

[Roll No. 165]

AYES—393

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Arney
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (CA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier

Duncan
Dunn
Durbine
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hincheey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingليس
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly

Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCreery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo

Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
King
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott

Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry

Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—15

Abercrombie
Baesler
Clyburn
Collins (MI)
Conyers

Dellums
Fattah
Furse
Hilliard
Kennedy (RI)

Meek
Mink
Thompson
Waters
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—25

Baker (LA)
Berman
Bevill
Clay
Collins (IL)
Dickey
Dicks
Gallegly
Gejdenson

Hayes
Herger
Holden
Jefferson
Laughlin
McDade
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Molinari

Paxon
Portman
Roberts
Schroeder
Tanner
Weldon (PA)
Williams

□ 1216

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Herger for, with Mr. Dicks against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1972

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3230, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3230) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) 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 National Security now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Except as specified in section 4 of this resolution, each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Unless otherwise specified in the report of the Committee on Rules, each amendment printed in the report shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment).

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

(e) Consideration of the first two amendments in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of cooperative threat reduction with the states of the former Soviet Union and shall not exceed forty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security or their designees, shall not

be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to the stricken. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. (a) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution.

(b) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes.

(c) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment made in order by this resolution out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on National Security or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 5. 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, as modified. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], 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 revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 430 is the traditional structured rule that we grant for defense authorization bills.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration. It provides for 2 hours of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority mem-

ber of the National Security Committee. The committee's amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill will be considered as base text for the purpose of amendment, and all points of order are waived against it.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the report of the Rules Committee to accompany this resolution, and waives all points of order against those amendments.

The amendments made in order are not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the National Security Committee.

They may also be amended if contained in part B of the report and are offered as part of en bloc amendments offered by the chairman. Such en bloc amendments are debatable for 20 minutes each equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member. The en bloc amendments are not subject to further amendment. Any modifications in the amendments printed in the report must be reported by the reading clerk.

Mr. Speaker, of the 117 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee, 41 are made in order by this rule—21 by Republicans and 20 by Democrats. The amendments are divided into two parts in the committee report. The six part A amendments go to some major issue areas.

The first topic in part A are two amendments relating to the cooperative threat reduction with the former Soviet Union, better known as Nunn-Lugar. Those two amendments by myself and Chairman GILMAN of the International Relations Committee will be debatable for 10 minutes each following 40 minutes of general debate on Nunn-Lugar.

The other amendments in part A include a DeLauro amendment on abortion, debatable for 40 minutes; a Torkildsen amendment on HIV in the military, debatable for 40 minutes; a Saxton amendment on the army reserve, debatable for 30 minutes; and a Shays-Frank amendment on burden sharing, debatable for 30 minutes.

Following those part A amendments, there are some 35 amendments made in order, debatable for 10 minutes each, unless of course they are included in en bloc amendments offered by Chairman SPENCE, in which case debatable for 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go into the details of those additional amendments. I commend to my colleagues the Rules Committee report on this rule which includes a brief summary of each amendment in addition to their complete text.

Let me simply say in concluding my remarks on this procedure that the Rules Committee, as usual, had a difficult challenge in sorting through over 100 amendments in just 1 day's time.

We appreciate the cooperation of Chairman SPENCE and his staff, Mr. DELLUMS and his staff, and of course, our own ranking minority member, Mr. MOAKLEY and his staff along with Mr. FROST who in managing the rule for the minority today. While we were obviously not able to please everyone by our final decision in making in order roughly 40 percent of the amendments submitted.

As I already indicated, even though there were more Republican amendments submitted than Democrat amendments, of the 41 amendments this rule makes in order, nearly half are by Democrats. So I think we have achieved our goal of being as fair as we could be to all concerned.

I therefore urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rule so that we can get on with the important debate on this vital piece of national security legislation.

On the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I must say that congratulations are in order to Chairman SPENCE, his staff and the rest of the National Security Committee for having the foresight and the courage to report out this excellent bill.

For the fourth year in a row, the Clinton administration has sent to Congress a defense budget request that is simply inadequate to this country's needs.

Particularly insulting was this year's weapon's procurement request of only \$39 billion, which is \$21 billion short of where the Joint Chiefs of Staff tell us that we need to be in just a few years.

I commend the committee for adding \$7.5 billion to this account, which has suffered a 70-percent real decline since 1985, leading to today's severe modernization problems.

This increase, along with a quadrupling of the President's ammunition request, will help fulfill one of the most sacred obligations the U.S. Government has:

Ensuring that American soldiers and sailors have a plentiful supply of the best weapons and equipment available so that they can adequately defend themselves in battle.

Anything less than that is unforgivable.

Our military personnel are also well taken care of in this bill by a 3-percent pay increase and a 4.6-percent increase in the basic housing allowance.

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

[As of May 9, 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	68	60
Modified Closed ³	49	47	28	25

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

[As of May 9, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Closed ⁴	9	9	17	15
Total	104	100	113	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint 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 May 9, 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).
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)	MO			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	O	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	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.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251-157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229-186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PQ: 219-203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422-0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218-208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	OmniBUS Civilian Science Auth	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S	H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	

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. SOLOMON. That is so important, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to continue to depend on an all-voluntary military that will attract good qualified young men and women from all across America, from all walks of life.

This bill makes positive strides in other categories as well. The Committee on National Security added \$1.5 billion to the President's request for research and development, including \$860 million for missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this President to commit himself to defending the American people against ballistic missiles. That is so important. The time for talk is over. There are no more excuses for not protecting ourselves. We know that there are literally dozens of terrorist state governments out there, not to mention countries like Iran and Iraq and Libya and North Korea and a number of others who at any given time, because of the advances that they have made in their military preparedness, could launch missiles right off the coast from submarines.

This additional funding, Mr. Speaker, along with the Defend America Act that we will consider next week, will help make missile defense a reality in this country.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, the long slide in defense spending must come to an end. The end of the cold war did not mean that America no longer has any interest in defending itself around the world. A robust military posture is critical to safeguarding those interests.

Mr. Speaker, nor did the end of the cold war mean that the American forces do not need the best equipment and weaponry that they can possibly get. They do. And the end of the cold war certainly did not mean that America is less vulnerable to missile attack, as I have just alluded to. It is, and even more so than during the cold war.

Once again, the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and

the Committee on National Security deserves high praise for their work, and I would urge support for this rule. Then when we take up the bill on Tuesday and Wednesday, I would urge strong support for maintaining the provisions that are in that bill. It is a good bill. I commend the committee for bringing it to this floor.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding the customary 30 minutes of debate time to me.

I personally support House Resolution 430, the rule to H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997. However, there is opposition to the rule because it does not allow for any amendments that would provide for a reduction in defense spending.

Specifically, the Foley-Shays amendment would reduce the overall authorization level of the bill to \$264.7 billion, which is the same level for fiscal year 1996 and a decrease of \$2.3 billion from this year's authorized level. Congresswoman SCHROEDER also offered an amendment that would cut the overall level of defense spending by \$13 billion. Both amendments were not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3230 reflects the country's continued effort to revitalize America's defenses in order to meet the security requirements of the post-cold-war world. The world has undergone tremendous changes over the last few years. The Soviet Union is no longer the dominant military threat it once was. However, we are still seeing other trouble spots breaking out throughout the world. It is therefore critical that we maintain a strong defense.

