

Today, the Congress is agreeing, the Senate has already acted. We will act in the next hour, and we will send to the President a true line-item veto that is going to put a dent in this big-spending Congress once and for all, and the American people are going to yell hooray, hooray, hooray.

PREEMPTION OF STATE PROTECTIONS IS A BAD IDEA

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the House Republicans will pass up a golden opportunity to advance realistic bipartisan health care reform when it considers H.R. 3103, instead of sponsoring and passing the Roukema-Kassebaum-Kennedy health reform bill that I cosponsored.

The bill which the House considers today will have disastrous consequences for consumers. Carefully crafted State insurance laws will be replaced by a uniform standard developed and implemented by the Department of Labor here in Washington. That is right. We are taking away States' ability to regulate and move it here to Washington. They want to move it to an agency that one of my Republican colleagues said was led by what he thought was a Communist.

What does this mean to the average American family? State statutes and rules requiring certain benefits be covered by health insurance policies may no longer apply. For instance, many States like Texas, where I am from, have statutes requiring the inclusion of newborn infant coverage in their State law. That will be wiped out if this bill passes today.

Under the Republican health plan, this may no longer apply. This is moving from State control to Washington control. That must have been in the fine print of the Contract With America.

A GREAT DAY FOR AMERICA

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said it very well. This is a historic day in this body. We are going to pass the line-item veto today. It is something that we have worked hard on and long on, and we finally are in a position where we are going to deliver a version of the line-item veto which works.

This is part of the new majority here. We are getting spending under control. This matters to America, so I hope Americans will stay tuned.

It is also remarkable to me that on the very same day we are doing this historic event, we are also going to be bringing forward the first meaningful

health care reform in many, many a year for the people of this country who need access to affordable health care. That is in the agenda for today as well, and I believe we are going to get that done, too. A great day for America.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will begin consideration of the Health Coverage Availability Act. As we embark on this very important discussion, I would like to urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to pass up on what is a truly golden opportunity to advance realistic, bipartisan health care reform legislation.

History has shown us that past efforts to tackle this issue have failed largely because they tried to accomplish too much. Unfortunately, by giving in to special interest groups, the majority seems to be headed down that same path once again.

Let's keep things simple. The Roukema-Kassebaum-Kennedy [RKK] bill is a sound piece of legislation that has broad bipartisan support. By helping millions of Americans keep their health insurance when they switch jobs, regardless of their health condition, it provides a much needed and relatively noncontroversial solution that a vast majority of the Members of this Chamber can agree on.

The demands of the moment require both Democrats and Republicans to unite behind the RKK bill if there is to be any realistic possibility for health reform during this Congress. Let us pass RKK now. The other issues can be worked out separately and moved separately.

REPUBLICANS PAY BACK TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are at it again. No different than we have done in the past here, my colleagues take a good bill, one that everything on both sides really has supported to pass, the Senate supports it, the President supports it. It is known as the Roukema-Kassebaum-Kennedy bill. It provides for portability, it provides for health care for preexisting conditions. And then my colleagues take that good bill and they put a terrible piece of legislation along with it, because they think well, we cannot pass that terrible piece of legislation by itself, and we can only pass it if we tack it on a big one.

Mr. Speaker, this is what they are doing. They are tacking it on. And what is it? It is payoff time. It is payoff time to the special interests of this

House, the people that are paying for the Republicans' campaign. That is what it is.

What does the Washington Times say about it? "Riders imperil health reforms."

So really, do they want to do health reform? No; they want to pass something for their special interests. That is what they want to do. Let us vote them down.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule. Those committees are the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there are no objections to this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3136, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 391 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 391

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3136) to provide for the enactment of the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1996, the Line Item Veto Act, and the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act of 1996, and to provide for a permanent increase in the public debt limit. The amendments specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and

ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) a further amendment, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit, which may include instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee.

SEC. 2. If, before March 30, 1996, the House has received a message informing it that the Senate has adopted the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 4) to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority, and for other purposes, then—

(a) in the engrossment of H.R. 3136 the Clerk shall strike title II (unless it has been amended) and redesignate the subsequent titles accordingly; and

(b) the House shall be considered to have adopted that conference report.

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

Page 2, line 9, strike "one hour" and all that follows through "Means" on line 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"80 minutes of debate on the bill, as amended, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight or their designees".

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN]. He is one of the most understanding Members of this body. He is going to be leaving us at the end of this year and we are going to miss him. We do not always agree, but he is one fine gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 391 provides for consideration of the bill H.R. 3136, the Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996. That is im-

portant. This bill contains the Senior Citizens Right to Work Act of 1996. It contains the Line-Item Veto Act, the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act of 1996, and a permanent increase in the public debt limit.

Believe me, if it were not for these other issues I just read off, I would not be standing up here supporting the increase in the debt limit for this Government. Not only does this bill represent the completion of three major contract promises, but it represents the product of bipartisan, bicameral and dual-branch negotiations. Think about that, ladies and gentlemen. That is cooperation. The bill before us today addresses concerns of both houses of Congress and the Clinton administration as well.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 3136, as modified by the amendments designated in the Committee on Rules report on this resolution. The rule provides for the adoption of two amendments. The first amendment is to title III of the bill relating to regulatory reform, and the second amendment is to title I of this bill relating to the Social Security earnings test limit. Both amendments address specific concerns of the administration and have been included in the bill in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation. It is hoped that the final product will meet the concerns of all parties involved.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under section 425(a) of the Budget Act relating to unfunded mandates. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and of course we have just enacted an addendum to that, an amendment giving the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and his committee an additional 20 minutes, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member.

The rule further provides for the consideration of an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] or his designee, which is debatable for 10 minutes. This further amendment was provided to the manager of the bill in order to accommodate any further negotiations between Congress and the administration that occurred last night after the Committee on Rules reported this bill. It is my understanding now, however, that the use of this authority will not be necessary. Upon completion of debate, the rule provides for one motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may only be offered by the minority leader or his designee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that if before March 30, 1996, the House has received a Senate message stating that the Senate has adopted the conference report on S. 4, which is the Line-Item Veto Act, then following House passage and engrossment of H.R. 3136, the Clerk shall be instructed to

strike title II unless amended from this bill. This title contains the exact text of the conference report of Senate bill 4.

Furthermore, upon the actions of the House, it will be deemed to have adopted the conference report on S. 4, which is the line-item veto conference report. This final procedure has been included in the rule as part of our continuing efforts to expedite the consideration of this terribly, terribly important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as to the text of H.R. 3136, let me express my strong support for these Contract With America measures. Title I, the Senior Citizens Right to Work Act of 1996, is crucial legislation which will lift the current impediments seniors throughout my district and yours and throughout this entire country face as they try to increase their income by working in their later years.

It is the most ridiculous thing when you have paid into Social Security with your own money, over all of these years, 30, 40, 50, 60, whatever it might be, that money is yours. It is being paid back to you from a trust, and yet you are penalized if you earn more than \$11,000, three to one; you have to give back one dollar for every three you earn over \$11,000. That is about the most undemocratic thing that I have ever seen. This bill is going to correct that.

It also provides relief that was made in 1994 and is a promise that is going to be kept today. Title III, the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act of 1996, will provide needed regulatory relief and flexibility to millions of small business owners, to farmers and families across this country, enabling these job creators, and these kind of businesses create 75 percent of every new job in America every single year. It allows them to expand employment in the marketplace and to grow our Nation's economy and grow jobs for high school students graduating and college students, as well.

Now, while this regulatory reform does not go as far as I would like to see it, it still represents a dramatic shift in the direction of regulatory relief that was promised in the contract for America. Mr. Speaker, this was another promise Republicans made, and this is another promise Republicans are going to keep here today.

Mr. Speaker, title II of the bill represents legislation that is near and dear to my personal heart, legislation that I have worked to pass for more than 18 years here in this Congress. Title II is the Line-Item Veto Act. It represents fundamental budget process reform, and I never thought it would happen. After many hearings, three committee markups, 2 days of floor consideration in the House, 1 week of floor consideration in the Senate, and more than a year of debate in a committee on conference, a thoroughly researched, extensively debated and well drafted bill has finally been produced.

The conferees, led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman CLINGER, sitting next to me over here, are to be commended for bringing the House such thorough and historic budget process reform and getting it through the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, I have been an ardent supporter of the line-item veto all these years. Nevertheless, I believe the conference report language before us today will provide the President, any President, regardless of political party, with an even more effective, yet limited line-item veto authority that I ever thought could be possible.

Without question, it will result in lower, more responsible Government spending. Under the bill, the President is delegated the constitutional authority to cancel dollar amounts of discretionary appropriations. He is granted the ability to limit tax benefits or increases in direct spending, and these cancellations must be transmitted by special message to the Congress within 5 days of signing the original bill into law.

With report to dollar amounts of discretionary appropriations, the President is permitted to cancel specific items in appropriations bills, any governing committee reports or joint explanatory statements to accompany a conference report. What that means is the bill will also allow the President to cancel any increase in direct spending, which includes entitlements and the Food Stamp Program. Believe me, that is going to make a difference, since that takes up almost all of the budget, these entitlement programs.

This delegated authority will allow the President to cancel any new expansions of direct spending.

Now, with regard to tax benefits, the President is permitted to cancel any

limited tax benefits identified by the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation in any revenue or reconciliation law. In an effort to limit this delegated cancellation authority, the line-item veto requires that the cancellations may be made if the President can determine that such cancellation would reduce the Federal budget deficit.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure reductions the deficit, a lot of people ought to listen to this because this is something we have been fighting for years, the bill has established a lock bloc mechanism lowering the statutory spending caps, locking in any savings gained through the use of the line-item veto.

How many times have we offered amendments on this floor and we have cut out spending on a project only to find the money was reinstated for another project later on? That is going to stop right now when the President signs this bill.

The bill also provides for expedited procedures in both the House and the Senate for consideration of a bill to disapprove any cancellation by the President. That disapproval bill would then be subject to a veto by the President, which would then have to be overridden by a two-thirds vote of both houses in order for the money, intended to be canceled, to be spent or to take effect. I intend to discuss the specifics of these expedited procedures later on in the debate, as will my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the conference on line-item veto. However, I will say now that these expedited procedures were intentionally drafted to allow any Member, majority or minority, who can muster sufficient support to receive a vote to disapprove on the floor of this House any particular veto.

The bill also provides for expedited judicial review of any challenge to the constitutionality of the act. No severability or nonseverability provisions were included in the bill, but it is the intention of the conferees that any judicial determinations regarding the constitutionality of the bill be applied severably to the legislation. This is consistent with the current rule of thumb regarding constitutional challenges to any law that is silent on the issue of severability.

Finally, the line-item veto authority becomes effective on the date of the earlier of these two: enactment of a 7-year balanced budget plan, or January 1, 1997. This authority would sunset on January 1, 2005.

Now, there has been some discussion whether the delay in the effective date has been motivated by partisan politics, but let us set the record straight here and now. As was stated in the Committee on Rules yesterday, this effective date has been agreed to by the signers of the conference report on both sides of the aisle, which were bipartisan. The Senate majority leader and Republican nominee for President, BOB DOLE, and President Clinton himself, after a conversation between Majority Leader DOLE and the President, both agreed to this effective date publicly in press conferences. Furthermore, the effective date was also chosen in part to take away any partisan games involving the line-item veto, take it out of the picture during the presidential election year.

