

Republicans' assault on the working families should not be confused with a gas tax cut. They are separate issues.

We should keep the minimum wage debate clean and we should vote to increase the minimum wage. If a tax cut is necessary, then we should do that also, but they are separate issues.

AMERICANS DESERVE AN INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, hard working Americans deserve a raise. They deserve an increase in the minimum wage. Many of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle do not want to provide that increase in the minimum wage because they say that, in fact, people who earn the minimum wage earn much more than that because they get food stamps, they get AFDC payments, they get medical benefits.

The question I have to ask is, Why should the taxpayers have to subsidize these people's jobs? Why should the marketplace not provide a livable wage so that these people can support their families, can support their children without the taxpayers subsidizing this through the welfare system?

When we increase the minimum wage we save a substantial amount of money for those individuals because we no longer have to subsidize their jobs as much as we did before we increased the minimum wage. We ought to make sure that, in fact, we are not asking the taxpayers to subsidize jobs where employers simply choose not to pay the minimum wage.

It is not that they cannot afford to, they just know that they do not have to pay it because the welfare system will subsidize that job. That ought not to be allowed. That ought not to be done anymore. We ought to in fact require those people to pay people for the hard work that they engage in.

RAISING MINIMUM WAGE WILL COST JOBS

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say in response to the gentleman who just spoke, Republicans are in favor of helping the working poor, but we are in favor of doing it in a way that will truly lift their take-home pay, to lift their wages. Raising the minimum wage will not have that effect.

The fact is economists, 90 percent of them, agree that raising the minimum wage will, in fact, cost jobs; it will cost the jobs of those that we most want to help, the low-skilled worker. The last time we raised the minimum wage, in 1991, only 17 percent of the new benefits

went to people living under the poverty level. That is not the effective way of helping those who are the working poor.

Raising the minimum wage will not only cost jobs, it will be inflationary, costing those whom we want to help more in their goods and services that they need to purchase. It is the wrong way to help those who are the working poor. There is a better way of doing it. We can do it.

I suspect the gentleman who just spoke supported the increased funding for EITC 2 years ago, and there is a better way of doing it, as we take that proposal that has had the support of Republicans and Democrats and focusing it upon those who are truly in need, the working poor, the families with children. We want to help them, but we want to help them in a way that will not hurt the economy and take jobs away from the most needy.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. 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 House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on House Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceeding.

The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 51,

answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—358

Ackerman	Doyle	Klink
Allard	Dreier	Klug
Andrews	Duncan	Knollenberg
Archer	Dunn	Kolbe
Armey	Edwards	LaHood
Bachus	Ehlers	Lantos
Baesler	Ehrlich	Largent
Baker (CA)	Emerson	LaTourette
Baker (LA)	English	Laughlin
Baldacci	Eshoo	Lazio
Ballenger	Evans	Leach
Barcia	Ewing	Lewis (CA)
Barr	Farr	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (NE)	Fattah	Lightfoot
Barrett (WI)	Fawell	Lincoln
Bartlett	Fazio	Linder
Barton	Fields (LA)	Lipinski
Bass	Flake	LoBiondo
Bateman	Foglietta	Lofgren
Becerra	Foley	Lowe
Bentsen	Forbes	Lucas
Bereuter	Ford	Luther
Bilbray	Fowler	Maloney
Bilirakis	Fox	Manton
Bishop	Frank (MA)	Manzullo
Bliley	Franks (CT)	Markey
Blute	Franks (NJ)	Martinez
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	Mascara
Boehner	Frisa	Matsui
Bonilla	Furse	McCarthy
Bonior	Galleghy	McCollum
Bono	Ganske	McCrery
Boucher	Gejdenson	McDade
Brewster	Gekas	McHale
Browder	Geren	McHugh
Brown (OH)	Gilchrest	McInnis
Brownback	Gilman	McIntosh
Bryant (TN)	Gonzalez	McKeon
Bunn	Goodlatte	McKinney
Bunning	Goodling	McNulty
Burr	Gordon	Meehan
Burton	Goss	Metcalf
Buyer	Graham	Meyers
Callahan	Green (TX)	Mica
Calvert	Greene (UT)	Millender-McDonald
Camp	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Gunderson	Minge
Canady	Gutknecht	Mink
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Mollohan
Castle	Hall (TX)	Montgomery
Chabot	Hamilton	Moorhead
Chambliss	Hancock	Moran
Christensen	Hansen	Morella
Chrysler	Hastert	Murtha
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Myers
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Clinger	Hayworth	Nadler
Clyburn	Hefner	Neal
Coble	Herger	Nethercutt
Coburn	Hinchey	Neumann
Coleman	Hobson	Ney
Collins (GA)	Hoekstra	Norwood
Collins (MI)	Hoke	Nussle
Combest	Holden	Obey
Condit	Horn	Olver
Conyers	Hostettler	Ortiz
Cooley	Houghton	Orton
Costello	Hoyer	Owens
Cox	Hunter	Oxley
Coyne	Hutchinson	Packard
Cramer	Hyde	Parker
Crane	Inglis	Paxon
Crapo	Istook	Payne (NJ)
Cremeans	Jackson (IL)	Payne (VA)
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Cummings	(TX)	Peterson (FL)
Cunningham	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Petri
Davis	Johnson, E.B.	Pomeroy
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Porter
DeLauro	Johnston	Portman
DeLay	Jones	Poshard
Dellums	Kanjorski	Pryce
Deutsch	Kasich	Quillen
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Quinn
Dickey	Kennedy (MA)	Radanovich
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Dingell	Kennelly	Ramstad
Dixon	Kildee	Rangel
Doggett	Kim	Reed
Dooley	King	Regula
Doolittle	Kingston	Richardson
Dornan	Klecza	