I commend the committee's fine job in bringing this bill to the floor and its commitment to maintain the technological advantage enjoyed today by U.S. military forces and to ensure that

edge in the future. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill does just that.

The bill authorizes a total of \$267 billion for DOD programs for fiscal year 1997—\$13 billion above the President's request. And \$7.5 billion of this increase is slated for weapons procurement.

In particular, this bill authorizes funding for 10 C-17's for fiscal year 1997, an airplane that is critical to our Nation's future airlift capabilities. The bill also increases the administration's request and authorizes \$732 million for procurement of six V-22 Osprey—the tiltrotor aircraft that will provide medium lift capabilities for our forces. In addition, the bill authorizes funding for six F-16 aircraft in fiscal year 1997 and \$2 billion on continued development of the F-22 stealth fighter. I also commend the committee for recommending an increase of \$290 million to the administration's request of \$528 million, to accelerate the conventional conversion of the B-2.

Other programs which strengthen our national defense and ensure our ability and readiness to respond forcefully to threats to our security are also authorized in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, 109 amendments were filed on this bill. Forty-one were made in order. While we would have wanted more to be made in order, this is a good rule, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL, Mr. PORTER GOSS, one of the most valuable Members of this body, who serves on the Committee on Rules with me and is a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and probably has more understanding of this issue than most Members I know.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, NY, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, providing for the national defense is one of the few Federal duties outlined by our Constitution—it is our fundamental responsibility to make sure that the Armed Forces have the resources and training to protect this country from every military threat. And despite the end of the cold war, we all understand there are still many threats out there. It is a dangerous world. Just now the spreading influence of Iran—an avowed enemy of the United States—in Europe and other parts of the world is ringing alarm bells. Other obvious dangers include: nuclear proliferation, heightened regional tensions and uncertainty about the direction of powers like Russia and China. Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of many Americans about our President's on-again-off-again commitment to key national security issues. President Clinton seems content to lend his tacit approval to Iran's expansion into Europe, while at the same time recommending drastic reductions in defense resources. Even the liberal media is commenting on this state of affairs. While I note that in some ways this bill might be too comprehensive—in terms of the social issues that would, I think, be better debated elsewhere—I commend the National Security Committee for bringing forward a responsible bill in a bipartisan manner. During the Rules Committee hearing on this legislation, the spirit of cooperation and consensus that went into crafting this bill was very evident.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have worked in the same spirit to put together the rule before us. After sifting through well over 100 amendments, we have a fair rule that makes in order a total of 42 Republican, Democrat, and bipartisan amendments on a wide range of issues. And once again we have done so in a single rule, where past Congresses have required multiple rules for this bill. I would urge strong support for this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, while oftentimes many of us take the well to discuss the substantive nature of the bill before us in the context of the debate on the rule, this is the rule. And for people who do not understand, the rule is the process by which we determine how we deliberate, discuss, and debate a significant piece of legislation.

Make no mistake about it, this is indeed a significant piece of legislation. It is the next fiscal year's defense authorization bill to the tune of \$267 billion, not million, billion. That is an extraordinary amount of money, Mr. Speaker, \$267 billion.

This rule determines how we shall debate, what we shall debate. It estab-

lishes the framework for the deliberation on this floor. And I am constrained to challenge the process for the following reason: The gentleman is correct, there are 6 quasi-substantive amendments, 35 remaining amendments, and I would like to say to my colleague had over 90 percent of these 35 amendments been introduced in committee, we would have accepted them. They are not very substantive. They are noncontroversial. For the most part they seek reports. They are language amendments. They do very little. They do not really go to the question of policy. Nor do they, Mr. Speaker, go to the issue of dollars.

At a time when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been paralyzed the Government of the United States in order to put forward the notion of a balanced budget, in the context of a post-cold-war environment, this budget seeks to increase the President's military request by \$13 billion.

Now, I am a mature guy. I have walked up and down this Hill now for almost 26 years, and I respect political difference. I understand partisanship. I understand ideological differences. I understand policy differences. I even understand fiscal differences. That is no problem. That is why the American people elect Democrats and Republicans, liberals, conservatives, and moderates.

But what I have great difficulty understanding and accepting is a process that renders us impotent, and I underscore "impotent," Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of emphasis, in getting at the top line of \$267 billion.

I respect the fact there are Members in this body who seriously believe we ought to spend \$267 billion. No problem. Let us have debate. But there are those of us who do not believe in the context of a post-cold-war environment, in the framework of a balanced budget, limited dollar environment, when we are punishing poor people, creating significant problems as we reduce expenditures across the line, \$13 additional billion in the military budget, when there is no longer a Soviet Union, when there is no longer a Warsaw Pact, it seems to me is right for us to debate. We ought to be able to accept each other's differences and let the body decide.

For the rule precludes that, and there is something wrong. As I looked at the proposed amendment, there was even a Republican amendment that would have reduced this military budget to last year's level. That would have been, Mr. Speaker, a \$3 billion cut. If there were those that wanted to reduce it, whack to the President's request, it would have been roughly a \$13 billion cut. So we should have had the opportunity, somewhere between \$3 billion and \$13 billion, to have a significant debate about whether or not we ought to spend this kind of money in this atmosphere.

I would have to live with the results of that debate and how my colleagues

would decide to approach the issue. But to have no opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to do so flies in the face of what we ought to be about. It is, as I said before the Committee on Rules, our *raison d'être*. It is our responsibility, it is our reason for being, to debate these issues.

We have been for the last nearly year and a half talking about balanced budgets until we know each other's speeches by heart, but we ought to have the opportunity.

Now, granted that we have equally divided the amendments between Democrats and Republicans. I have no problem with that. The fact that we have got 6 major amendments and 35 fairly noncontroversial amendments, some problem. But I will even put that aside. But to have no amendments on the top line, what it says, Mr. Speaker, is that Members of Congress will have no opportunity to challenge the top line, no other priorities. We in this rule will defend this turf. You have disenfranchised 435 Members of Congress, who should have the opportunity on any issue, to debate the substantive matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, your response might be, well, maybe you ought to debate the military budget top line in the context of the total budget. But each Member of Congress was cautioned that when we debate later this week the budget, if you wanted to submit a proposal, it had to be in the nature of a substitute. Mr. Speaker, you understand what that means. That means each Member has to file a total budget, not just their concerns about a particular budget.

What I am suggesting to you is not one single Member of Congress will have the opportunity to get at the top line of \$267 billion, whether they are Republican or Democrat, and there is something wrong about that.

I do not mind staying here all night to debate. We have stayed here all night to debate some matters that could have been debated in 1 hour, but we stayed, we drank coffee and we stayed all night. But when we come to \$267 billion, we want to drive this train at 100 miles an hour.

That is why we are being paid, to discuss and debate. I think I have demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, over the years I am willing to live with the result, but give us our chance. There has not been a chance to do that. For those reasons, I am constrained to oppose this rule, and I ask my colleagues to aggressively oppose this rule. It flies in the face of decency, democratic principles, and does not allow us to carry out our fiduciary responsibilities to the American voter and the taxpayer.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond briefly.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my very good friend, and I have such great respect for him, I commended him the other day when he was chairman of the committee, we all really looked up to him with great respect, because he handled

himself so well in the committee. But let me just say in this rule, we have made in order all of the important issues that were out there. Many were missing from years past. They were not offered by the Democrats or Republicans. We are dealing with Nunn-Lugar, which is in my opinion a very, very bad program, where we have given the Russian Government money to dismantle some of their missiles and they have diverted it to God knows where. We need to get to the bottom of that. We make those amendments in order.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one brief question, I will not quarrel with that. I am simply saying the top line. There were several amendments, Republican and Democrat. Can you explain why we do not have the opportunity? How that could happen?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am about to do that. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. We also deal with the very controversial issue of abortion. We deal with the HIV issue. These are all major issues where we are giving major portions of the time for debate.