Mr. Speaker, with that discussion of the rule and the major provisions of the line-item veto, I urge support of the rule and the bill for this historic occasion.

I include the following material for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 27, 1996]

| Rule type | 103d Congress | | 104th Congress | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Open/Modified-open ² | 46 | 44 | 59 | 59 |
| Modified Closed ³ | 49 | 47 | 25 | 25 |
| Closed ⁴ | 9 | 9 | 16 | 16 |
| Total | 104 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 27, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| H. Res. 38 (1/18/95) | O | H.R. 5 | Unfunded Mandate Reform | A: 350-71 (1/19/95) |
| H. Res. 44 (1/24/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 17 | Social Security | A: 255-172 (1/25/95) |
| | | H.J. Res. 1 | Balanced Budget Amdt | |
| H. Res. 51 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 101 | Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians | A: voice vote (2/1/95) |
| H. Res. 52 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 400 | Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve | A: voice vote (2/1/95) |
| H. Res. 53 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 440 | Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif | A: voice vote (2/1/95) |
| H. Res. 55 (2/1/95) | O | H.R. 2 | Line Item Veto | A: voice vote (2/2/95) |
| H. Res. 60 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 665 | Victim Restitution | A: voice vote (2/7/95) |
| H. Res. 61 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 666 | Exclusionary Rule Reform | A: voice vote (2/7/95) |
| H. Res. 63 (2/8/95) | MO | H.R. 667 | Violent Criminal Incarceration | A: voice vote (2/9/95) |
| H. Res. 69 (2/9/95) | O | H.R. 668 | Criminal Alien Deportation | A: voice vote (2/10/95) |
| H. Res. 79 (2/10/95) | MO | H.R. 728 | Law Enforcement Block Grants | A: voice vote (2/13/95) |
| H. Res. 83 (2/13/95) | MO | H.R. 7 | National Security Revitalization | PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95) |
| H. Res. 88 (2/16/95) | MC | H.R. 831 | Health Insurance Deductibility | PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95) |
| H. Res. 91 (2/21/95) | O | H.R. 830 | Paperwork Reduction Act | A: voice vote (2/22/95) |
| H. Res. 92 (2/21/95) | MC | H.R. 889 | Defense Supplemental | A: 282-144 (2/22/95) |

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued
[As of March 27, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| H. Res. 93 (2/22/95) | MO | H.R. 450 | Regulatory Transition Act | A: 252-175 (2/23/95). |
| H. Res. 96 (2/24/95) | MO | H.R. 1022 | Risk Assessment | A: 253-165 (2/27/95). |
| H. Res. 100 (2/27/95) | O | H.R. 926 | Regulatory Reform and Relief Act | A: voice vote (2/28/95). |
| H. Res. 101 (2/28/95) | MO | H.R. 925 | Private Property Protection Act | A: 271-151 (3/2/95). |
| H. Res. 103 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 1058 | Securities Litigation Reform | |
| H. Res. 104 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 988 | Attorney Accountability Act | A: voice vote (3/6/95). |
| H. Res. 105 (3/6/95) | MO | | | A: 257-155 (3/7/95). |
| H. Res. 108 (3/7/95) | Debate | H.R. 956 | Product Liability Reform | A: voice vote (3/8/95). |
| H. Res. 109 (3/8/95) | MC | | | PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95). |
| H. Res. 115 (3/14/95) | MC | H.R. 1159 | Making Emergency Supp. Appropr. | A: 242-190 (3/15/95). |
| H. Res. 116 (3/15/95) | MC | H.J. Res. 73 | Term Limits Const. Amdt | A: voice vote (3/28/95). |
| H. Res. 117 (3/16/95) | Debate | H.R. 4 | Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (3/21/95). |
| H. Res. 119 (3/21/95) | MC | | | A: 217-211 (3/22/95). |
| H. Res. 125 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 1271 | Family Privacy Protection Act | A: 423-1 (4/4/95). |
| H. Res. 126 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 660 | Older Persons Housing Act | A: voice vote (4/6/95). |
| H. Res. 128 (4/4/95) | MC | H.R. 1215 | Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 | A: 228-204 (4/5/95). |
| H. Res. 130 (4/5/95) | MC | H.R. 483 | Medicare Select Expansion | A: 253-172 (4/6/95). |
| H. Res. 136 (5/1/95) | O | H.R. 655 | Hydrogen Future Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (5/2/95). |
| H. Res. 139 (5/3/95) | O | H.R. 1361 | Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (5/9/95). |
| H. Res. 140 (5/9/95) | O | H.R. 961 | Clean Water Amendments | A: 414-4 (5/10/95). |
| H. Res. 144 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 535 | Fish Hatchery—Arkansas | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 145 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 584 | Fish Hatchery—Iowa | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 146 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 614 | Fish Hatchery—Minnesota | A: voice vote (5/15/95). |
| H. Res. 149 (5/16/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution FY 1996 | PQ: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95). |
| H. Res. 155 (5/22/95) | MO | H.R. 1561 | American Overseas Interests Act | A: 233-176 (5/23/95). |
| H. Res. 164 (6/8/95) | MC | H.R. 1530 | Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996 | PQ: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95). |
| H. Res. 167 (6/15/95) | O | H.R. 1817 | MilCon Appropriations FY 1996 | PQ: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95). |
| H. Res. 169 (6/19/95) | MC | H.R. 1854 | Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95). |
| H. Res. 170 (6/20/95) | O | H.R. 1868 | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95). |
| H. Res. 171 (6/22/95) | O | H.R. 1905 | Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/12/95). |
| H. Res. 173 (6/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 79 | Flag Constitutional Amendment | PQ: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95). |
| H. Res. 176 (6/28/95) | MC | H.R. 1944 | Emer. Supp. Approps. | PQ: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95). |
| H. Res. 185 (7/11/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 235-193 D: 192-238 (7/12/95). |
| H. Res. 187 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2 | PQ: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95). |
| H. Res. 188 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1976 | Agriculture Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95). |
| H. Res. 190 (7/17/95) | O | H.R. 2020 | Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95). |
| H. Res. 193 (7/19/95) | C | H.J. Res. 96 | Disapproval of MFN to China | A: voice vote (7/20/95). |
| H. Res. 194 (7/19/95) | O | H.R. 2002 | Transportation Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95). |
| H. Res. 197 (7/21/95) | O | H.R. 70 | Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil | A: voice vote (7/24/95). |
| H. Res. 198 (7/21/95) | O | H.R. 2076 | Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/25/95). |
| H. Res. 201 (7/25/95) | O | H.R. 2099 | VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996 | A: 230-189 (7/25/95). |
| H. Res. 204 (7/28/95) | MC | S. 21 | Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia | A: voice vote (8/1/95). |
| H. Res. 205 (7/28/95) | O | H.R. 2126 | Defense Approps. FY 1996 | A: 409-1 (7/31/95). |
| H. Res. 207 (8/1/95) | MC | H.R. 1555 | Communications Act of 1995 | A: 255-156 (8/2/95). |
| H. Res. 208 (8/1/95) | O | H.R. 2127 | Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996 | A: 323-104 (8/2/95). |
| H. Res. 215 (9/7/95) | O | H.R. 1594 | Economically Targeted Investments | A: voice vote (9/12/95). |
| H. Res. 216 (9/7/95) | MO | H.R. 1655 | Intelligence Authorization FY 1996 | A: voice vote (9/12/95). |
| H. Res. 218 (9/12/95) | O | H.R. 1162 | Deficit Reduction Lockbox | A: voice vote (9/13/95). |
| H. Res. 219 (9/12/95) | O | H.R. 1670 | Federal Acquisition Reform Act | A: 414-0 (9/13/95). |
| H. Res. 222 (9/18/95) | O | H.R. 1617 | CAREERS Act | A: 388-2 (9/19/95). |
| H. Res. 224 (9/19/95) | O | H.R. 2274 | Natl. Highway System | PQ: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95). |
| H. Res. 225 (9/19/95) | MC | H.R. 927 | Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity | A: 304-118 (9/20/95). |
| H. Res. 226 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 743 | Team Act | A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95). |
| H. Res. 227 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 1170 | 3-Judge Court | A: voice vote (9/28/95). |
| H. Res. 228 (9/21/95) | O | H.R. 1601 | Internatl. Space Station | A: voice vote (9/27/95). |
| H. Res. 230 (9/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 108 | Continuing Resolution FY 1996 | A: voice vote (9/28/95). |
| H. Res. 234 (9/29/95) | O | H.R. 2405 | Omnibus Science Auth. | A: voice vote (10/11/95). |
| H. Res. 237 (10/17/95) | MC | H.R. 2259 | Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines | A: voice vote (10/18/95). |
| H. Res. 238 (10/18/95) | MC | H.R. 2425 | Medicare Preservation Act | PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95). |
| H. Res. 239 (10/19/95) | C | H.R. 2492 | Leg. Branch Approps. | PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95). |
| H. Res. 245 (10/25/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 109 | Social Security Earnings Reform | PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95). |
| H. Res. 251 (10/31/95) | C | H.R. 2491 | Seven-Year Balanced Budget | |
| H. Res. 252 (10/31/95) | MO | H.R. 1833 | Partial Birth Abortion Ban | A: 237-190 (11/1/95). |
| H. Res. 257 (11/7/95) | C | H.R. 2546 | D.C. Approps. | A: 241-181 (11/1/95). |
| H. Res. 258 (11/8/95) | MC | H.J. Res. 115 | Cont. Res. FY 1996 | A: 216-210 (11/8/95). |
| H. Res. 259 (11/9/95) | O | H.R. 2586 | Debt Limit | A: 220-200 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 261 (11/9/95) | C | H.R. 2539 | ICC Termination Act | A: voice vote (11/14/95). |
| H. Res. 262 (11/9/95) | C | H.J. Res. 115 | Cont. Resolution | A: 223-182 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 269 (11/15/95) | C | H.R. 2586 | Increase Debt Limit | A: 220-185 (11/10/95). |
| H. Res. 270 (11/15/95) | O | H.R. 2564 | Lobbying Reform | A: voice vote (11/16/95). |
| H. Res. 273 (11/16/95) | MC | H.J. Res. 122 | Further Cont. Resolution | A: 229-176 (11/15/95). |
| H. Res. 284 (11/29/95) | O | H.R. 2606 | Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia | A: 239-181 (11/17/95). |
| H. Res. 287 (11/30/95) | O | H.R. 1788 | Amtrak Reform | A: voice vote (11/30/95). |
| H. Res. 293 (12/7/95) | C | H.R. 1350 | Maritime Security Act | A: voice vote (12/6/95). |
| H. Res. 303 (12/13/95) | O | H.R. 2621 | Protect Federal Trust Funds | PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95). |
| H. Res. 309 (12/18/95) | C | H.R. 1745 | Utah Public Lands | |
| H. Res. 313 (12/19/95) | O | H. Con. Res. 122 | Budget Res. W/President | PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95). |
| H. Res. 323 (12/21/95) | C | H.R. 558 | Texas Low-Level Radioactive | A: voice vote (12/20/95). |
| H. Res. 366 (2/27/96) | MC | H.R. 2677 | Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge | Tabled (2/28/96). |
| H. Res. 368 (2/28/96) | O | H.R. 2854 | Farm Bill | PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96). |
| H. Res. 371 (3/6/96) | C | H.R. 994 | Small Business Growth | |
| H. Res. 372 (3/6/96) | MC | H.R. 3021 | Debt Limit Increase | A: voice vote (3/7/96). |
| H. Res. 380 (3/12/96) | MC | H.R. 3019 | Cont. Approps. FY 1996 | PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96). |
| H. Res. 384 (3/14/96) | MC | H.R. 2703 | Effective Death Penalty | A: 251-157 (3/13/96). |
| H. Res. 386 (3/20/96) | C | H.R. 2202 | Immigration | PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96). |
| H. Res. 388 (3/20/96) | C | H.J. Res. 165 | Further Cont. Approps. | PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96). |
| H. Res. 391 (3/27/96) | C | H.R. 125 | Gun Crime Enforcement | A: 244-166 (3/22/96). |
| H. Res. 392 (3/27/96) | MC | H.R. 3136 | Contract w/America Advancement | |
| | | H.R. 3103 | Health Coverage Affordability | |

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, my chairman and my good friend, for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, we have very serious concerns about this rule and about the bill that makes in order the so-called Contract With America Advancement

Act. This legislation provides for an increase in the public debt limit to \$5.5 trillion, but it also includes three measures that are completely unrelated to the debt limit: a bill increasing the Social Security earnings limit, a conference report on the so-called Line Item Veto Act, and a new version of regulatory reform legislation entitled the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act.

