measures that cut the budget, but this one makes rational sense. It allows us to, when we get up there and say we are cutting money, make sure that that money stays cut. It has had broad bipartisan support over the years, and I would hope that this body adopts it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel like the actor Bill Murray in that movie "Groundhog Day"; we keep doing this again and again and again and again. We are 5 months into the fiscal year. We are supposed to have the appropriations bills done. Yet we have a huge

portion of the budget still stuck, and this bill represents, in fact, the 10th continuing resolution, the 10th. We tried to do this 10 times to keep the Government open, and a couple of times the Congress has failed and the Government has closed.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for some versions of the lockbox, I have even sponsored some of the versions. But the fact is today that our highest priority ought to be to finally, halfway through the fiscal year, get last year's fiscal business passed. We already have three versions of this amendment sitting in the Senate deeper than door nails. Why is it necessary to add a fourth when our principal purpose is simply to get the Government continued for the rest of the fiscal year?

I have a very pragmatic reason to suggest my colleagues not vote for this amendment. It is just another item that slows down the process, makes it less likely that this bill is ever going to become law, makes it less likely that we are going to get out of the way and see to it that the local school districts do not have to lay off teachers, that Superfund sites, which are shut down now because of lack of funding, do not continue to stay shut down.

We need to get on with the principal business of the public, which is to get this business out of the way so we can turn to new issues. That is what we ought to be doing. And yet we keep chewing the cud over and over and over again. It seems to me this is just one additional item that makes it more difficult for the bill to pass.

If my colleagues want to pass lockbox, do it someplace else where it is not going to slow down our basic purpose.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the lockbox amendment that can save the dollars. We should lock it away and not spend it somewhere else, and I would like to hook onto what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] was just mentioning, that it seems to me that ultimately what this is really about is making it more likely that we will ultimately balance the budget, which is what this whole exercise is all about.

That is why I am in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], who has also been one of our strong supporters from the outset.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Crapo lockbox amendment.

As we all know, getting a majority of this House to vote for a cut in Federal spending is not easy. Then, it becomes even more frustrating when that so-called cut is later spent on another program in an appropriations bill.

This amendment would make our cuts count by directing these savings to deficit reduction—not additional spending. I consider this one of the most substantive changes to how Congress manages its money in decades.

This House voted more than six to one last fall to accept the lockbox. Let us be honest, and make sure that a cut is really a cut.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Crapo lockbox amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, as we conduct this debate, that we understand exactly what the lockbox does because there has been a lot of discussion about whether we need it or whether we do not. The way this bill works is that when we vote on the floor of the House to cut any program or project, in the current law that money, the program or project is cut, but the money allocated for spending in the budget for that program or project remains allocated, and it is simply respend on other measures, measures which are obviously of a lower priority or they would have been put in place of the spending in the first place.

So all we see is a reshuffling of the spending, but never a reduction of the actual spending so that we get deficit reduction, and those who watch across this country on C-Span or in any other capacity and listen to the debates on this floor day after day as we talk about the need to balance the budget, hear us discuss that every day, they see us vote on amendments that would cut spending every day, but when we are all done, the spending is not reduced because of the budget system in which we now operate.

This lockbox would create a mechanism whereby when we vote to cut spending on any particular program or project, if the majority of this Congress says that spending should be cut, then in reality that spending is allocated to deficit reduction rather than being shifted into new funds. Now if someone wants to bring an amendment and say I do not want deficit reduction, I simply want to cut spending from this program and put it into that program, that is perfectly allowed. This simply says that when we debate here on the floor and tell the American people that we are cutting spending in order to protect our budget, that when we are done with the day that is what happens.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple and straightforward principle. It is one when American people understand it they cannot quite see why the Congress has to even have this kind of a system because it does not make sense that we

could debate to cut spending and then, after we were done, have the spending simply shifted over into other spending priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, in the last 14 months, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been fighting these budget battles, and I have great sympathy for what the gentleman is trying to accomplish with his amendment. He wants to cut down on the amount of discretionary spending from the U.S. Congress. He is right, and we agree, and we have been working with him and jointly with the other body to do exactly that, and we have had enormous success.