□ 1245

We get involved with the Army reserve, with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] sitting here. That is a very controversial issue. We get involved with burden sharing. That is a very controversial issue that I have worked with the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] on for years.

But getting back to the top line figure itself, there is nothing worse than the way we have handled this in the past where Members are allowed to stand up here and offer an amendment to freeze defense spending. What does that mean? Where are we then going to prioritize? Or we are going to cut defense spending by 10 percent across the board? What does that do to the priorities? Cut it by 5 percent, 2 percent. We have had Members that want to offer amendments to cut it by 1 percent. That is not the way to go about it.

There is something strange here because in years past, as the gentleman knows, we have had numerous amendments to come in and cut particular weapons programs. The gentleman has always offered amendments to cut the B-2 program. Those amendments are nonexistent of the 117 that were presented to us.

Now, what I am saying is that we have a budget resolution coming up in which the Committee on the Budget has agreed to a figure of \$267.3 billion. The budget that is here now recalls for \$600 million less than that.

In addition, the area to fight, where we are going to have the top line, is either in the budget resolutions that are

going to come before this House the day after this bill is completed, or in the defense appropriation bill, where we actually appropriate the money for all of these programs. That is why we do not see amendments being allowed today to cut across the board or to freeze defense spending.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California briefly because I am using up all our time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Quickly, if I hear the gentleman correctly, then, he is suggesting that no amendments in perpetuity will be allowed to cut any other budget other than the military budget; housing, welfare, education, all these other programs. We will not allow amendments to reduce those budgets either? Because if that is the case, I can show the gentleman chapter and verse where those kinds of amendments were allowed.

This is big money, 267. So are we setting a new precedent or establishing a new policy? Because if we are, this is a major point of departure.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that, no; we are setting no precedent. The gentleman knows that we have this bill on the floor next week. We have a missile defense system bill on the floor, and then we have the budget bill followed shortly by the appropriation bills.

We want to be able to deal with this all in that broad concept in order to be able to maintain a decent military for the future of our country.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if I heard my distinguished colleague correctly, I would make two observations. First, this is a precedent being set on the military budget that has not been set on any other budget, and that is that we cannot make cuts; that we cannot offer amendments to make cuts, and the rules will not do it. We know that is not the case. We have made cuts in other programs. I will just let that sit there for whatever that is worth.

The second point that I would make is that, if the issue is get this bill up on Tuesday and get it out by Wednesday night, this is a triumph of process over substance, and we ought to be about substance. We have time to deliberate here, and I am not trying to demagog the issue. I am willing to stay here all night like anyone else; but, when we are talking about \$267 billion, slow the train down and let us have a deliberative and substantive discussion. Do not let process triumph over substance.

If we are going to establish this precedent on the military budget, then establish this precedent on programs that deal with our youth, with our

poor, with our aged, with our unemployed and other programs.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a member of the committee.

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

I want to respond just briefly to my friend from California. I believe in having substantive debates, and we have had a ton of substantive debates over the last many years. One thing that I have noticed is generally not substantive, is when somebody comes to the floor not with a programmatic cut, not saying the missile defense is wrong or I want to cut the tank program or the helicopter program, but just saying I think we can take \$3 billion out of the defense budget because it looks right and it feels good. And we end up with Members rushing to the floor saying is this a good one? And we have literally thousands of programs, and we have a \$3 or \$4 billion cut across the board.

I agree with the gentleman that the Members should be allowed to answer the tough questions. But I would say that generally the across-the-board cuts are the least substantive debates that we have in this House when they are not specific programs that those cuts are offered in the context of.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to my colleague by saying any committee could make that argument when they came to the floor. Look, our product is a wonderful product. Do not make cuts in the program. Why should we be protected like any other committee? Two sixty-seven is a lot of money.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. The debate thus far has been interesting.

I would just like to reflect on what the House has been doing the last couple of days. We considered legislation regarding housing for tens of millions of Americans across the country and the assistance they might receive from the Federal Government. We spent over an hour and a half debating the issue of pets. Pets in public housing. But during the consideration of this bill there will not be 1 minute, there will not be 1 second spent on the issue of whether or not the United States of America should continue to acquire B-2 bombers, a weapon that is worth more than its weight in gold. Every single ounce of that plane is worth more than an ounce of gold.

Not 1 minute will be spent on whether or not we should acquire additional B-2 bombers, a weapon system that even the Pentagon does not want. But that could not happen here on the floor.

Now, the chairman will say, well, no one wanted to offer it. It was not offered because we all knew it was a done deal. The books were cooked and these kind of amendments were not going to be allowed. Why not have an open rule? The famous open rule, where we would consider any and all amendments offered by people legitimately elected.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I do not have time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. I will give the gentleman a minute if he will yield.

Mr. DEFAZIO. All right, Mr. Speaker, I will yield if the gentleman does not use more than a minute.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman.

Under 40 years of Democrat rule there was never one open rule in the defense bill and the gentleman knows that. But more than that, if the gentleman himself or Mr. DELLUMS had filed a B-2 amendment, I would have made it in order. Guaranteed. No amendment is there.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will open up the rule again, I will bring one by.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is welcome to use the rest of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate that there will not be an amendment on star wars. Here is a fantasy program created by Ronald Reagan that has spent over \$40 billion. The total results are one phoned-up test over the Pacific Ocean, which the Pentagon admits it phoned up. It did not actually work. They blew it up with a detonator. And now we are going to go ahead with billions of dollars more.

In fact, we are going to mandate deployment on an antimissile system. Which one? None of them work. Well, we do not know, but within 7 years we will deploy one for up to \$40 billion or \$50 billion. Probably it will not work and it is not needed.

We have missile defense in this country. It worked against the greatest threat to this country's freedom and security, the Soviet Union, for 50 years. Mutually assured destruction. No Podunk third World terrorist nation is going to launch a missile at the United States of America that is identifiable because they know they would no longer exist.

We do not need that kind of missile defense. We need defense against terrorist weapons. But we will not have the discussion about star wars here on the floor. That amendment will not be allowed.

We are not going to have a discussion about the fact that the Department of Defense cannot account for \$15 billion over the last 10 years. Now, if any other agency of government were missing \$500,000, we would have special committees and investigations.

Mr. Speaker, members should vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], a very valuable member of the Armed Services Committee, renamed the Committee on National Security.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the chairman for reporting what I think is a very fair rule. I cannot remember, Mr. Chairman, when there were 41 amendments made in order, almost half of which were of the minority party. I think that is quite commendable and I think it is quite fair, maybe more fair than the gentleman should have been.

I would also like to remind the Members that have previously spoken from the other side that it was just 25 years ago when our defense budget amounted to about 33 or 34 percent of everything we spent through the Federal Government. Then back in the middle 1980's we got to around 30 percent, after having dipped down quite low. And today we are spending about half as much in terms of the percentage of our total expenditure on defense as we were even in 1986.