The rule before us continues the disturbing trend under the Republican majority of disregarding normal legislative procedures and unreasonably restricting debate. This is a closed rule. No amendments are in order except one that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is permitted to offer. When the Committee on Rules met last night on this matter, the committee allowed this amendment without knowing what

it would be. We hope it is a good amendment.

The rule also sets up a highly unusual procedure, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] described a few minutes ago, for disposing of the Line Item Veto Act. The rule provides that if the other body approves the conference report on this bill before Saturday and the House passes H.R. 3136, the conference report shall be sent to the President as a free-standing bill.

Because the Senate approved the conference report last night, that part of this bill will in fact be separated upon passage of this legislation. We believe it is unnecessary and unwise to construct final action on the Line Item Veto Act in this convoluted manner. There is no good reason why this matter should not be considered in the same way other conference reports are normally considered; that is, as free-standing legislation and without reference to action by the other body. For that matter, there is no good reason why any of the extraneous legislation included in this increase in the debt limit must be included.

□ 1100

While we understand that the inclusion of the three bills here reflects an agreement, reached between the President and the Republican leadership in both Houses of the Congress, we regret that is the case. We think it would have been much more responsible and appropriate for us to consider a simple, straightforward debt limit increase. The raising of the debt limit is an extremely urgent matter, as we all know. We have to do it very soon to prevent a Government default. The fact this very necessary legislation is encumbered with unrelated controversial matters will cause, unfortunately, some of us who otherwise would support raising the debt limit to instead vote against it.

In the Committee on Rules last night, we offered an amendment to make in order a clean debt limit increase. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our amendment was defeated on a party line vote, as were several other amendments we offered that would have given the House more choices in the outcome of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the most troubling portion of this legislation, in my view, is the Line Item Veto Act conference report. While we all agree that reducing Federal budget deficits is one of the most important tasks facing us, many of us do not believe that providing the President with the extraordinary new authority contained in the Line Item Veto Act will do much, if anything, to help us achieve that goal.

What this legislation will do is transfer power from Congress to the President and enhance the power of a minority in Congress to override the will of a majority on matters of spending priorities. Under this legislation, the

President's cancellation of line items in appropriations, which includes not only items listed in bills but also in committee reports and joint statements of managers or direct spending or targeted tax benefits, would automatically take effect unless Congress specifically passes a resolution disapproving the cancellation. If Congress overturns the President's action, the President could then veto the disapproval, which, in turn, would have to be overridden by two-thirds of both Houses. Thus the President would be empowered to cancel any such item with the support of only a minority of Members of either House. A one-third plus 1 minority, working with the President, would control spending.

This procedure would result in a dramatic and quite possibly unconstitutional shift in responsibility and power from the legislative branch to the executive branch. This broad shift of powers could easily lead to abuses. The President could target the rescissions against particular legislators or particular regions of the country or against the judicial branch. This power could be used to force Congress to pay for a pet Presidential project that a majority of Members oppose or to agree to a policy that is completely unrelated to budgetary matters.

Furthermore, we would be transferring this unprecedented amount of power to the President with little reason to believe that it would have much of an effect on the Federal budget deficit. This new line item veto would be used primarily for annually appropriated discretionary spending. However, discretionary spending, as Members know, which accounts for less than one-third of the budget, is already the most tightly controlled type of spending, since it is subject to strict caps. It has been declining both as a percentage of the total Federal budget and as a percentage of GDP for the last several years. It will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

Additional controls in this area of the budget will not accomplish much, if anything, in the way of deficit reduction. In fact, discretionary spending is an area of the budget where Presidents have wanted more spending than Congress has approved. According to the Office of Management and Budget, from 1982 to 1993, Congress appropriated \$59 billion less than the President had requested.

In addition, over the last 20 years, Congress has rescinded \$20 billion more than the President has requested in rescissions. If those patterns continue and the President is given greater leverage in the appropriations process, it is likely that he will use this new line item veto authority as a threat to secure appropriations for programs he wants funded rather than to reduce total amount of spending.

I would also like to point out that the legislation is unlikely to accomplish what its advocates claim it will in the way of including special-interest

targeted tax benefits under this new authority. That is because the bill allows the Joint Tax Committee, which is controlled by the House and Senate tax-writing committees, to determine what provisions in the bill constitute a targeted tax benefit before it is sent to the President. Thus it is highly unlikely that many special-interest tax benefits, if any at all, will be subject to the line item veto authority.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, if the House moves forward with approval of this line item veto authority, I believe even the measure's most ardent supporter will in time come to regret it.

The other troubling piece of this package, at least in this Member's view, is the increase in the Social Security earnings limits for recipients aged 65 to 69. While this legislation is extremely popular, I believe it moves in the wrong direction in terms of what we need to accomplish to control spending, and perhaps it is more than a little ironic that it is coupled with the line item veto in this piece of legislation. This part of the legislation would increase Social Security benefits, already our Nation's most expensive entitlement program by far, by an estimated \$7 billion over the next 7 years alone. Most of that benefit increase also, most, would go to relatively well-off recipients while some of the spending cuts used to pay for those benefit increases would fall on those of more modest means.

In addition, the legislation would take a giant step toward turning Social Security retirement benefits into a reward for turning age 65 rather than insurance against the loss of income that comes with retirement, as the Social Security system was designed to provide. We ought to consider very carefully whether that kind of change is wise, particularly when we know we are facing a huge shortfall in the funds that will be needed to pay existing levels of benefits when the large baby-boom generation reaches retirement age in the early part of the next century.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, although many of us on this side of the aisle would have greatly preferred a rule providing for a straightforward debt limit extension, we believe that if this legislation is going to be encumbered with extraneous matters that are a priority to our Republican Members, then the rule also ought to permit us to at least consider one legislative priority from this side of the aisle as well. One of our highest priorities is increasing the minimum wage.

So, at the end of this debate, we shall move, Mr. Speaker, to defeat the previous question so that we may amend the rule to provide for consideration of an amendment that would raise the minimum wage in two steps to \$5.15 an hour.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend, first of all, this line-item veto does not apply to just the small portion of the budget dealing with discretionary spending. The conference final report expanded that to include all entitlement programs, including food stamps. It includes the entire budget.

Second, the gentleman complains that there are extraneous matters in this bill other than the debt ceiling; namely, Social Security, repeal of penalties and the line-item veto and regulatory relief. And yet, in their trying to defeat the previous question, they will add further extraneous material. That I do not understand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], one of the most respected and hardest-working Members of this body. He is a member of the Committee on Rules and also a tremendous help as a conferee on the line-item veto measure.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule for business at hand that allows the House to approve necessary legislation to preserve the full faith and credit of the United States—while keeping important promises to the American people. I confess, I am extremely uncomfortable voting for an extension of the debt ceiling. An offer of extended credit is a false favor to someone who is having trouble paying the bills. And the same holds true for the national budget—higher debt limits simply postpone and exacerbate the inevitable pain of paying the bill. We have a moral obligation to break the cycle of debt. Of course we know that decades of neglect cannot be reversed overnight. But that does not mean we should not spend every day moving in that direction. Although President Clinton torpedoed our effort to lock in this year a glidepath to balance in 7 years, the drive toward a balanced budget is continuing. Our new majority has already saved billions of dollars in this year's spending cycle alone. We've crafted positive reforms to preserve and strengthen our national safety net—while shrinking the size and reach of the Federal bureaucracy. We've made tough choices to secure our children's future—and we are not going to be sidetracked by President Clinton's overactive veto pen. We all know the pen is filled with red ink, just like his budget pen. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this debt ceiling increase—but only because we are finally on the right track toward a balanced budget and fiscal sanity. I hope next time we vote on the debt limit we will be voting to lower the ceiling, nor raise it. Thankfully, there is good news in this bill—items that represent promises kept to America. With this bill we will be implementing the line-item veto, a major deficit cutting tool that we are delegating to the President in the interest of saving the taxpayers money. After

more than a year of hard work, the conference has completed an agreement to grant the President real, effective and carefully defined line-item veto authority over spending and tax bills.

This historic delegation of power will be a significant new weapon in our arsenal as we fight for deficit reduction. It is not a matter of the President pitted against the Congress. It is a matter of the two branches of government working together to ensure wise management of the Nation's finances. For the first time, the bias will shift away from spending and toward saving. Americans understand that big spending and tax bills often get signed into law, carrying with them provisions of questionable national merit that might not stand on their own. The line-item veto allows the President to zero in on these items and bring them to the light of day. That is just the kind of accountability we so desperately need in the Federal budget process to bring our spending under control. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that this legislation includes the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act, legislation to increase, to restore some fairness to our Tax Code for seniors. I take my hat off to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] for the incredible work he has done on that, as well. The Social Security earnings limit is a dinosaur—and it discriminates mightily against those seniors who want to be productive. This is a long-overdue first step toward the ultimate goal of repealing the unfair restriction altogether. Support this rule and the bill.

I take my hat off to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], for the extraordinary work they did in prevailing in the conference on this version we are passing today.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this unfair rule. If we are going to attach unrelated items to this debt limit extension, then I believe the working people of America deserve to know why the Gingrich Republicans will not allow the House to vote on an amendment that would increase the minimum wage.

What is the majority so afraid of? Why are they in opposition to paying working parents enough, enough to support their families and enough to take care of their kids?

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the new majority knows that if it came to a vote, it would be next to impossible for Members of this House to deny the fact that the 10 million minimum wage earners in this country deserve a raise.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that April 1 will mark the 5-year anniversary of the last time this House approved an increase in the minimum wage, the truth is the minimum wage has significantly lost its value and it keeps families in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body to do something good for the working families of this country and to make work pay.

To my colleagues who care about working people in this country, I urge you to reject this rule and show the new majority that it is high time for an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because it denies a long-overdue opportunity to raise the minimum wage.

Yesterday the Committee on Rules rejected my request to offer an amendment to increase the minimum wage. They have left in the cold families who are working hard and playing by the rules and who are being left behind.