The fact is nondefense discretionary spending over the years under Democrat control has just gone up, up, up, up, and up. In fiscal year 1994, it was up to \$237 billion, in fiscal year 1995, they had it up to \$246 billion, and had they retained control, it would have kept going on up. But we have scaled it back.

We had the rescission bill, and, no, I will not yield now. I will be happy to yield at the end of my statement.

We had the rescission bill that cut back fiscal year 1995 to \$230 billion. In 1996, right now, we are down to \$223 billion. In 1997, according to the budget agreement that passed the House and Senate, we will be down to \$219 billion.

We are making inroads in spending. We are attempting to accomplish what the gentleman is trying to do. But what I am concerned about is that if the gentleman's amendment passes, and I am sure it probably will pass because it is such an easy vote for so many Members, it will tie our hands and make us incapable of negotiating with the Senate or with the White House to reach agreements on bills that should pass in the interests of the American people.

In fact, in this bill there is funding for Bosnia, there is funding for flood relief in the Northwest, and some of the very constituents that are going to be tremendously benefited by programs in this bill might not have been had the lockbox been invoked on this bill because we might not have been able to include this funding.

Now, I know that Members say, well, it is important that we cut spending, that we reduce it. I have made that argument ad nauseam for the last 14 months. But, my colleagues, the problem is not in the discretionary budget because we are getting the discretionary budget under control. The discretionary budget, however, is only one-third of the \$1.6 trillion that the U.S. Government spends every year. Two-thirds is interest on the debt, Social Security, welfare, Medicare, Med-

icaid, and all the other entitlements, and unless we get control on the entitlements, we are never going to balance the budget. We can talk about a balanced budget by the year 2002, but if we do not get an agreement between the House and the Senate and the President of the United States to tackle that two-thirds of the budget, we are never going to accomplish anything.

Now, I find it ironic that two Members who took the well, at least two, possibly three; no, there are three that I can identify, and I am not going to embarrass them; three Members that took the well actually voted last week to increase entitlements. Now if discretionary spending is not the problem, and yet our colleagues want to shackle our hands to negotiate and reach an agreement that benefits the American people, and if mandatory spending is the problem, one would think Members would want to be consistent, and I know the gentleman who sponsors this amendment is consistent because he voted against those entitlements last week. But other Members who have spoken here did not. What they did was to take two programs which are funded by discretionary spending and say there is not enough money going into those programs. We have got to make them mandatory. We have got to make them entitlements, and they converted them, and the aggregate cost of those two programs in the farm bill, passed on Thursday last, is \$4 billion over 7 years.

Now, my colleagues, if we are going to vote for the lockbox, fine. But think about what we did last week. If my colleagues voted for that farm bill, if my colleagues voted to convert discretionary spending to mandatory, in effect they have contributed to the real problem of the deficit, and they are doing absolutely nothing but screwing the system up with the lockbox.

Now, I happen to think that the lockbox is well intentioned, but as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I will tell my colleagues it is very difficult to satisfy the many Members of the far left, the far right, and the people in the middle in this House, let alone work with the people in those same spectrums on the Senate side and negotiate with the White House, who does not like anything we want to do and wants to veto this bill. We have got a tough problem, and the lockbox only makes it tougher. It restricts our ability to negotiate with these other varying factors and, in essence, says we cannot do anything.

Now, our function in Government is not to sit around and do nothing. The gentleman from Maryland, and, if I have time, I will yield to him, he represents a lot of Federal employees. If this bill does not pass, we do not come to negotiated agreement with the Senate and the White House, we are going to shut down Government.

Do not make it worse. Let us defeat this.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, they say three times can be the charm. Well, today the