So this is not a robust spending bill. This is a very lean spending bill. And I might say that some Members of the opposition party, particularly the leadership of the opposition party down at the White House, need to get realistic about where we are going with our defense policy and try to match our defense spending with that policy.

We have been everywhere from Somalia and Haiti and Bosnia and the straits of Taiwan, and we are worried about Korea. We have been to the Middle East. And all of these on military excursions of one kind or another all cost money, and moneys which are intended to keep our servicemen and women in a safe condition. That is essentially what we are looking to do with this rule, followed by the bill.

Early on our leadership said they would bring this bill to the House in a timely fashion, and the gentleman from New York has helped certainly to do that, and I commend him for it. We on the Armed Services Committee looked at this bill and we decided that there were some deficiencies because of the administration policy of using our defense forces in a robust way in many parts of the world, and so we added back some money that the President did not request.

For example, the Service Secretaries testified that they needed more money for weapons modernization. It is in this bill. And \$7.5 billion was added to end the modernization holiday which is gutting our forces and providing us with little option but to send our men and women around the world with a lack of modern weapons, which they really need.

The Secretary of Defense asked for a quality of life program, and as the chairman knows, it is in this bill: A 3-percent pay increase, a 4.6-percent hike in base allowance for quarters, and a provision to aid single service members to live off post.

Many Defense officials cited the need for more family housing, and it is in this bill. This is something that is extremely necessary for quality of life. And so we are very pleased to bring forth this rule as well as the provisions of the bill which will follow.

Once again, I commend the chairman and also thank him for making in order the amendment which we will debate for 30 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule.

I recall when we opened this Congress the colleagues on the other side told us we were going to have open rules and free and open debate, and this is a protestation, a rule that has been mostly honored in the breach, and this rule is a classic example of it.

This bill adds \$12.9 billion to the President's request, the Pentagon's request for national defense. There was an amendment filed that would strike the entire \$12.9 billion. In all candor, I probably would not have voted for it, but that is the overarching issue here.

At the very least we should open the debate with how much money we are going to spend on national defense. If we do not want to debate \$12.9 billion, a huge add-on, at least we could have taken up the Foley amendment offered by a gentleman from the other side of the aisle to strike \$2.6 billion and keep defense spending flat next year with the level of spending this year. But that amendment, too was precluded by this particular rule.

These two amendments, as I said, are the overarching issues. They address what we are going to spend and what we are going to allocate to defense. Deep within the interstices of this rule there are other things that are precluded that I think are good government amendments. I offered one. A simple amendment to strike \$25 million in funding that was added to the budget to accelerate the production of plutonium pits that go into nuclear weapons.

□ 1300

We have more plutonium pits than we can say grace over. If you want to restart production, \$25 million is a spit in the bucket compared to what it is going to cost.

My amendment to knock out this entirely unnecessary \$25 million was not made in order. I am the ranking member of the R&D subcommittee on our committee. There is a provision here that precludes the use of this money for developing short takeoff and landing capabilities for the Joint Strike Fighter, which means it precludes its use for the Marine Corps. I know there has been some sort of compromise struck. Let us do it on the floor, do it in the well, put it behind us, and let us have that debate here and now.

What are we going to debate then? We are going to debate social issue, totally peripheral to this bill, important

maybe, but not as important as how much we spend on national defense. We are reopening gays in the military and HIV-positive serving, that is what this debate will be focused upon, not the key issues of how best to defend this country and how much to spend. That is why we should all oppose this rule and start over again.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at the attitude of the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. SRATT].

The gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. SPRATT] was a member of the majority for many years here and never once put an open rule on this defense bill on the floor. He knows that. This is more balanced, which the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will agree, as far as the distribution of amendments. Not only have we been fair, but to this gentleman, Mr. SPRATT, we have made two amendments that were very critical to him in order. There were many Republicans that were turned down; many Democrats that were turned down.

I think the gentleman should be a little more grateful for what we did for him instead of standing up here and knocking a rule that makes it that much more difficult for me to give him amendments in the future that he asks for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], perhaps another disgruntled Member who did not get his amendment made in order, because we made 2 Spratt amendments in order and there was not room for it, but nevertheless he is a very valuable Member of this body. He has a good point to make here. I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some regret because the time has been given to me so graciously by the gentleman from New York, who is not only a great chairman but he is a great marine. But I still nonetheless rise with no less resolve in opposition to this blatantly unfair rule.

It is unfair because it does not permit the people's representatives to hear a tragic and disturbing story that they deserve to hear. It is the story of how defense contracts for military landing gear are being sent abroad; how American working men and women are sweating blood to send tax dollars to Washington so that we can send their jobs overseas; how the percentage of foreign landing gear contracts has increased from 15 percent in 1992 to 76 percent in 1996. These are the U.S. contracts for our landing gear. They have gone from 85 percent in 1992 down to 24 percent in 1996.

How the American landing gear industrial base has been decimated as a result of that; how 77 United States cities had businesses with landing gear defense contracts in 1992 and how that has dwindled to 38 cities today, cities like Pomona, CA; Upland, CA; East Haven, CT; Sarasota and Stuart, FL;

Wichita, Kalamazoo, New York City, Cincinnati, Dallas, Salt Lake City, Seattle, Oshkosh. How Americans actually are providing foreign aid to some of those governments so that not only can their citizens subsidize the stealing of American jobs but American citizens can subsidize that, too.

Out of the \$200 million that we spent just on Air Force landing gear, not Army or Navy, in the past 7 years, nearly half has gone abroad.

Well, maybe now they have heard the story, but if we do not defeat this terrible rule, the people's representatives will not have the opportunity to stop this outrageous abuse of American tax money and have the trust that they place in us. I do not care if you are a fair trader or a free trader or something in between, but when we use American workers; taxes to send jobs building our own military aircraft overseas to be built by foreign governments, subsidized by their own taxpayer dollars there, everyone knows that is wrong. We should not do it. We should be voting on this amendment. Defeat this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state my opposition to this rule. This is supposedly an opportunity for a candid debate on the merits of the 1997 Department of Defense authorization bill. The Committee on Rules is supposed to enable this debate.

My colleagues submitted 117 amendments to this bill. Although this is a high number, it is actually lower than in previous years. Why? Because it is difficult to draft amendments to a bill you have not seen. And this bill became available to Members the day after amendments were due. So by sheer will, 117 amendments were submitted. However, we are going to debate only 41 of them.

The Committee on Rules has shut down 68 percent of the amendments they received. Clearly the majority have carefully selected which amendments they want to debate candidly. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one issue that we will not be debating, because under this rule we will not be debating the majority's addition of \$12.9 billion to the President's budget request for defense. We added \$7 billion above what the Pentagon asked for last year. Now in this year of balancing the budget, we say to a government agency, the Pentagon, you did not ask for enough money. We have found \$13 billion that you should have asked for, but we are going to give it to you.

Then we are going to bring it to the House of Representatives for a debate, and there is not a Member who has an opportunity to question whether or not we should be giving that agency more than they asked for. Could you imagine any other budget that we deal with on the floor of this House that we would say to a government agency, you did not ask for enough money. We are

going to give you more than we are not going to debate it.

That is exactly what this rule does. The same people that want to balance the budget, want to take 15 percent of the budget, increase it by \$13 billion and say when we have debate on the floor of the House, we are not going to debate whether it is in the Nation's interest to have added this money to the bill, not to mention the fact that we are adding money for missile systems, and if you look at the Republican budget over 7 years that you voted for, if you look at the increases in the \$13 billion, how are we going to maintain this equipment?