Think about it, the minimum wage today is \$4.25 an hour. That means the approximate annual salary for a full-time minimum wage worker is \$8,500, barely half the official poverty line for a family of four and below what people make on welfare. They would deny a 90-cent-an-hour increase. Imagine 90 cents. This, from people who make over \$130,000 a year.

Members of Congress earned more during the Government shutdown than a full-time minimum wage worker earns in a single year.

America needs a raise. Reject this rule. Help hard-working families by putting more money in their paychecks.

□ 1115

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to the last two speakers, to say that yes, there is some merit in raising the minimum wage. I believe that it should be raised. But, just to give an example, I met with farmers from all over New York State yesterday, and we discussed that and how it would reflect on them. They said:

JERRY, if you can just give us some regulatory relief, in other words, so we don't have to spend so much of our money meeting all of these regulations, we certainly wouldn't object to a raise in the minimum wage.

Let the regulatory relief bills go through that we pushed for the last 2 years, and I think you would find some support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], someone I have great respect for. The gentleman came to the body 18 years ago with me and is the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. He was the chairman of our conference for over a year on the line-item veto. If you want to

know why his hair is a little grayer, it is because of that, I assure you. He did yeoman work. We could not be here today without BILL CLINGER.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we often engage in this body in hyperbole, some would say hot air. But I have got to say today we really are entitled to say this is a historic time we are engaged in. This bill we are going to be considering today is indeed a historic bill.

For years a lot of us have talked the talk about the line-item veto. But, unfortunately, we have been unable to bring it to the floor to get a vote. Today we are going to be able to walk the walk. So I am very delighted as chairman of the conference on the line-item veto to bring our product to this floor as part of the increase in the debt limit. I think it is absolutely appropriate that it should be considered as part of this increase in the debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider a bill that will increase the Federal debt limit to \$5.5 trillion. That is \$22,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. We have got to find a better way to get control of this spending. What this bill will do is give the President a scalpel instead of a hacksaw to really deal with the enormous debt that we keep building up year after year after year and the deficits we run year after year. This is an enormous burden we have been imposing on the American people. This is the first serious effort to really provide an effective means to address this enormous problem.

I have to say we would not be here without the hard work of a lot of people. BOB DOLE, our nominee for President, was an inspiration and really was the driving force in getting us to resolve this conference and get an agreement with the White House on what could pass and be signed by the President. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been a tireless worker for this legislation for, as he said, 10 years and longer. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], all of whom served over this whole year on this conference, have just been invaluable in bringing us to this day. At times we did not think we would get an agreement because of determined opposition. Despite that tough opposition from people on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol, we have gotten an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I urge support for the line-item veto and for this bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those occasions when every Member of this body should be mindful of the undertaking that we make at the beginning of every Congress to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, because the line-item veto provision in this proposed bill runs absolutely in the face of that obligation.

The first words of the Constitution are, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." A few pages later, dealing with the President's responsibility with regard to legislation, the Constitution states as follows: "If he approves, he shall sign it,"—the bill—"but, if not, he shall return it with his objections."

Those are the basic parameters of the legislative responsibilities that we have under the Constitution and that the President has under the Constitution, and it is not in our power to change them. It is our responsibility in fact to respect and preserve them.

While the friends that we have across the ocean in Britain are having second thoughts these days about their monarchy, this line-item veto provision and its effect will be to start the gradual accretion of power in an American monarchy.

If we recall those grand words of the Declaration of Independence in which we protested the usurpation of power by King George, then mark my words, we will live to regard the usurpation of power that we invite by future Presidents of the United States if this provision becomes law.

Thank God that the courts will be there to do the right thing and find it, as it is, contrary to the Constitution.

The court has spoken to this point many times, but most recently and on point I think in the Chadha case, making it absolutely clear that the powers of neither branch with respect to the division and responsibility on legislation can be eroded.

What is even more bizarre in this particular proposal is the provision for the 5-day "cancellation" period. Now, think about that. This is a metaphysical leap of Herculean proportions.

The enactment provisions of the Constitution say that once the President signs a bill, it shall be law. We propose that he then gets a 5-day cancellation right after signing a bill? That is absolutely absurd. This defies any logical reading of the clear meaning of the Constitution with regard to these provisions.

But beyond the constitutional arguments, this proposal is fundamentally unwise, and it manifests a disrespect of our own responsibilities in this body under law and under the Constitution.

On the large issues, let us think back to what would have happened during the Reagan administration, with a President who, for his own reasons, sent budgets to this body zeroing out most categories of education funding in the Federal budget. Presumably, if that President had this power, it would

be exercised to eliminate most education funding by the U.S. Government, and 34 Senators representing 9 percent of the people of this country, in league with the President, could have brought about that outcome.

Even more pernicious, and the invitation to usurpation that lies in this language can also be understood by going back to those days in the late eighties when we were still debating whether we would continue aid to the Contras. Now, if I happened to have been fortunate enough to have gotten, let us say, a provision in an appropriations bill for a needed post office or a needed courthouse in my district, and it was down at the White House awaiting signature at the same time we were debating aid to the Contras, I would guarantee you I would have gotten a call from someone at the White House saying, "Congressman, I notice you had some success in dealing with this need in your district. We are pleased at that, but we need your support on aid to the Contras."

That is exactly the kind of absolutely evil excess of power that we are inviting future Presidents to use. Pick your issue. That is one that comes to my mind.

It is clear that the Governors of the several States who have this power use it in exactly this way, to get their version of spending adopted in contradiction to the legislative judgment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to just say to my good friend that I suspect he protests too much. From Thomas Jefferson to Richard Nixon, Presidents had the right of rescission. If they did not want to spend the money because it was not necessary, they did not have to do it. Unfortunately for America, this Congress took that President to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court made him spend the money. That is what happened, and that is why we are in the fiscal mess we are in today. We are attempting to turn around a little bit of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Southgate, KY, Mr. JIM BUNNING, someone I used to worship when I was growing up. He was a hero of mine because of his baseball prowess, throwing no-hitters and pitching shutouts. He is no less a hero today, especially for what he has done today on this line-item veto.

(Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the first bill I signed on when I came to Congress 9 years ago was the line-item veto, and, thank God, we are finally going to get it passed today. It has been a long time coming, but we have taken another major step in restoring fiscal responsibility to the budget process. Of course, I am talking about the line-item veto.

The line-item veto will allow the President to end, once and for all, that notion that Federal spending cannot be

controlled. As President Truman said, the buck will truly stop with the President. If he does not use that power that we give him, shame on him. I have been for this bill, by the way, when a Republican was in office, and now I am for it while a Democrat is in office.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to give the President the opportunity to restore the fiscal integrity of this Government and to end the era of pork-barrel spending. We all have spending needs in our States and districts, but we have a duty to the country not to bankrupt the Treasury. All spending is not the same. Alpine Ski slides in tropical locations and ice hockey warming huts are not of the same importance as people with adequate needs for post offices and courthouses.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is not perfect. We have worked hard to make something work that everyone can use, that is good for the American people. It was crafted in an effort to accommodate the concerns of the broadest cross-section of the Members of this House and the Senate.

I wish we had not gone down the road of applying the line-item veto to tax issues, but even on that issue we have tried to meet the concerns with the majority of this Congress. I hope and pray that everyone realizes that this line-item veto is in the best interest of the United States of America, and if in fact the courts look at this bill, as one of the prior speakers has talked about, that they will find how much the need is there for this and it will be ruled constitutional by the courts. We will let them decide. Let us just do our work and pass this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a long time in coming but we are about to take another major step toward restoring fiscal responsibility to the budget process. I am, of course, talking about finally giving the President the line-item veto.

The line-item veto will allow the President to end, once and for all, the notion that federal spending cannot be controlled. As President Truman said, the buck will truly stop with the President.

If he doesn't use the power that we give him, shame on him.

We are going to give him the opportunity to restore the fiscal integrity of this Government and end the era of the pork barrel.

We all have spending needs in our States and districts but we also have a duty to the country not to bankrupt the Treasury.

All spending is not the same. Alpine Ski slides in tropical locations and ice hockey warming huts are not of the same importance to the people as adequate post offices and courthouses.

The bill before us is not perfect but we have worked hard to make it something that will work for the American people.

It was crafted in an effort to accommodate the concerns of the broadest cross-section of the Members of the House and Senate.

I wish we had not gone down the road of applying the line-item veto to taxes. But, even on that issue we have tried to meet the concerns of the majority of our Members.

The line-item veto before us today will be criticized by some who think that it goes too

far. Others will say that we did not do enough. That satisfies me that we did the right thing.

To those who wanted us to include more on taxes, I would simply remind them that our financial problems have not been caused by too few revenues but by too much spending.

In 1981, the year before the Reagan tax cut took effect, revenues were \$599 billion and by 1993 revenues had grown to nearly \$1.15 trillion. Even though revenues nearly doubled spending grew at an even faster pace.

To paraphrase President Reagan, the American people are not taxed too little, their Government spends too much.

Nonetheless, we recognized that there is the potential for abuse in the tax laws and we have taken adequate steps to address that problem.

The limited tax provisions which appear from time to time in a large tax bill and which under the Democrats were often targeted to a specific taxpayer are now going to be subject to the line-item veto.

That means that Congress will now specifically point out to the President what these provisions of limited benefit are and he can use the line-item veto on them.

The nonpartisan Joint Tax Committee will identify these limited tax provisions for the tax writing committees based on the definition in this bill. And we will clearly point to them in what we send to the President for his signature.

I feel confident that the President will see the good policy behind some of these very narrow tax breaks such as the orphan drug tax credit which provides a tax incentive for research into drugs for rare diseases.

But he can use his veto pen to make sure that no unfair tax breaks are given to one or just a few taxpayers as has happened from time to time.

I would also remind those who think that we should have gone farther on allowing the President to item veto tax provisions to remember that tax breaks allow people to keep their own money.

Spending provisions take money from one person's pocket to be used for someone else's benefit.

If that distinction isn't clear to you, I imagine that your constituents can help you see the light. They know whose money we are spending.

This is a good bill and by passing it we can keep one of our most important promises from the Contract With America. I urge my colleagues to support line-item veto.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and urge the House to defeat the previous question. My opposition to the rule is very simple: This rule denies that House an opportunity to consider an amendment to increase the minimum wage that was offered before the Rules Committee by my colleague, Representative DELAURO.

Some on the other side of the aisle will argue that a minimum wage increase is not germane to a bill increasing the debt limit. I remind my colleagues that the Republican leadership has chosen to load this bill with extra-

neous matters, including regulatory reform for small business, which is of questionable germaneness. The Republican leadership has deliberately decided not to allow this body to consider wage relief for the working poor.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House to give workers a raise, a raise that is long overdue. April 1 will mark the fifth anniversary of the last time the minimum wage was increased. The real wages of American workers have been declining for over two decades and the disparity between rich and poor in this country continues to grow. In terms of distribution of wealth, the United States has become the most unequal industrialized nation in the world. Increasing the minimum wage is one modest step toward addressing this problem.

The Republican leadership of this House enjoys the distinction of destroying the spirit of bipartisanship on so many issues, including the minimum wage. In 1989, for example, the minimum wage increase passed this body by a vote of 382 to 37, with 135 Republicans voting for the bill, and 89 to 8 in the Senate, with the support of 36 Republicans. In fact, Speaker GINGRICH, Senator DOLE, and my committee chairman, BILL GOODLING voted for the last increase. Regrettably, Republicans now appear too embarrassed to even allow this body to vote on that issue.