House will, for the third time this Congress, approve an important budget tool to make sure that spending cuts we agree to actually translate into savings for the American people. We hope this action will be the charm in getting this budget reform done. As Members know, this House voted for the deficit reduction lockbox by a huge margin of 373 to 52 on August 4, 1995, as an amendment to the Labor-HHS spending bill. We voted for the lockbox once again, as a freestanding bill, by a vote of 364 to 59 on September 13, 1995. There is no doubt that if it were up to the clear majority of this House, lockbox would be the law of the land today. Of course we know that we must also convince our friends in the other body to concur—and that's where the holdup has been. And so, in sending them lockbox legislation as part of this omnibus spending bill, we will affirm for a third time that we really do mean business in getting lockbox in place for the upcoming appropriations cycle. While I know some of our colleagues on the Appropriations Committees still have concerns about this lockbox, I remind them that this measure has been thoroughly vetted through subcommittee and full committee hearings, the Rules Committee markup, and careful consultation with Appropriations and Budget Committee staff. We believe that we have an effective product that still allows enough flexibility for the appropriators to do the enormously difficult job we ask of them. I commend Mr. CRAPO for his efforts to reach the goal of ensuring that a cut is really a cut; that when we say we are saving money by spending less in appropriations bills we follow through on that commitment. I hope my colleagues will join me once again in supporting this deficit reduction tool.

□ 1700

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 329, noes 89, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—329

Ackerman	Boehner	Clinger
Allard	Bono	Clyburn
Andrews	Boucher	Coble
Archer	Brewster	Coburn
Armey	Browder	Coleman
Bachus	Brown (OH)	Collins (GA)
Baesler	Brownback	Combest
Baker (LA)	Bryant (TN)	Condit
Baldacci	Bunn	Cooley
Ballenger	Bunning	Costello
Barcia	Burr	Cox
Barr	Burton	Cramer
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Crane
Barrett (WI)	Calvert	Crapo
Bartlett	Camp	Creameans
Barton	Campbell	Cubin
Bass	Canady	Cunningham
Bentsen	Cardin	Danner
Bereuter	Castle	Davis
Billbray	Chabot	de la Garza
Billirakis	Chambliss	Deal
Bishop	Chenoweth	DeFazio
Bliley	Christensen	DeLauro
Blute	Chrysler	DeLay
Boehlert	Clement	Deutsch

Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.	Portman
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Poshard
Doggett	Jones	Pryce
Dooley	Kanjorski	Quillen
Doolittle	Kaptur	Quinn
Dornan	Kasich	Ramstad
Doyle	Kelly	Reed
Dreier	Kennedy (MA)	Regula
Duncan	Kennedy (RI)	Richardson
Dunn	Kennelly	Riggs
Edwards	Kildee	Rivers
Ehlers	Kim	Roberts
Ehrlich	King	Roemer
Emerson	Kingston	Rohrabacher
English	Klecza	Ros-Lehtinen
Ensign	Klug	Roth
Eshoo	Kolbe	Roukema
Everett	LaHood	Royce
Ewing	Lantos	Salmon
Farr	Largent	Sanford
Fawell	Latham	Sawyer
Fazio	LaTourette	Scarborough
Fields (LA)	Laughlin	Schaefer
Fields (TX)	Lazio	Schiff
Filner	Leach	Schroeder
Flake	Levin	Schumer
Flanagan	Lewis (KY)	Scott
Foley	Lightfoot	Seastrand
Forbes	Lincoln	Sensenbrenner
Fowler	Linder	Serrano
Fox	Lipinski	Shadegg
Franks (CT)	LoBiondo	Shaw
Franks (NJ)	Lofgren	Shays
Frisa	Longley	Shuster
Frost	Lucas	Sisisky
Funderburk	Luther	Skelton
Furse	Maloney	Slaughter
Gallegly	Manton	Smith (MI)
Ganske	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Gejdenson	Martinez	Smith (TX)
Gekas	Martini	Smith (WA)
Gephardt	Mascara	Solomon
Geren	Matsui	Souder
Gilchrest	McCarthy	Spence
Gilman	McCollum	Spratt
Goodlatte	McHale	Stearns
Goodling	McHugh	Stenholm
Gordon	McInnis	Stump
Goss	McIntosh	Stupak
Graham	McKeon	Talent
Greenwood	McNulty	Tanner
Gunderson	Meehan	Tate
Gutknecht	Menendez	Tauzin
Hall (OH)	Metcalf	Taylor (MS)
Hall (TX)	Meyers	Taylor (NC)
Hamilton	Mica	Tejeda
Hancock	Miller (CA)	Thomas
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Harman	Minge	Thornton
Hastert	Molinari	Thurman
Hastings (WA)	Montgomery	Tiahrt
Hayworth	Moorhead	Torkildsen
Hefley	Morella	Torricelli
Hefner	Myrick	Trafficant
Heineman	Neal	Upton
Herger	Nethercutt	Visclosky
Hilleary	Neumann	Volkmer
Hilliard	Ney	Waldholtz
Hobson	Norwood	Walsh
Hoekstra	Nussle	Wamp
Hoke	Ortiz	Ward
Holden	Orton	Watts (OK)
Horn	Oxley	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Pallone	Weldon (PA)
Houghton	Parker	Weller
Hunter	Pastor	White
Hutchinson	Paxon	Whitfield
Hyde	Payne (VA)	Wicker
Inglis	Peterson (FL)	Wise
Istook	Peterson (MN)	Wolf
Jackson-Lee	Petri	Wynn
(TX)	Pickett	Young (AK)
Jacobs	Pombo	Young (FL)
Jefferson	Pomeroy	Zeliff
Johnson (CT)	Porter	Zimmer