If you look at the outyears of the Republican budget, it is heavy on the front end, but once you get into the sixth, seventh, eighth, later years of that budget, it goes down. We have already added \$20 billion in 2 years beyond what the Pentagon asked for. No one in America really believes that this is the way that you balance the budget. We should defeat this rule. It is unfair and it does not give the American public an opportunity to debate whether or not we ought to be giving \$13 billion more than the Pentagon asked for.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to the former speaker.

It is too bad that the Clinton administration intimidates our Joint Chiefs of Staff. A perfect example of that was that the Clinton administration, which now is permeated with people that never served in the military, there is nothing all wrong about that, but sometimes you have a different way of thinking. I have, as a matter of fact, an amendment that will be made in order and brought up on Tuesday to investigate why we are not giving veterans priority consideration under the laws of the land in the Clinton administration, not only in the Defense Department but everywhere.

But the point is, there was a situation just recently where the Clinton administration now wants to privatize all of the military depots throughout the country. Sounded like a pretty good idea. Sounds like GERRY SOLOMON, privatize. But that would have been a disaster in case of emergencies to do that.

The Clinton administration forced the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all but one, to sign a letter saying that they believed in privatizing. That is exactly the same situation on the level of funding for the Defense Department. The previous speaker knows that. That is why we have to override the President and put in the money that we, the Congress of the United States, think is necessary.

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

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

I would only caution my friend, the chairman on the other side, about certain remarks. I would remind him that the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, did not serve in the military. The

majority leader of the House, Mr. ARMEY, did not serve in the military. The majority whip of the House, Mr. DELAY, did not serve in the military.

I know the gentleman served in the military, as did I, but I would urge the gentleman not to make remarks about the Clinton administration and people who did not serve in the military when there are leaders on his side of aisle who also did not serve in the military.

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

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that I was not criticizing. I made it very clear that I was not. It is not a prerequisite to have served in the military, but sometimes you do think a little differently. But I have no criticism for any of those that you mentioned, including the President, in spite of the differences about how he did not serve, in my opinion. I have not criticized him in any way about that.

Mr. FROST. Including the Speaker and the majority leader and the majority whip who also did not serve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time.

I want to offer an insight into this debate that hopefully will be accepted by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules. The defense is everyone's business. Defense is everyone's business. It is the business of America. It is the business of this Congress. It is the business of the President of the United States.

The authorization process which we are engaged in and reviewing a rule for is a very important process. It sets the tone for the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations. I cannot imagine why it is not appropriate for those of us who offered a simple amendment to reduce the Defense Department's budget to the extent that they wanted to have it. This budget is \$13 billion more than they requested.

I might add, having come from a family of those who have served in the military, I do not find them intimidating easily. I might not imagine that the Joint Chiefs would be intimidated by the fact that someone elsewhere is pressuring them to do something. I offered a simple amendment to reduce the defense budget by \$6 billion. Fairly that leaves \$7 billion remaining in that budget over the amount requested by the Defense Department.

I do not even dictate to the Defense Department how they should do the reductions. I believe in readiness. I believe in military personnel. I have been to Bosnia and Croatia and the former Yugoslavia, Italy and Germany to look at our troops, others have been elsewhere.

I know the value of making sure that our military personnel are ready and well and kept. I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs believes in, the Committee on Rules believes in veterans preferences. I can assume that he believes in affirmative action as well. None of that will be damaged, if you will, by a simple opportunity to discuss a reduction in the defense budget. We, Mr. Speaker, must do so.

I do agree, however, with the Harman amendment which respects the men and women in the military that are HIV positive, respecting their heroism, respecting their leadership and not denying them the opportunity of being in the U.S. military.

Let us open the rule and allow debate on reducing this budget. I think the Defense Department will be happy. The men and women in the military will be happy, and we will do what is right for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule on H.R. 3230, the Defense authorization bill. The amount of the authorized appropriations in the bill exceed the amount requested by the Department of Defense by \$13 billion. I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that would have reduced the total appropriations for the Department by \$6 billion. However, the Rules Committee did not accept my amendment.

I believe that the entire House of Representatives should have the opportunity to determine whether this \$13 billion increase over the Defense Department's recommendation is prudent. Most Members have not had the opportunity to review this bill in any depth. I am surprised that many Members of this body who speak strongly in favor of a balanced budget would not take the opportunity to allow a vote on an amendment that would help us to reach the goal of deficit reduction. Even if some Members believe that the Defense Department needs significant increases in funding, my amendment would have still allowed the Department to operate on \$7 billion above the President's request.

The Department of Defense must contribute its fair share of the sacrifice in achieving fiscal responsibility for our Government. Programs such as Medicaid, Medicare, education, housing, and environmental protection must not endure a disproportionate share of the burden in balancing the budget.

I am sure that Members of Congress and the Department of Defense can work cooperatively to find some reductions in the Department's budget. For example, in the procurement area, you could carefully review the number of C-17 planes, the number of DDG-51 destroyers, and the number of strategic missiles. Additionally, in other areas, you could examine whether some airborne missions or reserve divisions need to be merged to save money. We need to have a real debate on these important issues of the Department's priorities. The proposed rule for this bill does not allow us to have this important discussion. I believe, however, in any Defense reduction the Defense Department would make the correct decisions.

There are a few positive amendments that were allowed by the Rules Committee such as an amendment striking the provision stating

that military personnel who are HIV-positive would have to separate themselves from active service. But such positive amendments don't negate the need to discuss reductions to the Defense Department authorization.

The rule for this bill is still too restrictive and I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and allow amendments that would reduce the overall level of authorized appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, this is really an incredible rule. What we have been hearing for the last year and what we will be hearing shortly is that the leadership here in the Congress thinks that we should make savage cuts in Medicare, force elderly people who do not have the money to pay more for premiums. Meanwhile, they are suggesting that we spend \$13 billion more for the military than the President wants. Do not you think the American people are entitled to that debate on priorities? The Republican majority wants to savage Medicaid; 88 million people will no longer have health insurance. Children will be without health insurance. Elderly people will be unable to pay for their prescription drugs.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I ask, "Don't you think we should have a debate as to whether or not we cut military spending, or we salvage Medicaid?"

I think the American people want that debate.

Maybe they will agree with our colleagues. Maybe they think we should spend more money on star wars and B-2 bombers and less money on health care; maybe our colleagues are right. I do not think they are. But I think that is a debate that we should have.

Mr. Speaker, all over America, middle-class families are desperate. In Vermont they are knocking their brains out trying to figure out how they can afford to send their kids to college. Meanwhile the Republican leadership is cutting back on loans and grants.

I think the American people, the middle class of this country, has a right to decide whether we put more money into education or whether we continue to spend a hundred billion dollars a year defending Europe and Asia against a nonexistent enemy.

Mr. Speaker, some of the cuts that have been advocated here by the Republican leadership are cruel, they are unnecessary. It seems to me that before we go after nutrition programs for children, we take a hard look at the military budget. We have a right to have that debate.

Defeat this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] we only have one speaker remaining on our side who will close for us. I do not know if the gentleman has any other speakers.

Mr. SOLOMON. I ask the gentleman, who is that speaker, sir?