We often talk about how important it is to get people off welfare. If we are serious about that, if we really want to get people off welfare as opposed to just talking about it, there is one simple way to do that—to make work pay.

Recent studies suggest that 300,000 workers would be lifted out of poverty if the minimum wage were raised to \$5.15 per hour. It is time to do something positive for the working poor.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Americans support raising the minimum wage. It is unconscionable for the Republican leadership of this House to block the will of the American public.

Defeat this rule, defeat the previous question, allow us to consider increasing the minimum wage.

□ 1130

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the debt limit part of this bill should have been passed last year. It is another indication of the inability of the leadership of this House to get issues of fiscal importance to the floor in a timely fashion. The debt has been confronting us since September of last year and has placed at risk the good credit of the United States of America,

which in fact placed, therefore, the fiscal stability of the international community at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this rule, and I will vote against it because it marries two issues, one which I very strongly support.

Finally, the Republican leadership has come to the extension of the debt until 1997, so that it will not be a political football but will be the recognition of fiscal responsibility.

It is late but welcomed. However, they have married to that bill a line item veto. It is a line item veto which the gentleman from Colorado, one of the previous speakers, has characterized as contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I agree with that premise. I am hopeful that the courts will find this provision unconstitutional, because I believe with Senator BYRD and I would hope with at least some of my colleagues that this is a radical shift of authority from the people of the United States and their representatives to the Executive of the United States.

Now, I support an enhanced rescission. That is a device which would allow the President of the United States to take out of a piece of legislation and say to the American public, this item should not be passed but the bill should be passed. But then the enhanced rescission would say, we have to bring it back to the House in the full light of the American public's scrutiny in a democracy and pass it. But what it would not do is to give to the President the ability to have one-third plus one of a House say that I and I alone will top this from going into effect.

Mr. Speaker, that will be a radical shift of power. It is not surprising that we pass radical proposals in this Congress, of course, but the fact of the matter is it is bad policy. In my opinion, we will live to regret it.

It is ironic, indeed, that those who have waited 9 years, according to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING, to see this legislation pass, propose today to have it delayed until January. If it is so important, why not now? Is it perhaps because President Clinton is a Democrat? I hope not.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds. I was proud to yield 15 to my good friend over there so he would have some time.

The President of the United States is a part of this agreement to make it January 1, 1997. That was what we call cooperation, bipartisanship.

Let me just say to my good friends, as I listened to the speakers up here, one after another get up and oppose this line-item veto, I look at the National Taxpayers Union and almost every one of them appear as the biggest spenders in the Congress. They used to be a majority, and they are the ones that drove this debt through the ceiling, \$5 trillion.

It irritates me to have to stand up here today and vote to raise the debt ceiling by \$500 billion when I voted for none of it, none of that debt.

Well, the reason I am going to vote for it is because we have a chance now to do something for the senior citizens, get rid of this heinous tax that is on Social Security now, on the earnings tax. We have a chance to do the line item veto, which is going to put a crimp in every one of these big spenders. There are not many left around here. Most of them got beat, but there are still a few and we are going to cut their spending off.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not referring to me personally, I take it.

Mr. SOLOMON. No; absolutely not. I have great respect for my friend, although I will check the list to see if he is on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], someone I have great respect for, from Shewsbury, MA. He has only been here now for about 3½ years. But let me tell my colleagues, he has been a leader on this line item veto. With him and some of the others, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and many others, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], who is not here on the floor yet, but because of them, we have this line-item veto here now. He is a great American.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his kind words. This is, as others have said, a very important day, a very exciting day because it means that this Government is going to make a break from the past and we are going to continue the process of turning the Federal ship of state away from deficits and debt and toward fiscal sanity and fiscal balance by giving the President of the United States the line-item veto authority. It is a major step forward in eliminating wasteful Federal spending.

In passing the conference report on S. 4, the Line-Item Veto Act, Congress is saying to the American people that we have listened to the call for fiscal responsibility. For more than a century, Presidents like Ronald Reagan have called for the line-item veto, but it took this Republican Congress to give it to a Democratic President in a true showing of bipartisanship.

Bipartisanship is exactly what has characterized this legislation from its inception. It passed the House on February 6, 1995, by the overwhelming vote of 294 to 134. All along, Members from both sides of the aisle have pushed this legislation toward this ultimate destination. In a process that took more than a year, the House and Senate conferees worked out the differences in two bills which could not have been more different. The product of that work is an extremely workable procedure that mirrors what the House has passed.

Congress has delegated to the President the very serious power to cancel

individual spending items that are normally buried in appropriations bills. However, we did not stop there. This conference report expands the line-item veto to include direct spending and limited tax benefits that cost the American taxpayers more in some cases than appropriations bills. Unlike other attempts at rescissions legislation, the emphasis in this conference report is on deficit reduction and not spending.

Mr. Speaker, the President will be able to cancel individual spending items, increases in direct spending and limited tax benefits. Congress must then pass a bill to disapprove of those cancellations and affirm it wants to spend the money. The President can veto the disapproval legislation and Congress must override by a two-thirds majority. Make no mistake about it, this is a powerful tool of fiscal accountability.

When the Congress cannot muster the two-thirds to override the President, the total of the cancellations must be deposited in a lockbox. This mechanism will guarantee that a cancellation or rescission in spending cannot be used in another account. Instead, any savings must be used toward deficit reduction.

This line-item veto, Mr. Speaker, has been field tested in 43 States with very impressive results. It is common sense. It works. It is what the American people want.

Let us continue the revolution of fiscal sanity begun by the 104th Congress and give the President this fiscal tool.

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, I would like to commend and thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], for allowing me the extraordinary opportunity to serve with them on this historic conference report.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The Contract With America Advancement Act: what a true abuse of the English language. If this is an advancement of the Contract With America, the one thing it demonstrates is that some of our Republican colleagues cannot tell backward from forward. Let us look at what is included in this great advancement of the Contract With America failed agenda.

Well, the first thing is an increase in the Social Security earnings limit. A laudable measure. So laudable that 411 Members of this body last year voted to approve it, and only four voted against it. Our seniors would have this Social Security earnings limit adjusted already if our Republican colleagues had advanced it at the beginning of this Congress instead of at this point.

What is the second item? Regulatory reform. Far different from the regulatory wreckage of the unilateral disarmament of our health and safety laws that they proposed last year. Again, if they had advanced this very modest regulatory reform, our small businesses across America would have had relief in 1995, not a promise in 1996. Finally and most important, it advances the contract through the line-item veto. What is the history of the line-item veto in this body?

Well, last February we took it up, and we considered it, and we approved it by a vote of 294 to 134. It is true that the version that is here before us today is improved, improved in part because at the time of that debate in February, my Republican colleagues rejected the sunset amendment that I proposed, and today they have incorporated that very amendment into this proposal.

The Speaker of the House came to the floor that night and he told us, and I quote: "You have a Republican majority giving to a Democratic President this year without any gimmicks an increased power over spending, which we think is important."

Unfortunately, he did not think it was important enough to appoint conferees for 6 months, or the President would have had this tool last year. What we have here is a Contract With America that is a flop, and this advancement act is a sop.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the vote we are about to have on this rule, on the previous question on the rule, will be a vote on whether or not we as Members of this body want to raise the minimum wage, whether we want to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, all over America people are working hard. They are working overtime. They are working second jobs. They are working third jobs to make ends meet. They deserve a break. They deserve to have a government that is on their side, that will not stand in their way. But once again, we are here and the majority will not, the majority will not even allow us a vote on an issue to put more money in the pockets of Americans. That is what we are talking about, putting more money in the pockets of working people and families in this country.

Now, the minimum wage has not been raised since 1989. Back then two people who supported the raise were NEWT GINGRICH and BOB DOLE. But they are standing in the way today of helping working families. Mr. Speaker, when are my friends on this side of the aisle going to learn they cannot talk about family values if they are not going to value the family and they cannot move from welfare to work if they do not make work pay.

The minimum wage is not enough. It is less than \$9,000 a year for a full-time worker. One cannot raise a family on

that amount of money. There are literally millions of single parents in this country who are trying to do just that. Think about it. Could we raise a child or two children on that? It is a disgrace that people who make that choice to choose work over welfare, who work hard every single day, they try to set a good example for their kids, for their neighborhood, cannot lift themselves above the poverty line.

□ 1145

Now these are not kids we are talking about. We are talking about 60 percent of the people on the minimum wage are working women with children who work hard and deserve a raise. They do not come to this floor, do not come to this floor, I tell my colleagues, to tell us that it will cost jobs, because every study that has been done over the last few years, from California to the studies that were done in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, have indicated that there would not be a loss of jobs. In fact, some of the studies say that there would be an increase in jobs in this country if we, in fact, raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, that is why over a hundred economists, three Nobel laureates, have said raise the minimum wage. When the minimum wage goes up, everybody benefits. People who make a little bit more than the minimum wage will get a raise, people above them will get a raise, and what we will have is people circulating more money in the economy. People will be buying more at the grocery store, they will be buying more at the hardware store. It will create a dynamic where people will have more money in their pockets, and they will be spending money, and they will help the economy in general.

Now over 12 million Americans would benefit right away from a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage, including about 42,000 people in my own State of Michigan alone.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 years since we raised the minimum wage. Its value, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it at its 40-year low, 40-year low. Seventy percent of the American people in a recent poll say they support an increase in the minimum wage.

Now is the chance for my colleagues to stand up and face this issue head-on because here it is. This vote on the previous question on the rule is whether or not my colleagues are going to support having this made in order so we could vote on this important question and put money in the pockets of Americans today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can have the opportunity to raise this issue, and I thank my colleague for having yielded me this time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], who has led the fight for as long as I can remember, ever since he succeeded his father as a Congressman, and he has been a real leader on this.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill which includes a very important provision—the line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], with whom I have worked so closely on this issue in the past, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this legislation, I think there is no one in this House who will deserve more credit for it than the gentleman from New York, JERRY SOLOMON. I congratulate him for his work on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day of every Congress since I was elected in 1988, I have introduced a line-item veto bill that is almost identical to the provision that we are considering now.

While past Congresses have been unwilling to pass a line-item veto with real teeth in it, and in fact we passed one that the Wall Street Journal in 1993 called a voodoo line-item veto bill, I am pleased that today we are on the verge of approving a line-item veto that will truly be effective in reducing pork barrel spending.

In fact, the other body overwhelmingly passed this provision yesterday by a vote of 69 to 31.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. Forty-three of our Nation's Governors, both Democratic and Republican, already have the line-item veto and are using it to cut spending in their States and balance their budgets.

It is time for Congress to give this same tool to the President, so that he can eliminate the most outrageous examples of wasteful and unnecessary spending without vetoing entire appropriation bills.

The General Accounting Office estimated in 1992 that more than \$70 billion of pork-barrel spending could have been cut between 1984 and 1989 if Presidents Reagan and Bush had had a line-item veto.

The Cato Institute estimates that \$5 to \$10 billion a year could be saved with a line-item veto.

In last year's State of the Union Address, President Clinton highlighted some of the most absurd examples of pork-barrel spending approved by the 103d Congress, and said "If you give me the line-item veto, I will remove some of that unnecessary spending."