NOES—89

Abercrombie	Clayton	Ford
Baker (CA)	Collins (IL)	Frank (MA)
Bateman	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Becerra	Coyne	Gibbons
Beilenson	Dellums	Gillmor
Berman	Dicks	Gonzalez
Bonilla	Dingell	Gutierrez
Bonior	Dixon	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Engel	Hinchey
Brown (CA)	Evans	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Jackson (IL)
Callahan	Foglietta	Johnston

Klink	Nadler	Skeen
Knollenberg	Oberstar	Stark
LaFalce	Obey	Studds
Lewis (CA)	Olver	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Torres
Livingston	Packard	Towns
Lowey	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Markey	Pelosi	Vento
McCrery	Rahall	Vucanovich
McDade	Rangel	Walker
McDermott	Rogers	Waters
McKinney	Rose	Watt (NC)
Meek	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Mink	Rush	Williams
Moakley	Sabo	Wilson
Mollohan	Sanders	Woolsey
Moran	Saxton	Yates
Murtha	Skaggs	

NOT VOTING—13

Bevill	Durbin	Radanovich
Bryant (TX)	Green	Stockman
Chapman	Hayes	Stokes
Clay	Johnson (SD)	
Collins (MI)	Myers	

□ 1718

Messrs. LEWIS of California, KNOLLENBERG, FRANK of Massachusetts, and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. LOFGREN, and Messrs. MOORHEAD, PASTOR, FIELDS of Louisiana, MARTINEZ, and PICKETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, 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. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 372, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 372 is adopted.

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think that is safe to say.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3019 to the Committee on Appropriations

with the instruction that the Committee report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment.

On page 386, line 15, strike all after "tion" through "11" on page 387, line 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, we have already indicated the problems in this bill for education and for environmental cleanup. The focus of this motion to recommit is quite different.

Mr. Speaker, after passage of the Veterans' Administration appropriation bill through the House, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs was not exactly bashful in indicating his displeasure with some of the funding cuts and policy recommendations adopted by the House. As a citizen of a free country and a congressionally confirmed member of the President's Cabinet, he was completely within his rights and was simply executing part of his duties as the administration's principal advocate for veterans.

But apparently that demonstration of free speech was too much for those who did not agree with his statements. The result in conference was language sharply limiting the Secretary's travel budget and reducing a number of personnel positions available to the Secretary. This bill contains those provisions.

The message is apparently very clear: Disagree with the majority who run this house on a veterans' issue and you will pay the price.

I might add this is not an isolated incident. The Secretary of the Interior has also been treated in a similar manner. He too has been very vocal in expressing his concerns about some of the provisions in the appropriation bill for Interior. His punishment was to see his office budget reduced by an additional 10 percent because he spoke out.

This motion is very simple and it applies only to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. It takes the gag off the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by restoring his office budget and restoring his travel budget. He has a right to talk to the country about his concerns about some of the cuts that were provided in this bill or any other bill that affect veterans and veterans' health care.

Now, I want to make clear the objection to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is not based on the amount of money he spent. His predecessor, Mr. Derwinski, a good friend of ours, his highest travel budget was \$198,000 in any one year. His lowest travel budget was \$131,000. Secretary Brown's today, his highest travel budget is \$131,000, equal to Mr. Derwinski's lowest, and his lowest travel budget was \$105,000. The bill before us would cut that travel budget to \$50,000.