Mr. FROST. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. SOLOMON. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. I can think of no one better to speak on behalf of this bill than this gentleman who is a very good friend of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. He is a member of the committee, been there a long time and has so much experience in this field.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for the great job that he has done as chairman of the Committee on Rules because he puts together this rule not only with an understanding of the parliamentary mechanics that go with that job, but also as somebody who really understands national security, and I want to thank him for that job and thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for the input that he has.

Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues who maybe did not get an amendment made in order, I did not get one of my amendments made in order, and I offered a couple of them, and yet I support this rule, and let me tell my colleagues why I do.

First, we did add to this year's defense request, but it was done because the military wanted that additional money. In fact, we asked the service Chiefs this year, and the genius of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] this year was to bring in the service Chiefs and ask them to tell us what they really wanted beyond President Clinton's defense budget. They asked for \$15 billion in added modernization and equipment. They asked for \$15 billion more. We gave them about \$7 billion more.

If we look at President Clinton's defense budget, his 5-year defense plan in 1995, do my colleagues know what he asked for modernization this year? Almost \$50 billion. do my colleagues know what he asked for when he actually got to the year-end question this year? Went down to \$38.9 billion, and after his own chiefs came in and said we need this, then we acted and we gave them about half of what they requested, of the additional add-on they requested, and the total bill, when we put it together, was still about \$4 billion less than President Clinton said in 1995 we would need for this year.

So the first question is, Did the military want this? And the answer is, "Absolutely, yes."

Second, do they need it? I think the best symbol of whether or not they need it is a meeting that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the ranking member, and I had with the U.S. Marine Corps and other service groups, specifically the ammunition experts when we asked them, "Can you fight two wars? If your infantry men have to fight the 2 MRC scenario, will they have enough bullets in their ammo pouches to fight two wars?"

They said "no." Marines are always candid. The marines said they do not have enough ammo to fight two wars; they are 96 million M-16 bullets short. These ammo pouches, like the one I am holding here, will be empty if our marines are caught up in that two-war scenario.

So, yes, we added ammunition for the marines, and they added a lot of other ammunition in the marine account, too. Howitzers, tank ammunition, and down the line, we put in everybody dime of ammo that they needed, and one of the gentlemen who complained about the top line was a Member who joined in letters asking for about \$300 million in add-ons. Now, that is not bad because I think that he too realizes that this defense budget is coming apart at the seams.

The Clinton defense plan is coming apart at the seams. It results in not enough ammunition for the troops, it results in not making the safety upgrades for 24 Aviate Marine jumpjets, and the marine aviators told us it would become 50 percent safer if they got those upgrades. It is very expensive to do the upgrades, but we put the money in to do that. So, yes.

The second question, Do they need it? Answer is, "Absolutely, yes." In fact, according to the Clinton administration 2 years ago and the service Chiefs themselves, they need more, they need more than the top line we gave them.

Mr. Speaker, finally let me just say that the first obligation that we have is to defend this country, and for those Members who have talked about social needs and the need to balance this budget with social needs, it is balanced with social needs, it meets the most basic obligation; that is, to defend America.

This is an excellent bill, and the Committee on Rules has done a good job in putting this rule to the floor, and, yes, we do not have the first ever in history open rule on the defense bill, but the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and I have engaged in a couple of 5- and 6-week defense bills at one time, and we did enjoy that debate, and I like to have as much time as possible, but I am also reminded that last year we got behind the gun and we finished our defense bill after the first of the year.

I like this rule. I think we are doing what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, lastly let me make my last point to people that say these add-ons were not requested by the service. They were special add-ons that the members of Congress put in for pork in their district. That was the cry last year. We did a calculation, and with respect to the additional requirements that we met in this bill with the Army, those requirements that we put in were 98 percent requested by the service. With the Navy it was 86 percent requested by the service. With the Marines it was 99 percent requested by the service. With the Air Force it was 95 percent requested by the service. And I thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for making sure we put those numbers down this time and set the story straight.