Mr. Speaker, I wish we did not need such things as a balanced-budget amendment and a line-item veto to bring our Federal spending under control.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Speaker, Congress has proven time and again that it does not have the will to cut spending on its own.

That is why this legislation is so very necessary today. If the Congress does not really want to cut spending, it will have to say so, and say so publicly.

Mr. Speaker, with a national debt of over \$5 trillion, we simply cannot afford to withhold this important tool from the President any longer.

Former Senator Paul Tsongas, writing in the *Christian Science Monitor* a few months ago, said that if present trends continue, the young people of today will face average lifetime tax rates of an incredible 82 percent.

We must do something about this to give a good economic future to our children and grandchildren.

This will not solve our problems by itself, but it will be a big step in the right direction. I urge passage of this very important legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Harrisburg, PA [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, when I first ran for the Congress many years ago, I ran on a platform that included 10 separate items, much like the Contract With America. One of them, much like the Contract With America, was to advance the cause of line-item veto. My own Commonwealth, Pennsylvania, had enjoyed since its constitutional existence long time ago that privilege on the part of the Governor, the chief executive. I wanted, as part of my campaign for election to the Congress, to try to transfer that responsibility to the Chief Executive of the United States.

We are at the threshold now of accomplishing one of my points of my own personal Contract With America. Second, another point, regulatory flexibility with judicial review is also at hand with this vote.

I urge support of the previous question.

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

Let me simply advise Members that if the previous question is defeated, we will offer an amendment to the rule which would make in order the floor amendment to incrementally increase the minimum wage from its current \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15 an hour beginning on the Fourth of July 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], our distinguished minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can add an amendment to this bill that will increase the minimum wage. I simply want to say that wages, decent wages, are a family value. People who earn the minimum wage today earn a little over \$8,000 a year. The minimum wage has not been

increased in 5 years. It is a 40-year low. One-third of the people on the minimum wage are the sole wage earner in their family. It will not cost jobs, as some have asserted.

I met a woman in my district the other day, a single mother with 2 minimum wage jobs. She told me she was worried that her kids would not be a victim of a crime; she was worried they would perpetrate crimes. People cannot spend time with their family if they do not earn a decent wage.

I urge Members to vote against this previous question, and I say to my friends on the other side, "You've not heard the last of the minimum wage. I suspect we won't prevail on this vote. But we are going to bring it back and back and back and back until we finally prevail for America's families and workers."

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend, the minority leader, who I have great respect for, I just cannot help but feel that there are some political games being played here. As my colleagues know, written into this rule was a little provision that said during the time after the Committee on Rules finished meeting last night, and while Mr. Panetta or the President were meeting with our Republican leadership, they could have negotiated to add anything into this bill, anything. That was not even mentioned once, this business of the increasing the minimum wage. Where this has come from I do not know, but I just suspect it is political games.

So let us just do away with that, and let me just in closing give my colleagues a little bit of history because it is kind of interesting, especially when we consider the word BYRD from West Virginia, something to do with the other body. As my colleagues know, in 1876; that was 120 years ago, Representative Charles Falken of West Virginia—remember him, George; was the gentleman here then?—came to the floor of this House and introduced a bill granting the President the authority to veto individual items in spending measures. Can my colleagues imagine that 120 years ago, a Representative from West Virginia? Boy, how times change over 120 years.

When I first came to this Congress 17 years ago, one of the first bills I introduced was the line-item veto. We have been waiting 17 years. In 1980, when Ronald Reagan entered the White House and asked Congress to grant him line-item veto authority, that was 16 years ago. In 1994 the Republican candidates all across this great country campaigned on a promise in the Contract With America that, if elected, they would pass a bill giving the President line-item veto, no matter who that President was, Republican, Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today at the finish line of a race that has lasted 120 years, and I get so excited I can jump up and down. Today I stand with my Republican colleagues and a good number of Democrats. Wait and see, most of the Democrats on that side of the aisle will vote to deliver a promise to the American people.

As a conferee on the line-item veto, I must submit that this historic moment is due in no small part to the efforts of our conference chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], sitting right next to me, and that of the Senate majority leader, BOB DOLE. If BOB DOLE had not put his weight behind this, we never would have got it by many of those Senators who do not want to give up that power. They want to spend, spend, spend, but they did, thanks to BOB DOLE.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD further explanatory information regarding the expedited procedures of congressional consideration of a Presidential message.

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

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that the provisions relating to the receipt and consideration of a cancellation message and a disapproval bill are clearly understood, I believe it is necessary to provide some further explanation.

Upon the cancellation of a dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, an item of direct spending or a limited tax benefit, the President must transmit to Congress a special message outlining the cancellation as required. When Congress receives this special message it shall be referred to the Committee on the Budget and the appropriate committee or committees of jurisdiction in each House. For example, the message pertaining to the cancellation of a dollar amount of discretionary budget authority from an appropriation law would be referred to the Committee on Appropriations of each House; a message pertaining to the cancellation of an item of direct spending would be referred to the authorizing committee or committees of each House from which the original authorization law derived. Any special message relating to more than one committee's jurisdiction, i.e., a cancellation message from a large omnibus law such as a reconciliation law, shall be referred to each committee of each House with the appropriate jurisdiction.

Every special message is referred to the Committees on the Budget of both the House and the Senate. This is due to the requirement in the bill that the President include in each special message certain calculations made by the Office of Management and Budget. These OMB calculations pertain to the adjustments made to the discretionary spending limits under section 601 and the pay-as-go balances under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as a result of the cancellation to which the special message refers.

Upon receipt in the House, each special message shall be printed as a document of the House of Representatives.

In order to assist Congress in assuring a vote of disapproval on the President's cancellation message, a series of expedited procedures are established for the consideration of a disapproval bill. A disapproval bill qualifies for these expedited procedures if it meets certain time requirements within an overall time period established for congressional consideration. The time clock for congressional consideration starts the first calendar day of session after the date on which the special message is received in the House and Senate. Congress has 30 calendar days of session in which to approve or disapprove under these expedited procedures of the President's action. A calendar day of session is defined as only those days in which both Houses of Congress are in session.

During this 30-day time period, a disapproval bill may qualify for these expedited procedures in both Houses. However, upon the expiration of this 30 day period a disapproval bill may no longer qualify for these expedited procedures in the House of Representatives. A disapproval bill may qualify at any time for the expedited procedures in the Senate.

If Congress adjourns sine die prior to the expiration of the 30-calendar day of session time period and a disapproval bill relating to a special message was at that time pending before either House of Congress or any committee thereof or was pending before the President, a disapproval bill with respect to the same message may be reintroduced within the first 5 calendar days of session of the next Congress. This reintroduced disapproval bill qualifies for the expedited procedures and the 30-day period for congressional consideration begins over.

In order for a disapproval bill to qualify for the expedited procedures outlined in this section it must meet two requirements. First, a disapproval bill must meet the definition of a disapproval bill. Second, the disapproval bill must be introduced in later than the 5th calendar day of session following the receipt of the President's special message. Any disapproval bill introduced after the 5th calendar day of session is subject to the regular rules of the House of Representatives regarding consideration of a bill.

It should be noted that the expedited procedures provide strict time limitations at all stages of floor consideration of a disapproval bill. The conferees intend to provide both Houses of Congress with the means to expeditiously reach a resolution and to foreclose any and all delaying tactics—including, but clearly not limited to: extraneous amendments, repeated quorum calls, motions to recommit, or motions to instruct conferees. The conferees believe these expedited procedures provide ample time for Congress to consider the President's cancellations and work its will upon them.

Any disapproval bill introduced in the House of Representatives must disapprove all of the cancellations in the special message to which the disapproval bill relates. Each such disapproval bill must include in the first blank space a list of the reference numbers for all of the cancellations made by the President in that special message.

Any disapproval bill introduced in the Senate may disapprove all or part of the cancella-

tions in the special message to which the disapproval bill relates.

Any disapproval bill shall be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of jurisdiction. Any committee or committees of the House of Representatives to which such a disapproval bill has been referred shall report it without amendment, and with or without recommendation, not later than the seventh calendar day of session after the date of its introduction.

If any committee fails to report the disapproval bill within that period, it shall be in order for any Member of the House to move that the House discharge that committee from further consideration of the bill. However, such a motion is not in order after the committee has reported a disapproval bill with respect to the same special message. This motion shall only be made by a Member favoring the bill and only 1 day after the calendar day in which the Member offering the motion has announced to the House his intention to make such a motion and the form of which that motion takes. Furthermore, this motion to discharge shall only be made at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule of the day after the calendar day in which the Member gives the House proper notice.

This motion to discharge shall be highly privileged. Debate on the motion shall be limited to not more than 1 hour and shall be equally divided between a proponent and an opponent. After completion of debate, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to or not agreed to shall not be in order. It shall not be in order to consider more than one such motion to discharge pertaining to a particular special message.

After a disapproval bill has been reported or a committee has been discharged from further consideration, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the disapproval bill. If the bill has been reported, the report on the bill must be available for at least one calendar day prior to consideration of the bill. All points of order, except that lying against the bill and its consideration for failure to comply with the one day layover, against the bill and against its consideration shall be waived. The motion that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole shall be highly privileged. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

During consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole, the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate on the disapproval bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided between and controlled by a proponent and an opponent of the bill. After completion of the 1 hour of general debate, the bill shall be considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Only one motion that the committee rise shall be in order unless that motion is offered by the manager of the bill.

No amendment shall be in order except any Member if supported by 49 other Members, a quorum being present, may offer an amendment striking the reference number or reference numbers of a cancellation or cancellations from the disapproval bill. This process al-

lows Members the opportunity to narrow the focus of the disapproval bill striking references to cancellations they wish to overturn. A vote in favor of the disapproval bill is a vote to spend the money the President sought to cancel. A vote against the disapproval bill is a vote to agree with the President to cancel the spending.

No amendment shall be subject to further amendment, except pro forma amendments for the purposes of debate only. Consideration of the bill for amendment shall not exceed one hour excluding time for recorded votes and quorum calls. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without any intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

All appeals of decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the House of Representatives to this procedure for consideration of the disapproval bill shall be decided without debate.

It shall be in order to consider only one disapproval bill pertaining to each special message under these expedited messages except for consideration of a similar Senate bill. However, if the House has already rejected a disapproval bill with respect to the same special message as that to which the Senate bill refers, it shall not be in order to consider that bill.

In the event of disagreement between the two Houses over the content of a disapproval bill passed by both Houses, conferees should be promptly appointed and a conference on the disapproval bill promptly convened.

Upon conclusion of such a committee of conference it shall be in order to consider the report of such a conference provided such report has been available to the House for 1 calendar day excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays, unless the House is in session on such a day, and the accompanying statement has been filed in the House.

Debate in the House of Representatives on the conference report and any amendments in disagreement on any disapproval bill shall be limited to not more than 1 hour equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent. A motion to further limit debate shall not be debatable. A motion to recommit the conference report shall not be in order and it shall not be in order to reconsider the vote by which the conference report is agreed to or disagreed to.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in closing I just would like to point out that President Ronald Reagan closed his autobiography entitled *Ronald Reagan In American Life* with these following paragraphs, which I cited in my 1 minute earlier today. He said:

"And yet, as I reflected on what we had accomplished, I had a sense of incompleteness, that there was still work to be done. We need a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget," said Ronald Reagan, "and the President needs a line-item veto to cut out unnecessary spending."