Riggs	Sisisky	Thurman
Roberts	Skaggs	Tiaht
Roemer	Skeen	Torres
Rogers	Skelton	Torricelli
Rohrabacher	Slaughter	Towns
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (MI)	Trafficant
Rose	Smith (TX)	Upton
Roth	Smith (WA)	Vucanovich
Roukema	Solomon	Walker
Roybal-Allard	Souder	Wamp
Royce	Spence	Ward
Salmon	Spratt	Waters
Sanford	Stearns	Watt (NC)
Sawyer	Stenholm	Watts (OK)
Saxton	Stokes	Waxman
Scarborough	Studds	Weldon (FL)
Schaefer	Stump	Weldon (PA)
Schiff	Stupak	White
Schumer	Tanner	Whitfield
Scott	Tate	Wicker
Seastrand	Tauzin	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Woolsey
Serrano	Tejeda	Wynn
Shadegg	Thomas	Yates
Shaw	Thompson	Young (AK)
Shays	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Shuster	Thornton	Zeliff

NAYS—51

Abercrombie	Hefley	Pickett
Borski	Heineman	Pombo
Brown (CA)	Hilleary	Rush
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Sabo
Chenoweth	Jacobs	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Latham	Stark
Durbin	Levin	Stockman
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Talent
Ensign	Longley	Taylor (MS)
Everett	Martini	Torkildsen
Filner	McDermott	Velazquez
Flanagan	Meek	Vento
Funderburk	Menendez	Visclosky
Gephardt	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Gillmor	Oberstar	Weller
Gutierrez	Pallone	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—23

Beilenson	Frost	Pastor
Berman	Gibbons	Rivers
Bevill	Hayes	Sanders
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Walsh
Chapman	Kaptur	Wilson
Clay	Livingston	Wise
de la Garza	Moakley	Wolf
Fields (TX)	Molinari	

□ 1201

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 418 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 418

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union of consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for appointment of United States marshals by the Director of the United States Marshals Service. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule, It

shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 2641, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1338 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2641 as passed by the House. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendments to S. 1338 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution, and that I may be permitted to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD following debate on the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 418 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2641, the U.S. Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996, under a completely open rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The rule also makes in order the Judiciary Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as original text for the purpose of amendment, and provides that each section will be considered as read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may give priority in recogni-

tion to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration, and such amendments will also be considered as read. As is customary, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Finally, after House passage of the bill, the rule provides for the necessary steps to consider the Senate bill, S. 1338, to insert the House-passed provisions, and to request a conference with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that this is a wide open rule. Any Member can be heard on any germane amendment to the bill at the appropriate time. Although there is no preprinting requirement contained in this rule, preprinting of amendments in the RECORD is an option that is encouraged, and I hope more Members will consider that option in the future. We on the Rules committee continue to believe that making amendments available for our colleagues to read in advance of floor action serves a very useful purpose and contributes to improving the overall quality of debate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2641, which this open rule makes in order, is a simple, straightforward bill that seeks to take the politics out of appointments to the U.S. Marshals Service by changing the selection of marshals from that of appointment by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to selection by the Attorney General based on relevant criteria such as an individual's law enforcement and administrative expertise.

As a former judge and prosecutor, I worked very closely for many years with highly qualified and well-trained law enforcement officials, at the local, State, and Federal levels. Naturally, I was very surprised to learn that under current law, there is no criteria for the selection of U.S. marshals.

As was noted in the Judiciary Committee report on H.R. 2461, in some instances, appointed marshals lack the law enforcement experience and qualifications necessary to carry out the often multifaceted law enforcement missions currently performed by the U.S. Marshal Service. Today, those missions involve such demanding and sensitive tasks and fugitive apprehension, prisoner transportation, witness protection, the disposal of seized assets, and providing judicial security.

To address these concerns, H.R. 2641 provides that after the year 2000, new marshals will be selected on a competitive basis among career managers within the Marshals Service, rather than simply being nominated by a home State Senator.

In the meantime, marshals selected between the date of enactment of this bill and the year 2000 would continue to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, but would only be permitted to serve 4-year terms.

As one of my Rules Committee colleagues said yesterday, this legislation