This is a good defense bill. Let us pass the rule and let us pass the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, and then I will yield the remaining time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed that the House was going to consider bills under an open process. I would like to point out that 86 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restrictive rule. Not only are the Republicans restricting the process on the floor, they are also restricting Members' input during the committee process. I find it unfortunate that 48 percent of the legislation considered this session has not been reported from committee. In fact, 13 out of 27 measures brought up this session have been unreported.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following extraneous material in the RECORD:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes; PQ	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (0)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.	H. Res. 51	Open	N/A.
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve.	H. Res. 52	Open	N/A.
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California.	H. Res. 53	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; PO	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision; PO	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered; PO.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language; PO.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act; FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins; PO.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments; PO.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ); PO.	N/A
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority; PO.	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive: provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open: waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority; PO. "RULE AMENDED".	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open: Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive: 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open: waives cl. 2(f)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive: waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Billey amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open: Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title; PO.	N/A.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open: 2 hr of gen. debate; makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive: waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl. 7 of rule XVI and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open: waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl. 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. Provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open: waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute as well as cl. 5(a) of rule XXI and cl. 1(q)(10) of rule X against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority; PO.	N/A.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive: waives cl. 2(f)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open: waives cl. 2(f)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open: makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open: makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed: Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open: self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive: waives cl. 2(f)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive: waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl. 5(c) of rule XXI (3% requirement on votes raising taxes); PO.	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive: provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A.
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive: makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl. 5(c) of rule XXI (3% requirement on votes raising taxes); PO.	1D
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive: waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed: Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A.
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive: Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule: Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open: waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed: provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A.
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed: provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A.
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed: provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open: waives cl. 2(f)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive: waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open: waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed; provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr. of general debate; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open; waives cl 2(l)(6) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.).	N/A
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed; makes in order three resolutions: H.R. 2770 (Dornan), H. Res. 302 (Buyer), and H. Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed; provides 2 hours of general debate in the House; PO	N/A
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act	H. Res. 313	Open; pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995.	H. Res. 323	Closed; consideration in the House; self-executes Young amendment	N/A
PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION				
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.	H. Res. 334	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report: 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered. **NR; PO.	N/A
H.J. Res. 134	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134.	H. Res. 336	Closed; provides to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 134 with the Senate amendment and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment (H. Con. Res. 131) which is self-executed in the rule. The rule provides further that the bill shall not be sent back to the Senate until the Senate agrees to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 131. **NR; PO.	N/A
H.R. 1358	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.	H. Res. 338	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report: 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered. **NR; PO.	N/A
H.R. 2924	Social Security Guarantee Act	H. Res. 355	Closed; **NR; PO	N/A
H.R. 2854	The Agricultural Market Transition Program	H. Res. 366	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill; 2 hrs of general debate; makes in order a committee substitute as original text and waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order only the 16 amends printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; circumvents unfunded mandates law; Chairman has en bloc authority for amends in report (20 min.) on each en bloc; PO.	5D; 9R; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 994	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995	H. Res. 368	Open rule; makes in order the Hyde substitute printed in the Record as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Pre-printing gets priority; vacates the House action on S. 219 and provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table and consider the Senate bill; allows Chrmn. Clinger a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the text of H.R. 994 as passed by the House (1 hr) debate; waives germaneness against the motion; provides if the motion is adopted that it is in order for the House to insist on its amendments and request a conference.	N/A
H.R. 3021	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States.	H. Res. 371	Closed rule; gives one motion to recommit, which if it contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 3019	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget	H. Res. 372	Restrictive; self-executes CBO language regarding contingency funds in section 2 of the rule; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; Lowey (20 min), Istook (20 min), Crapo (20 min), Obey (1 hr); waives all points of order against the amendments; give one motion to recommit, which if it contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	2D/2R.
H.R. 2703	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996	H. Res. 380	Restrictive; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the amendments; gives Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) on en blocs; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 735. **NR.	6D; 7R; 4 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2202	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995	H. Res. 384	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill and amendments in the report except for those arising under sec. 425(a) of the Budget Act (unfunded mandates); 2 hrs. of general debate on the bill; makes in order the committee substitute as base text; makes in order only the amends in the report; gives the Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) of debate on the en blocs; self-executes the Smith (TX) amendment re: employee verification program; PO.	12D; 19R; 1 Bipartisan.
H.J. Res. 165	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 386	Closed; provides for the consideration of the CR in the House and gives one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader; the rule also waives cl 4(b) of rule XI against the following: an omnibus appropriations bill, another CR, a bill extending the debt limit. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 125	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.	H. Res. 388	Closed; self-executes an amendment; provides one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 3136	The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996	H. Res. 391	Closed; provides for the consideration of the bill in the House; self-executes an amendment in the Rules report; waives all points of order, except sec. 425(a) (unfunded mandates) of the CBA, against the bill's consideration; orders the PO except 1 hr. of general debate between the Chairman and Ranking Member of Ways and Means; one Archer amendment (10 min.); one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee; Provides a Senate hookup if the Senate passes S. 4 by March 30, 1996. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 3103	The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996	H. Res. 392	Restrictive; 2 hrs. of general debate (45 min. split by Ways and Means) (45 split by Commerce) (30 split by Economic and Educational Opportunities); self-executes H.R. 3160 as modified by the amendment in the Rules report as original text; waives all points of order, except sec. 425(a) (unfunded mandates) of the CBA; makes in order a Democratic substitute (1 hr.) waives all points of order, except sec. 425(a) (unfunded mandates) of the CBA, against the amendment; one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee; waives cl 5(c) of Rule XXI (requiring 2/3 vote on any tax increase) on votes on the bill, amendments or conference reports.	N/A
H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment	H. Res. 395	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 3 hrs of general debate; Makes in order H.J. Res. 169 as original text; allows for an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or his designee (1 hr) **NR; PO.	1D
H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	H. Res. 396	Open; 2 hrs. of general debate; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996	H. Res. 409	Open; Preprinting gets priority	N/A
H.R. 1675	National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995	H. Res. 410	Open; Makes the Young amendment printed in the 4/16/96 Record in order as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the amendment; Preprinting gets priority; **NR.	N/A
H.J. Res. 175	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 411	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; one motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may be offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 2641	United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996	H. Res. 418	Open; Pre-printing gets priority; Senate hook-up. **PO	N/A
H.R. 2149	The Ocean Shipping Reform Act	H. Res. 419	Open; Makes in order a managers amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the managers amendment; Pre-printing gets priority; makes in order an Obestar en bloc amendment.	N/A
H.R. 2974	To amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims.	H. Res. 421	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XIII against consideration of the bill; makes in order the Judiciary substitute printed in the bill as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 3120	To amend Title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering.	H. Res. 422	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XIII against consideration of the bill; makes in order the Judiciary substitute printed in the bill as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2406	The United States Housing Act of 1996	H. Res. 426	Open; makes in order the committee substitute printed in the bill as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the substitute; makes in order a managers amendment as the first order of business (10 min); if adopted it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority; provides a Senate hook-up.	N/A
H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996	H. Res. 427	Open; waives cl 2(l)(2) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order a managers amendment as the first order of business (10 min); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the bill; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 3286	The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996	H. Res. 428	Restrictive; provides consideration of the bill in the House; makes in order the Ways & Means substitute printed in the bill as original text; makes in order a Gibbons amendment to title II (30 min) and a Young amendment (30 min); provides one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee.	1D; 1R

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 3230	Defense Authorization Bill FY 1997	H. Res. 430	Restrictive	41 amends; 20D; 17R; 4 bipartisan

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session, 87% restrictive; 13% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress, 58% restrictive; 42% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. ***** PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. ***** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

LEGISLATION IN THE 104TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION

To date 13 out of 23, or 57% of the bills considered under rules in the 2nd session of the 104th Congress have been considered under an irregular procedure which circumvents the standard committee procedure. They have been brought to the floor without any committee reporting them. They are as follows:

H.R. 1643, to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.

H.J. Res. 134, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

H.R. 1358, conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.

H.R. 2924, the Social Security Guarantee Act.

H.R. 3021, to guarantee the continuing full investment of Social Security and other Federal funds in obligations of the United States.

H.R. 3019, a further downpayment toward a balanced budget.

H.R. 2703, the effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996.

H.J. Res. 165, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

H.R. 125, the Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.

H.R. 3136, the Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996.

H.J. Res. 159, tax limitation constitutional amendment.

H.R. 1675, National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

H.J. Res. 175, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

THE TRADITION OF OPEN RULES UNDER DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker, several times during this debate my Republican colleagues have asserted that the Department of Defense authorization bill was never before considered under an open rule and therefore they are justified in restricting amendments and not permitting debate on the amount of money to be spent on ballistic missiles or environmental restoration or, in total, on defense.

In fact, the longstanding tradition of the House, when the Democratic Party controlled this body, was to consider DOD authorization bills under an open rule. Until the 99th Congress, all DOD authorization bills were considered under open rules. For example, in each session of the 98th Congress the annual DOD authorization bill was considered under an open rule (H. Res. 197 and H. Res. 494). If Republicans had offered an open rule, it would not have been the first such rule for consideration of this important annual authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for his generosity in yielding this time

to me, and, Mr. Speaker and Members, we come to the close of this debate. As I said earlier, this is a debate on the procedure by which we will discuss the military policy of this country. Let me try to place that in proper context.

We now find ourselves in the context of a post-cold-war world, a significant period in American world history. We do not even know quite how to name it. We simply call it post-cold war. But it is a moment that provides with it an enormous opportunity, Mr. Speaker, an enormous opportunity to redefine our national security agenda, redefine our national security strategy in the context of the realities of the post-cold-war world.

I believe that that new post-cold-war national security strategy ought to embrace three elements: First, a healthy, vibrant American economy, which means a well-educated, well-informed, well-trained American citizenry, healthy, where there is a commitment to full employment, commitment to our children, commitment to our future.

The second element of our national security strategy ought to be a foreign policy rooted in the notions of prevention, where there is a heavier reliance on political, economic, social and diplomatic solutions to problems that would preclude the need to go to the extraordinary step of war.

And, finally, the third element of our national security strategy: a properly sized, properly trained, properly equipped military to meet the realities as we move toward the 21st century.

This military budget addresses that third element.

This military budget, as I said earlier, is to the tune of \$267 billion.

Mr. Speaker, let me place that in context for people who do not understand. America's military budget is roughly equivalent to all the other military budgets in the world combined, and if we add the military budgets of America's allies in Europe and in Asia, our friends, combine those budgets, America and its friends spend in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget, leaving slightly over 19 percent of the rest of the world's military budget in the hands of, quote, potential adversaries.

We are outspending the rest of the world, the United States and its friends, four to one. So this notion about America's military budget falling apart is a farce; it is a bizarre notion.