Now, there is absolutely no reason why the Secretary should not be able to move around the country. There is no reason why he should not be able to move around the country doing his job.

I want to point out that the intent of this amendment is supported by the veterans' service organizations like the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion and the VFW. I will read one paragraph from the DAV letter:

The Secretary will be forced to curtail other activities which directly support our Nation's sick and disabled veterans. Specifically, these spending restrictions will have an adverse effect upon the ability of the Office of Public Affairs to assist with the participation in direct patient care activities such as disabled veterans winter sports clinic, national veterans wheelchair games, golden age games and the creative art festival. These events, individually and collectively, represent a true therapeutic and rehabilitative milieu unmatched in the traditional medical setting.

I would urge support for the amendment. Take the gag off the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this very procedural motion to recommit. It raises really a phony issue. The White House does not care a whit about this, never talked to us, never raised it, does not care.

Mr. Chairman, veterans are much better off than they were before. They got a \$400 million increase in health benefits over what they had last year. They are getting \$38.4 billion out of this package, \$16.9 billion of which goes to health care, so the veterans are doing well.

You know what the other side is upset about? They are upset because, yes, we have cut the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Planning, and some administrative expenses because Jesse Brown put veterans' benefit paychecks in envelopes, sent them to the veterans themselves with a notice, with a political message in it.

□ 1730

Now, free speech is not free if it is paid for by the taxpayer, and it is put in an envelope by the Secretary that included veterans benefits checks and sent out as a political speech to the American people. That has got to stop.

This is a phony issue. Vote "no" against the motion to recommit and vote for the bill. Let us not close the Government. This is a good process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I know a number of my colleagues have angst about the idea of voting for this bill, and I frankly, at least for those who voted for the Republican plan to balance the budget, have a little bit of difficulty understanding that angst, because this omnibus proposal keeps us on track. It moves to termi-

nate 175 programs, most of which under the stewardship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who did an outstanding job, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

In addition, I think there was some concern about the contingency funds, which, frankly, I had concern about. The contingency funding is taken care of.

In an effort to be reasonable with the administration, if, in fact, we can achieve a major reconciliation bill, then we give some additional flexibility to the administration, but it is no program that allows them to willy-nilly go out and spend more money. The simple fact of the matter is—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. The matter before us is the motion to recommit. Is the gentleman not required to confine his remarks to that motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, they did not tell me that.

I would just say the gentleman from Wisconsin obviously has a well-thought-out proposal but, in fact, does not get to the heart of the matter and distracts us from the need to stay on course in our effort to balance the budget and to keep this portion of the budget on track, and I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, he always does a fine job here on the floor. He has done a lot of research, but he fundamentally does not support the idea that we should terminate 175 programs and live under the cap.

So I would say to my Republican colleagues this is a chance to keep the momentum going. Let us come to the floor. Let us reject the well-thought-out motion from the gentleman of Wisconsin, get on with passing the bill and keep the revolution alive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 228, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No 54]

AYES—182

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)

Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher

Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clayton

Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs

Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)

Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—228

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)

Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio

Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon

Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Zimmer

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Baker (LA)
Bevill
Bryant (TX)
Chabot
Chapman
Clay
Collins (MI)

Dornan
Durbin
Ford
Green
Harman
Hayes
Hoke

Johnson (SD)
McCrery
McDade
Myers
Stockman
Stokes
Williams

□ 1749

Mr. ENSIGN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GIBBONS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 209, nays 206, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—209

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady

Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremins
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell

Fields (TX)
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley

Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingles
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum

McDade
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff

Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake

Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott

McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton

Slaughter
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson

Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp

Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—17

Baker (LA)
Bevill
Bryant (TX)
Chabot
Chapman
Clay

Collins (MI)
Duncan
Durbin
Green
Hayes
Johnson (SD)

McCrery
Myers
Stockman
Stokes
Taylor (NC)

□ 1806

Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3019, and that they may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 104-476) on the resolution (H. Res. 375) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2703, THE EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY AND PUBLIC SAFETY ACT OF 1996

Mr. GOSS, for the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-191) on the resolution (H. Res. 376) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.