Come over here and give Ronald Reagan another birthday present. Let us pass this line-item veto. Give it to

the President who has guaranteed, "I will sign it."

Come over here and vote for it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

We have just been informed that this closed rule self-executes into this debt limit bill a completely unrelated Senate-passed bill that will promote fraud by rogue operators posing as small businesses. This bill has not been reviewed by the House committees of jurisdiction, and the SEC strongly opposes it as drafted.

While I strongly support initiatives to aid small business development, this legislation includes provisions that gives preferential treatment to small businesses that engage in securities fraud. One section would require the SEC to adopt a program to reduce, or in some circumstances to waive, civil penalties for violations of statutes or rules by small entities. This would have the obvious effect of encouraging rogues and knaves to conduct unlawful activities through small-business shells in order to get off with a slap on the wrist or a free fraud. Mr. Speaker, this is outrageously bad public policy.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a copy of a letter from the Chairman of the SEC outlining the problems with the small business bill.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, March 27, 1996.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Committee on Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am writing to express the views of the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") regarding S. 942, the "Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996." S. 942 recently passed the Senate and we understand that it may soon be considered by the House. Although the Commission is very supportive of fostering small business endeavors, it has serious concerns that the bill could have a negative impact on the Commission's enforcement program. The Commission's principal concerns are as follows:

The Commission is concerned about the provisions in S. 942 that suggest that preferential treatment should be afforded to small businesses that engage in violative conduct. Fraud is by no means confined to large entities: some of the most egregious securities frauds in recent years (e.g., involving penny stocks, prime bank notes, and wireless cable) have been perpetrated by shell companies and other entities that could qualify as "small entities" under S. 942. In fact, nearly three-quarters of the firms in the securities industry could be considered "small entities." As a general matter, the Commission believes that rules involving market integrity should apply and be enforced equally as to all firms, large as well as small.

Another troubling provision in S. 942 would shift attorneys fees and other expenses to the Commission, even in cases where the Commission prevails in court, but where it fails to obtain the *full* relief it has sought. In order to protect investor funds from fraud and abuse, the SEC often must act with swift, decisive enforcement action against fraud or other misconduct. The requirements of S. 942 could serve to hamper the Commission's enforcement efforts as it seeks penalties or other appropriate relief from wrongdoers.

The Commission's enforcement program is well-recognized for its fairness. As a general practice, potential defendants are given the opportunity through "Wells" submissions to directly address the merits of proposed SEC enforcement actions before they are instituted by the Commission. In addition, pursuant to The Securities Enforcement Remedies and Penny Stock Reform Act of 1990, Congress already requires the Commission to weigh various factors before seeking or imposing civil penalties. These include mitigating factors—such as the ability of the respondent to pay a penalty as well as its ability to continue in business. The Commission is concerned, however, that the imposition of S. 942's additional requirements could "tilt" the enforcement balance in favor of small firms, regardless of the damage that may be done to public investors.

The Commission has a record on small business issues that is second to none. In recent years, the Commission has created a new, simpler registration and disclosure regime for small businesses that seek to raise capital in the securities markets. It also has sought to expand the category of small businesses that are exempt from the registration and full disclosure requirements of the Exchange Act. Most recently, the Commission's internal Task Force on Disclosure Simplification released a report recommending the elimination of numerous SEC regulations and forms, and proposing a variety of additional steps to ease the capital formation process for small businesses.

The Commission recognizes that still more can be done to reduce the regulatory burdens of small business, and we are committed to continuing our efforts in this area. However, while it is possible to streamline disclosure requirements for small business issuers without impairing market fairness, there is much less room to dilute or alter the regulatory and enforcement framework that applies to market professionals who handle investors' retirement funds and savings. In applying and enforcing rules relating to market integrity, the Commission believes that investor protection must come first.

The attached staff analysis discusses the issues raised by S. 942 in greater detail. We believe that the Commission's concerns can be easily met through appropriate exemptive provisions for the SEC. We ask your assistance in raising these issues on behalf of the Commission when S. 942 is considered by the House.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR LEVITT,
Chairman.

Attachment.

STAFF ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS OF S. 942 ON
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") has traditionally supported efforts to facilitate the capital formation process for small business. However, SEC staff is concerned that S. 942's proposals for small business regulatory reform sweep too broadly—that the bill could potentially impair regulatory and enforcement efforts that are crucial to the integrity of the securities markets, while imposing significant new costs upon the Commission.¹ This analysis focuses on parts of the bill that the Commission staff believes are the most troublesome.

SMALL BUSINESS ENFORCEMENT VARIANCE

Section 202 of S. 942 would require each agency to adopt a policy or program "to provide for the reduction, and under appropriate circumstances for the waiver, of civil penalties" for violations of statutes or rules by

small entities. This section appears to be premised on the assumption that violations by medium-sized or large businesses should be penalized, but that violations by small businesses should be tolerated. This approach does not seem appropriate for the regulation of the securities markets, which depend on the exercise of professional judgment and self-vigilance by *all* market participants, regardless of size.²

As a threshold matter, it is important to recognize that serious fraud is not confined to large entities: some of the most egregious frauds in recent years (involving penny stocks, prime bank notes, and wireless cable) have involved firms that could qualify as "small entities" under S. 942. In addition, this enforcement philosophy would also be applied to non-scienter based securities violations that are equally critical to the integrity of the securities market, for example, broker-dealer capital requirements. Notably, in crafting rules such as the capital requirements, the Commission already considers the size and the nature of a broker-dealer's business; if a firm violates the requirements applicable to them, there is no reason to consider these matters in the enforcement context.

This provision already exempts matter relating to environmental health and safety; on additional exemption relating to securities violations would appear equally tenable.

In any event, the language of the general requirement of Section 202 suggests that the reduction of civil penalties for violations by small businesses in mandatory; at a minimum, this language should be changed to clarify that the agency has discretion to consider "appropriate circumstances" in determining whether to reduce civil penalties.

AMENDMENTS TO EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

S. 942 would increase the ability of all qualifying litigants (and not just small businesses) to recover fees from agencies under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"). Currently, EAJA permits litigants to recover attorney's fees and other expenses from an agency if the agency's position was not "substantially justified." S. 942 would expand the opportunities for such recovery by permitting the award of fees and expenses if the judgment or decision of the court or adjudicative officer is "disproportionately less favorable" to the SEC than the relief the SEC requested. In practical terms, this means that the SEC could "lose, even if it wins" in a lawsuit or other enforcement proceeding.

The changes to EAJA made by S. 942 would significantly increase the exposure of the Commission to fee awards, in at least two ways:

First, the SEC might have to pay EAJA fees even in cases that it wins, in the event that it does not obtain the full relief it initially sought. For example, in enforcement actions, the Commission frequently seeks to obtain an injunction against securities law violations. While the court could find that a violation has occurred, it might not award an injunction for other reasons—for example, if the defendant is too old, working in a different type of business, or has expressed remorse for the violation. In such situations, the court's final judgment may be "disproportionately less favorable" to the Commission than the relief requested for reasons wholly unrelated to the merits of the Commission's case.

Second, the SEC would be vulnerable to fee awards in cases where it loses central issues of fact or law, regardless of the reasonableness of the Commission's position. The Commission faces some litigation risk every time it brings an enforcement action. Enforcement cases for insider trading fraud, for example, generally require the Commission to

¹Footnotes at end of article.

piece together documentary evidence such as telephone records and securities trading patterns. If a jury or judge disagrees with the Commission's interpretation of the facts and exonerates a defendant, the Commission could be liable for EAJA fees, even if the Commission had reasonably interpreted the available evidence and sought relief that it believed was substantially justified by such evidence.

Similarly, adverse resolution of legal issues could subject the Commission to EAJA fee awards. Even the most settled interpretations of the securities laws are subject to dissenting approaches of judicial or adjudicatory decisionmakers. In a recent case, for example, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit refused to follow several other circuit courts that had long recognized a claim for fraudulent insider trading based on the misappropriation of material nonpublic information. *United States v. Bryan*, 58 F.3d 933 (4th Cir. 1995). In such situations of novel or unanticipated legal decisions, the adverse resolution of a central issue can remove any grounds for relief and subject the Commission to fee awards.³

Finally, the Commission often must act with swift, decisive enforcement action against fraud, particularly in cases where money may be moved quickly outside of the jurisdiction of a U.S. Court. The requirements of S. 942 would hamper the Commission's enforcement efforts by requiring it to evaluate the risks to its own funds before seeing penalties or other appropriate relief from wrongdoers.

Because the Commission could be liable for EAJA awards even when it prevails in a lawsuit, or when its position is reasonable,⁴ the Commission opposes the EAJA provisions of S. 942.⁵

AMENDMENTS TO REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT

S. 942 would amend the Regulatory Flexibility Act ("Reg. Flex. Act") to permit court challenge of the Commission's final regulatory flexibility analyses. Enacted in 1980, the Reg. Flex. Act currently requires the Commission to prepare regulatory flexibility analyses evaluating the economic impact of proposed SEC rules and rule changes on small businesses. The SEC takes seriously the Reg. Flex. Act requirements, and faithfully prepares the requisite analyses for every rulemaking action it takes. Nevertheless, the Act requires the Commission to predict future events—that is, the effects that new and untested rules will have on small businesses operating in ever-changing markets. Such predictions are intrinsically imprecise; the Commission cannot predict market forces and behavior in advance.

The Reg. Flex. Act amendments in S. 942 would enable small businesses to challenge in court the SEC's compliance with the Reg. Flex. Act. A small business might try to argue, for example, that the SEC did not adequately foresee the impact that a rule change would have on small businesses. As a result of such a challenge, a court could order the SEC to defer enforcement of the rule against small entities until the court completed its review of the challenge, unless the court were to find "good cause" for continuing the enforcement of the rule.

The amendments contained in S. 942 would thus make it possible for a party who opposes any Commission rule proposal to use the Reg. Flex. analysis (regardless of the care and effort taken in its preparation) as a pretext for litigation. Conceivably, even rules that reduce burdens or provide exemptions for businesses—large or small—could be subject to attack under the Reg. Flex. Act amendments on the grounds that the Commission did not foresee their potential impact on small businesses, even where the im-

pact was shaped in large part by market shifts or economic forces. In any event, the Commission believes that, as a general matter, rules regulating market participants and relating to market integrity issues should apply equally to all firms, large as well as small.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF COMMISSION RULEMAKING

Title V of S. 942 permits Congress to override an agency's adoption of any rules. This legislative veto authority does not extend, however, to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee. Because the Commission's rules directly concern the integrity and efficiency of the securities markets, and are often closely tied to the stability of such markets, we believe that it is appropriate to accord the same exemption for SEC rules as is accorded to the Federal Reserve and the FOMC.⁶

FOOTNOTES

¹ Senator Bond has made notable efforts to narrow the scope of S. 942. However, the bill passed by the Senate continues to pose significant issues with respect to the Commission's enforcement and regulatory programs. This analysis outlines those concerns for the Commerce Committee.

² In fact, of the approximately 7600 broker-dealers registered with the Commission, over 5300 are small entities.