But we ought to intellectually grapple with each other, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to lay down old labels, old

ideas, old paradigms, old policy and old programs, but let us talk about it. There is a fiscal dimension to this. The people who put \$13 billion see great dangers and see the need to march forward almost in cold war fashion. But there are those of us who see the potential, the possibilities and the great promise of moving the world away from war and moving the world away from the need to spend so much money on defense.

We ought to, irrespective of whether we agree or disagree, have the right to debate these matters free and open, and all I ask, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is the opportunity for free and open debate. It does not have to be an open rule. We can have a substantive debate without having open rule.

This rule is so constricted and so confined that we cannot even get to the intelligent rationale that ought to be the business of the United States Congress.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, go back and give us the opportunity to stand here and carry out our responsibilities as dignified Members of the Congress.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will not use all of our time. I will be as brief as I can just to point out the gentleman seems to be concerned at our level of defense spending. He complains that our budget is much bigger than it should be. Yet just look across the Pacific, look at the country of the People's Republic of China who in the last several years have doubled their defense budget, doubled their defense budget, and are using, and I will not yield at this point; my colleague should not interrupt a closer. The People's Republic of China are taking the weapons that they are producing today and giving it to the stated terrorist nation enemies, professed enemies of this country like Iran, Iraq, Libya, and others, and North Korea. This country's first obligation is to be prepared militarily to defend the interests of the United States of America around this world. That is what this budget does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. 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—235, nays 149, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Allard	Frisa	Murtha
Archer	Frost	Myers
Armey	Funderburk	Myrick
Bachus	Gekas	Nethercutt
Ballenger	Geren	Neumann
Barr	Gilchrest	Ney
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Norwood
Bartlett	Gilman	Nussle
Barton	Goodlatte	Oberstar
Bass	Goodling	Ortiz
Bateman	Goss	Oxley
Bereuter	Graham	Packard
Bilbray	Green (TX)	Parker
Bilirakis	Greene (UT)	Petri
Bliley	Greenwood	Pombo
Blute	Gutknecht	Porter
Boehlert	Hall (TX)	Pryce
Bonilla	Hancock	Quillen
Bono	Hansen	Quinn
Brewster	Hastert	Radanovich
Browder	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Brown (FL)	Hayworth	Rangel
Bryant (TN)	Hefley	Regula
Bunning	Hefner	Richardson
Burr	Heineman	Riggs
Burton	Hilleary	Rogers
Buyer	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Hoekstra	Rose
Calvert	Horn	Roth
Camp	Hostettler	Royce
Campbell	Houghton	Salmon
Canady	Hunter	Saxton
Chabot	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Chambliss	Hyde	Schiff
Chenoweth	Inglis	Seastrand
Christensen	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chrysler	Johnson, E. B.	Shadegg
Clayton	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Clement	Kasich	Shuster
Clinger	Kelly	Sisisky
Coble	Kennedy (RI)	Skeen
Coburn	Kim	Smith (MI)
Coleman	King	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Combust	Klink	Solomon
Cooley	Klug	Souder
Cox	Knollenberg	Spence
Cramer	Kolbe	Stearns
Crane	LaHood	Stenholm
Crapo	Largent	Stockman
Cremeans	Latham	Stump
Cubin	LaTourette	Talent
Davis	Lazio	Tate
de la Garza	Leach	Tauzin
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Tejeda
Dixon	Linder	Thomas
Doolittle	Livingston	Thompson
Dornan	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Dreier	Longley	Torkildsen
Duncan	Lucas	Trafficant
Dunn	Manton	Vucanovich
Edwards	Manzullo	Walker
Ehlers	McCollum	Walsh
Ehrlich	McCrery	Wamp
Emerson	McHale	Waters
English	McHugh	Watts (OK)
Everett	McInnis	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	McIntosh	White
Fawell	McKeon	Whitfield
Flanagan	Meek	Wicker
Foley	Metcalf	Wilson
Forbes	Meyers	Wolf
Fowler	Mica	Young (AK)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Mollohan	
Franks (NJ)	Montgomery	

NAYS—149

Ackerman	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Andrews	Hamilton	Pastor
Baessler	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hilliard	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Hoke	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hoyer	Pickett
Bentsen	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Poshard
Boniore	(TX)	Rahall
Borski	Jacobs	Reed
Boucher	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Bunn	Kanjorski	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Castle	Kennelly	Sanders
Chapman	Kildee	Sanford
Clyburn	Klecza	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Schumer
Condit	Lantos	Scott
Costello	Levin	Serrano
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Cummings	Lincoln	Skaggs
Danner	Lipinski	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lofgren	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Lowey	Spratt
Dellums	Luther	Stark
Deutsch	Maloney	Stokes
Dingell	Martinez	Studds
Doggett	Martini	Thurman
Doyle	Mascara	Torres
Durbin	Matsui	Torricelli
Engel	McCarthy	Towns
Eshoo	McDermott	Upton
Evans	McKinney	Velazquez
Farr	McNulty	Vento
Fattah	Meehan	Visclosky
Fazio	Millender	Volkmer
Hastings (LA)	McDonald	Ward
Filner	Minge	Watt (NC)
Flake	Mink	Waxman
Foglietta	Moran	Weller
Frank (MA)	Morella	Wise
Furse	Nadler	Woolsey
Ganske	Neal	Wynn
Gephardt	Obey	Yates
Gibbons	Olver	Zimmer
Gonzalez	Orton	
Gordon	Owens	

NOT VOTING—49

Baker (CA)	Gallegly	Paxon
Baker (LA)	Gejdenson	Portman
Berman	Gunderson	Roberts
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hayes	Roukema
Brown (OH)	Herger	Scarborough
Brownback	Holden	Schroeder
Clay	Jefferson	Skelton
Collins (IL)	Jones	Stupak
Conyers	Kaptur	Tanner
Cunningham	Laughlin	Thornton
Dickey	Markey	Tiahrt
Dicks	McDade	Weldon (PA)
Dooley	Menendez	Williams
Ensign	Miller (CA)	Zeliff
Fields (TX)	Moakley	
Ford	Molinari	

□ 1347

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dicks for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Herger for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Scarborough for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mrs. KENNELLY and Mr. SANFORD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would have voted "aye" on House Resolution 430 if I had been present for this vote.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip to inquire of the schedule for the rest of the week and for next week.

Mr. DELAY. I am pleased to announce that we have concluded our legislative business for the week.

On Monday, May 13, the House will not be in session. On Tuesday, May 14, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members should note that we do not anticipate votes until after 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 14.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read through the list at this time, but a complete schedule will be distributed to all Members' offices this afternoon.

After consideration of the suspensions, we will take up H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, the rule for which was just passed today.

On Wednesday, May 15, the House will meet at 9 a.m. and recess immediately for the Former Members' Day annual meeting. We expect to resume legislative business by 10 a.m. and complete consideration of H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization bill.

On Thursday, May 16, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business and have Members on their way home by 6 p.m. on Thursday, May 16.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for the information and would ask him if he plans to consider next week either of these two bills, the ballistic missile defense bill or the United Nations command and control bill.

Mr. DELAY. We do not anticipate consideration of either of those bills next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas a few questions. As we enter into the weekend and Mother's Day, certainly many of us are glad that we are out now to spend time in our home districts and see our families. We would just like to be able to next week have a certain schedule, so that it is not a repeat of this week when the gentleman told us that we would start votes at 2 and be out at 6 on Tuesday, and then we did not start votes until 7 and we were going until about 11.