³ Although the proposed EAJA amendments provide an exception from fee awards if the "party or small entity has committed a willful violation of law or otherwise acted in bad faith, or special circumstances made an award of attorney's fees unjust," a court or administrative law judge probably could not make a finding of "willful violation" or bad faith action by the defendant if it determined that, even in a close case, its interpretation of the law or the facts did not permit the relief requested by the Commission.

⁴ Under existing law, EAJA fees have not been imposed on the SEC when the court has found that there was a reasonable basis for the Commission's action. *See, e.g., SEC v. Switzer*, 590 F. Supp. 756 (W.D. Okla. 1984) (refusing to award EAJA fees, despite finding no securities law violation, because of reasonable basis for Commission's enforcement action).

⁵ Even though the Commission by law forwards the civil penalties it obtains in enforcement actions to the U.S. Treasury, the Commission must pay EAJA fees directly out of its annual appropriation. Amendments to EAJA under S. 942 would further increase the burden on the Commission by increasing the fee rate for attorney's fees from \$75 per hour to \$125 per hour.

⁶ Similar concerns arise regarding H.R. 994, a separate regulatory reform bill that is currently under consideration in the House. That bill would require the Commission to engage in a lengthy, costly and onerous review of all of its rules (even those involving market integrity), despite the substantial efforts the Commission has made in the past to tailor its rules to the changing conditions of the securities industry. A similar exception in H.R. 994 for the rules of the federal banking agencies should be extended to include the Commission.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that

he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 232, nays 180, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]
YEAS—232

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard | Ganske | Myrick |
| Archer | Gekas | Neumann |
| Armey | Geren | Ney |
| Bachus | Gilchrest | Norwood |
| Baker (CA) | Gillmor | Nussle |
| Baker (LA) | Gilman | Oxley |
| Ballenger | Goodlatte | Packard |
| Barr | Goodling | Parker |
| Barrett (NE) | Goss | Paxon |
| Bartlett | Graham | Petri |
| Barton | Greenwood | Pombo |
| Bass | Gunderson | Porter |
| Bateman | Gutknecht | Portman |
| Bilbray | Hall (TX) | Pryce |
| Bilirakis | Hancock | Quillen |
| Bliley | Hansen | Quinn |
| Boehler | Hastert | Radanovich |
| Boehner | Hastings (WA) | Ramstad |
| Bonilla | Hayes | Regula |
| Bono | Hayworth | Riggs |
| Brownback | Hefley | Roberts |
| Bryant (TN) | Heineman | Rogers |
| Bunn | Herger | Rohrabacher |
| Bunning | Hilleary | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Burr | Hobson | Roth |
| Burton | Hoekstra | Roukema |
| Buyer | Hoke | Royce |
| Callahan | Horn | Salmon |
| Calvert | Hostettler | Sanford |
| Camp | Houghton | Saxton |
| Campbell | Hunter | Scarborough |
| Canady | Hutchinson | Schaefer |
| Castle | Hyde | Schiff |
| Chabot | Inglis | Seastrand |
| Chambliss | Istook | Sensenbrenner |
| Chenoweth | Johnson (CT) | Shadegg |
| Christensen | Johnson, Sam | Shaw |
| Chryslers | Jones | Shays |
| Clinger | Kasich | Shuster |
| Coble | Kelly | Skeen |
| Coburn | Kim | Smith (MI) |
| Collins (GA) | King | Smith (NJ) |
| Combest | Kingston | Smith (TX) |
| Cooley | Klug | Solomon |
| Cox | Knollenberg | Souder |
| Crane | Kolbe | Spence |
| Crapo | LaHood | Stearns |
| Creameans | Largent | Stenholm |
| Cubin | Latham | Stockman |
| Cunningham | LaTourette | Stump |
| Davis | Laughlin | Talent |
| Deal | Leach | Tate |
| DeLay | Lewis (CA) | Tauzin |
| Diaz-Balart | Lewis (KY) | Taylor (NC) |
| Dickey | Lightfoot | Thomas |
| Doolittle | Linder | Thornberry |
| Dornan | Livingston | Tiahrt |
| Dreier | LoBiondo | Torkildsen |
| Duncan | Longley | Torricelli |
| Dunn | Lucas | Upton |
| Ehlers | Manzullo | Vucanovich |
| Ehrlich | Martini | Waldholtz |
| Emerson | McCollum | Walker |
| English | McCrery | Walsh |
| Ensign | McDade | Wamp |
| Everett | McHugh | Watts (OK) |
| Ewing | McInnis | Weldon (FL) |
| Fawell | McIntosh | Weller |
| Fields (TX) | McKeon | White |
| Flanagan | Metcalfe | Whitfield |
| Foley | Meyers | Wicker |
| Fox | Mica | Wolf |
| Franks (CT) | Miller (FL) | Young (AK) |
| Franks (NJ) | Molinari | Young (FL) |
| Frelinghuysen | Montgomery | Zeliff |
| Frisa | Moorhead | Zimmer |
| Funderburk | Morella | |
| Galleghy | Myers | |

NAYS—180

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|----------|
| Abercrombie | Barrett (WI) | Bevill |
| Ackerman | Becerra | Bishop |
| Andrews | Beilenson | Bonior |
| Baesler | Bentsen | Boucher |
| Baldacci | Bereuter | Brewster |
| Barcia | Berman | Browder |

Brown (CA) Hoyer
 Brown (FL) Jackson (IL)
 Brown (OH) Jackson-Lee
 Cardin (TX)
 Clay Jacobs
 Clayton Johnson (SD)
 Clement Johnson, E. B.
 Clyburn Johnston
 Coleman Kanjorski
 Collins (MI) Kennedy (MA)
 Condit Kennelly
 Conyers Kildee
 Costello Kleczka
 Coyne Klink
 Cramer LaFalce
 Danner Lantos
 de la Garza Levin
 DeFazio Lewis (GA)
 DeLauro Lincoln
 Dellums Lipinski
 Deutsch Lofgren
 Dicks Lowey
 Dingell Luther
 Dixon Maloney
 Doggett Manton
 Dooley Markey
 Doyle Martinez
 Durbin Mascara
 Edwards Matsui
 Engel McCarthy
 Eshoo McDermott
 Evans McHale
 Farr McKinney
 Fattah McNulty
 Fazio Meehan
 Flake Meek
 Foglietta Menendez
 Ford Miller (CA)
 Frank (MA) Minge
 Frost Mink
 Furse Moakley
 Gejdenson Mollohan
 Gephardt Moran
 Gibbons Murtha
 Gonzalez Nadler
 Gordon Neal
 Green Oberstar
 Hall (OH) Obey
 Hamilton Olver
 Harman Ortiz
 Hastings (FL) Orton
 Hefner Owens
 Hilliard Pallone
 Hinchey Pastor
 Holden Payne (NJ)

NOT VOTING—19

Blute Forbes
 Borski Fowler
 Bryant (TX) Gutierrez
 Chapman Jefferson
 Collins (IL) Kaptur
 Fields (LA) Kennedy (RI)
 Filner Lazio

□ 1214

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Fowler for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Lazio of New York for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. DEUTSCH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHAYS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 177, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

AYES—232

Allard Frelinghuysen
 Archer Frisa
 Arney Funderburk
 Bachus Gallegly
 Baker (CA) Ganske
 Baker (LA) Gekas
 Ballenger Gilchrist
 Barr Gillmor
 Barrett (NE) Gilman
 Barrett (WI) Goodlatte
 Bartlett Goodling
 Barton Goss
 Bass Graham
 Bateman Greenwood
 Bilbray Gunderson
 Bilirakis Gutknecht
 Bilely Hall (TX)
 Boehlert Hancock
 Boehner Hansen
 Bonilla Hastert
 Bono Hastings (WA)
 Brewster Hayworth
 Brownback Hefley
 Bryant (TN) Heineman
 Bunn Herger
 Bunning Hillery
 Burr Hobson
 Burton Hoekstra
 Buyer Hoke
 Callahan Holden
 Calvert Horn
 Camp Hostettler
 Campbell Houghton
 Canady Hunter
 Cardin Hutchinson
 Castle Hyde
 Chabot Inglis
 Chambliss Istook
 Chenoweth Johnson (CT)
 Christensen Johnson, Sam
 Chrysler Jones
 Clement Kasich
 Clinger Kelly
 Coble Kim
 Collins (GA) King
 Coombest Kingston
 Cooley Kleczka
 Cox Klug
 Crane Knollenberg
 Crapo Kolbe
 Cremeans LaHood
 Cubin Largent
 Cunningham Latham
 Davis LaTourrette
 Deal Laughlin
 DeLay Leach
 Deutsch Lewis (CA)
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (KY)
 Doolittle Lightfoot
 Dornan Linder
 Dreier Livingston
 Duncan LoBiondo
 Dunn Lucas
 Ehlers Manzullo
 Ehrlich Martini
 Emerson McCollum
 English McCrery
 Ensign McDade
 Everett McHugh
 Ewing McInnis
 Fawell McIntosh
 Fields (TX) McKeon
 Flanagan Metcalf
 Foley Meyers
 Forbes Mica
 Fox Miller (FL)
 Franks (CT) Molinari
 Franks (NJ) Montgomery

NOES—177

Abercrombie Bishop
 Ackerman Bonior
 Andrews Boucher
 Baesler Browder
 Baldacci Brown (CA)
 Barcia Brown (FL)
 Becerra Brown (OH)
 Beilenson Clay
 Bentsen Clayton
 Bereuter Clyburn
 Berman Coburn
 Bevil Coleman

Dingell Levin
 Dixon Lewis (GA)
 Doggett Lincoln
 Dooley Lipinski
 Doyle Lofgren
 Durbin Lowey
 Edwards Luther
 Engel Maloney
 Eshoo Manton
 Evans Markey
 Farr Martinez
 Fattah Mascara
 Fazio Matsui
 Flake McCahty
 Foglietta McDermott
 Ford McHale
 Frank (MA) McKinney
 Frost McNulty
 Furse Meehan
 Gephardt Meek
 Geren Menendez
 Gibbons Miller (CA)
 Gonzalez Minge
 Gordon Mink
 Green Moakley
 Hall (OH) Mollohan
 Hamilton Moran
 Harman Murtha
 Hastings (FL) Nadler
 Hefner Neal
 Hilliard Oberstar
 Hinchey Obey
 Hoyer Olver
 Jackson (IL) Ortiz
 Jackson-Lee Orton
 (TX) Owens
 Jacobs Pallone
 Jefferson Pastor
 Johnson (SD) Payne (NJ)
 Johnson, E. B. Payne (VA)
 Johnston Pelosi
 Kanjorski Peterson (FL)
 Kennedy (MA) Peterson (MN)
 Kennelly Pickett
 Kildee Pomeroy
 Klink Poshard
 LaFalce Rahall
 Lantos Rangel

NOT VOTING—22

Blute Fowler
 Borski Gejdenson
 Bryant (TX) Gutierrez
 Chapman Hayes
 Collins (IL) Kaptur
 Dickey Kennedy (RI)
 Fields (LA) Lazio
 Filner Longley

□ 1224

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Fowler for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Lazio of New York for, with Mr. Stokes against.

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

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 98, I was attending a White House bill-signing ceremony on the Senior Citizens Housing Safety Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

(For text of conference report deemed adopted pursuant to Resolution 391, see proceedings of the House of March 21, 1996, at page H2640.)